

EMMANUEL MICHAEL PAPAMICHAEL

BELLEROPHON AND STHENEBOEA (OR ANTEIA)

The story of Bellerophon and Stheneboea (or Anteia) is a good example of what is called the Potiphar motif. Its relation to the legend of Hippolytos and Phaedra is obvious. These stories were brought even closer by Euripides, whose treatment of the myths of Hippolytos and Bellerophon made the characters of Phaedra and Stheneboea, and to some extent those of Hippolytos and Bellerophon, good parallels¹. But the myth of Bellerophon was well known long before Euripides, and some of its primary features had already been developed by Homer, Hesiod, Pindar and other writers.

The most important account of the myth before Euripides is found in the *Iliad* Z (6) 155-202. This version also constituted the background against which the arguments of the Euripidean plays *Stheneboea* and *Bellerophon* were fashioned. It is therefore important to know Homer's account of the legend. Homer tells us²:

Glaucos begot noble Bellerophon. To him the gods granted good looks and handsome manliness. But Proetos in his heart contrived evil against him, and, because he was by far mightier, drove Bellerophon out of the land of the Argives, for Zeus had subjected them to his sceptre. Now Anteia, Proetos wife, was mad in her lustful passion to lie secretly with Bellerophon but could in no way persuade him, a man of sound mind and upright heart. So she contrived a false story and spoke to king Proetos: «May you die Proetos, or else slay Bellerophon, who wanted to lie with me in love against my will.» So she spoke and wrath seized Proetos when he heard this. He refrained from killing Bellerophon, for he stood in fear of that, and sent him to Lycia instead, giving him letters designed to cause him harm. He wrote on a folded tablet many deadly instructions and bade Bellerophon show it to Iobates (the king of Lycia and), his (Proetos') father-in-law, that Bellerophon might perish. Thus

1. See Aristoph. *Frogs* 1043:

ἄλλ' οὐ μὰ Δί' οὐ Φαίδρας ἐπόρουσ' ἴσθ' οὐδὲ Σθηνεβοίας; on this cf. also pp. 62 f.

2. See pp. 73 f.

Bellerophon went to Lycia, escorted by the blameless gods. But when he came to Lycia and the stream of Xanthos, (Iobates) the king of broad Lycia showed him great honour. For nine days the king offered him hospitality and slew nine oxen. When, however, the tenth rosy-fingered Dawn appeared, then he questioned Bellerophon at length and sought to see what letter he had brought him from his son-in-law Proetos. But when he received the evil message of his son-in-law, he first ordered Bellerophon to kill the furious Chimaera, a monster of divine stock and not of men. Her front part was a lion, the hind part a dragon, and the middle a goat, and she breathed out a terrible blazing fire. Bellerophon killed her, relying on the signs of the gods. Secondly, he fought against the glorious Solymi, and this, as he said, was the hardest battle he had ever entered. And thirdly, he slew the Amazons, women who matched themselves against men. And, as he was on his way back, the king devised another cunning trick. He chose the bravest men of broad Lycia and set an ambush, but none of them returned home, for blameless Bellerophon killed them all. But, as the king realized that Bellerophon was the good offspring of a god, he kept him there, and gave him his own daughter and granted him half of all his privileges and possessions. In addition, the Lycians gave him the best part of their land as his own domain, a good piece of orchard and plough-land.

And she (the king's daughter) bore wise Bellerophon three children, Isander, Hippolochos, and Laodameia. Zeus the counsellor lay with Laodameia, and she bore godlike Sarpedon, the warrior in bronze harness.

But when even that man (Bellerophon) came to be hated by all the gods, then in truth he wandered alone over the Aleian plain, consumed by grief, and avoiding the paths of men.

Some fragmentary evidence regarding this story is found in Hesiod's work. The evidence as a whole does not constitute a coherent account, but, as we shall see, three important features of the story—Pegasos, of whom we do not explicitly¹ hear anything in Homer, the Chimaera, and Bellerophon's fight against her—are very well attested and agree with what Homer says.

1. But implicitly something miraculous of this sort seems to be suggested by Homer in the *Iliad* Z (6) 183:

καὶ τῆν μὲν (sc. Χίμαιραν) κατέπεφνε θεῶν τεράεσσι πιθήσας

and already before this (verse 171):

ἀντάρ ὁ βῆ Λυκίηνδε θεῶν ὑπ' ἀμόμονι πομπῇ·

see below, pp. 57 f.

In the *Theogony* 278 ff. Hesiod gives the myth of Pegasus:

The Dark-haired one, that is Poseidon, lay with Medusa, one of the Gorgons, who was mortal, in a soft meadow amid spring flowers. And when Perseus cut her head off, there sprang forth great Chrysaor and the horse Pegasus, who was so called because he was born near the (πηγαί) springs of Ocean¹...Pegasus flew away, leaving the earth, the mother of flocks, and came to the immortals. He lives in the house of Zeus and brings to him, the wise counsellor, the thunder and lightning.

After a few verses we read the tale of Chimaera (*Theog.* 306 ff.), how Typhon, the terrible, outrageous and lawless, lay in love with Echidna², the maid with glancing eyes. She brought forth fierce offspring—Geryones, Cerberos, the Hydra of Lerna...and (vv. 319 ff.) Chimaera, who breathed overwhelming fire, a creature terrible, big, swift-footed and strong. She had three heads, one of a fierce-eyed lion, another of a goat, and another of a serpent, a mighty dragon. In her front part she was a lion, in the hind part a dragon, and in the middle a goat breathing out the blast of burning fire³. Pegasus and brave Bellerophon killed her.

An even more important piece of evidence, although of very fragmentary nature, is found in Hesiod's *Catalogue of Women* or *Ehoiai* (Γυναικῶν Κατάλογος sive 'Hoīai)⁴ fr. 43 (a):

- 81 ἦ δὲ Ποσει[ιδάωνος ἐν] ἀγκοίνησι μιγεῖ[σα
Γλαύκῳ ἐν [... ..] ἀμύμονα Βελλε[ροφόντην,
ἔξοχον ἀνθ]ρώπων ἀρ]ετῇ ἐπ' ἀπειρόνα γ[αῖαν.
τῷ δὲ καὶ ἠ[..... πα]τήρ πόρε Πήγασο[ν ἵππον
- 85 ὠκύτατον [... ..] μινεπτε[
πάντη ἀν[.....] ε τα ...[
σὺν τῷ πῦρ [πνείουσαν υ - υ υ - υ Χίμαιραν.
γῆμε δὲ πα[ῖδα φίλην μεγάλητορος Ἴοβάταο
αἰδοίου βασ[ιλῆος
- 90 κοίρανος α[
ἦ τέ[χε

1. Eur. and Pind. give Πειρήνη, see below, p. 58.

2. Apollod., *Bibl.* II. 3, 1-2, in his narrative of Bellerophon mentions this, saying: λέγεται δὲ καὶ τὴν Χίμαιραν ταύτην τραφῆναι μὲν ὑπὸ Ἀμισωδάρου, καθάπερ εἴρηκε καὶ Ὅμηρος, γεννηθῆναι δὲ ἐκ Τυφῶνος καὶ Ἐχίδνης, καθὼς Ἡσίοδος ἱστορεῖ.

3. These last two verses (323-4) are found verbatim in Homer's account and may be spurious in Hesiod's *Theogony*.

4. *Fragmenta Hesiodica*, ed. R. - M. L. Merkelbach - West, Oxford 1967.

In the fragment it is stated that Poseidon is Bellerophon's actual father and Glaucos his nominal one, that Bellerophon surpassed all men over the boundless earth in vitrue, and that his father gave him the fastest horse, Pegasus, on whom he flew everywhere. Then he apparently killed Chimaera, who breathed forth fire, and wedded the lovely daughter of magnanimous Iobates, the revered king and tyrant of Lycia. Pindar (*Olympia* XIII. 63-92) has a rather detailed account of how Athene helped Bellerophon catch the winged horse Pegasus. Particularly relevant is what is contained in the verses 84-92b:

- 85 ἤτοι καὶ ὁ καρτερός ὄρμαίνων ἔλε Βελλεροφόντας,
 φάρμακον πραῦ τείνων ἀμφὶ γένυι,
 ἵππον πτερόεντ'· ἀναβάς δ'
 εὐθύς ἐνόπλια χαλκωθεῖς ἔπαιζεν.
 σὺν δὲ κείνῳ καὶ ποτ' Ἀμαζονίδων
 αἰθέρος ψυχρῶν ἀπὸ κόλπων ἐρήμου
 τοξόταν βάλλων γυναικεῖον στρατὸν
 90 καὶ Χίμαιραν πῦρ πνέοισαν καὶ Σολύμους ἔπεφνεν.
 διασωπάσομαι οἱ μόνον ἐγώ·
 τὸν δ' ἐν Οὐλύμπῳ φάτναι
 92b Ζηγὸς ἀρχαῖαι δέκονται.

In truth, the strong Bellerophon, after his great efforts, caught the winged horse, by bridling him with that gentle charm (that is the bridle with its golden band); and mounting straightway, he flourished his weapons, armed in bronze harness. With that steed he once attacked from the lonely bosom of the cold ether the archer army of the Amazon women; moreover he slew the fire-breathing Chimaera and the Solymi. I shall go on, saying nothing with regard to his fate; as for Pegasus, him they shelter in the old stalls of Zeus in Olympus.

Besides this very important piece of information we find even more valuable evidence with reference to Bellerophon's fate in the *Isthmia* VII. 44 ff. Before the strictly relevant verses, Pindar, having in mind Bellerophon's tragic adventure as paradigm case, makes a general invocation, saying (38 ff.):

... ἀείσομαι χαίταν στεφάνοισιν ἀρ-
 μόζων. ὁ δ' ἀθανάτων
 μὴ θρασσέτω φθόνος.

...

τὰ μακρὰ δ' εἴ τις

παπταίνει, βραχὺς ἐξικέσθαι χαλκόπεδον θεῶν
ἔδραν·

I shall sing with garlands in my hair, and I pray that the immortals may not trouble me. ...but if anyone sets his eyes on things afar, he is too little to attain the bronze-paved abode of the gods.

He then brings his paradigm case:

... ὃ τοι πτεροεῖς
44b ἔρριψε Πάγασος

δεσπότην ἐθέλοντ' ἐς οὐρανοῦ σταθμούς
ἐλθεῖν μεθ' ὁμάγουριν Βελλεροφόνταν
Ζηγός. τὸ δὲ πᾶρ δίκαν
γλυκὺ πικροτάτα μένει τελευτά.

for the winged Pegasus threw Bellerophon, his rider, who wanted to get to the dwellings of heaven and be in the company of Zeus. Him who desires unlawful things awaits a most bitter end.

The significant thing here is that a number of features of the myth that we see in Euripides' tragedies, *Stheneboea* and *Bellerophon*, were well known long before him. Pegasus' role in the fight against the Chimaera is very well attested, as we have seen, by Hesiod and Pindar¹. Moreover Pindar mentions the tragic incident of the hero's falling from the horse and strongly stresses *hybris* as his flaw and the cause of his downfall, a factor expressly mentioned in the *Bellerophon* of Euripides.

Let us now see how Euripides used this account in his own personal way to produce with subtractions, additions, and modifications two of his well-known tragedies, *Stheneboea* and *Bellerophon*². For this purpose we have a number of pieces of evidence of different value:

a) Sources that explicitly state that something comes from the play of Euripides. b) Items of information attributed to tragedians in general, but which we have very good reasons to suppose come from

1. Apart from literary sources we also have Corinthian vase-painting before the mid and Athenian before the end of the seventh century with scenes of Bellerophon on Pegasus attacking the Chimaera. Such scenes continue to be found on various art objects in later centuries (Brommer, *Vasenlisten*², 220 ff.). Cf. *Oxf. Class. Dict.*, 2nd ed. s. v. *Pegasus*: «... Pegasus became early a favourite of Greek artists and poets; proto-Corinthian vases show him in action against the Chimaera (H. Payne, *Necrocorinthia* (1931), 133, cf. pl. 4, I).»

2. *Bellerophon* will not be our concern here.

these particular plays of Euripides. c) Information that probably refers to the play in question. d) Other evidence that is dubious or not applicable to these plays.

Sources from the play: Most of what we use here fortunately belongs in this category and, although we have much less than what we may wish, it is nevertheless sufficient to give a good idea of what is particular to this play.

Argument and Prologue (in Johannes Logothetes on Hermogenes *περὶ μεθόδου δεινότητος* Rhein. Mus. 63, 147)¹.

Stheneboea: ἔστι δὲ ἡ ὑπόθεσις αὕτη. Προῖτος ἦν Ἀκάμαντος (I. Ἀβαντος) υἱός, Ἀκρισίου δ' ἀδελφός, βασιλεὺς δὲ Τίρυνθος. γήμας δὲ Σθενέβοιαν ἐξ αὐτῆς ἐγέννησε παιῖδας. Βελλεροφόντην δὲ φεύγοντα ἐκ Κορίνθου διὰ φόνον αὐτὸν μὲν ἤγγισε τοῦ μύσου, ἡ γυνὴ δὲ αὐτοῦ τὸν ξένον ἠγάπησε. τυχεῖν δὲ μὴ δυναμένη τῶν ἐπιθυμημάτων διεββαλεν ὡς ἐπιθέμενον αὐτῇ τὸν Κορίνθιον· πεισθεὶς δὲ ὁ Προῖτος ἐξέπεμψεν αὐτὸν εἰς Καρίαν, ἵνα ἀπόληται· δέλτον γὰρ αὐτῷ δοὺς ἐκέλευσε πρὸς Ἰοβάτην διακομίζειν. ὁ δὲ τοῖς γεγραμμένοις ἀκόλουθα πράττων προσέταξεν αὐτῷ διακινδυνεῦσαι πρὸς τὴν Χίμαιραν. ὁ δὲ ἀγωνισάμενος τὸ θηρίον ἀνεῖλε. πάλιν δὲ ἐπιστρέψας εἰς τὴν Τίρυνθα κατεμέμψατο *τὸν Προῖτον, ἀνέσεισε δὲ τὴν Σθενέβοιαν ὡς* τὴν Καρίαν ἀπάξων. μαθὼν δὲ παρὰ του* ἐκ Προῖτου² δευτέραν ἐπιβουλήν φθάσας ἀνεχώρησεν. ἀναθέμενος δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν Πήγασον τὴν Σθενέβοιαν μετέωρος ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν ἤρθη. γενόμενος δὲ κατὰ Μῆλον τὴν νῆσον ταύτην ἀπέρριψεν. αὐτὴν μὲν οὖν ἀποθανοῦσαν ἀλιεῖς ἀναλαβόντες διεκόμισαν εἰς τὴν Τίρυνθα. πάλιν δὲ ἐπιστρέψας ὁ Βελλεροφόντης πρὸς τὸν Προῖτον αὐτὸς ὠμολόγησε πεπραχέναι ταῦτα· δις γὰρ ἐπιβουλευθεὶς ὑπ' ἀμφοτέρων, δίκην εἰληφέναι τὴν πρέπουσαν, τῆς μὲν εἰς τὸ ζῆν, τοῦ δὲ εἰς τὸ λυπεῖσθαι.

The plot of the play is as follows: Proetos was Acamas's (or better Abas's) son, and the brother of Acrisios, king of Tiryns. He married Stheneboea and had children by her. When Belleophon fled from Corinth after having committed a murder, Proetos purified him of the defilement, but his wife fell in love with the guest, and, as she could not obtain what she lustfully desired, she slanderously stated that the Corinthian had assaulted her. Proetos, having confidence in her, sent him to Caria to meet his doom, for he gave him a letter to carry

1. H. v. Arnim, *Supplementum Euripideum*, Bonn 1913, p. 43; cf. Nauck, *TGF*², 'Σθενέβοια', pp. 567 f.

2. «μὲν τὸν Προῖτον, ὡς εἰς τὴν Καρίαν, πρὸ αὐτῆς ἐκ Προῖτου Wilamowitz (*Classical Philology* III. 3, «De Euripidis Stheneboea», July, 1908, p. 226); with regard to the last one see pp. 62, 69.

to Iobates, who, acting in accordance with what was written, bade him to fight the Chimaera at the risk of his own life. But he fought and slew the monster. And when he returned back to Tiryns, he reproached Proetos and threatened to take Stheneboea away to Caria. But when he was informed by a third party¹ that Proetos was again contriving against him, he managed to escape in time. He put Stheneboea on the back of Pegasus and rode off into the air, over the sea, and when he was approaching the island of Melos, he threw her down. She died of course, and fishermen picked her body up and carried it over to Tiryns. Bellerophon returned to Proetos and confessed that he had done the deed. As plots had been made by both against him, he had inflicted fitting punishment upon them; one had paid with her life, the other with his deep sorrow.

This short but succinct argument gives us a rough idea of the plot of the play and allows us to see some important changes that the tragedian included in his work².

Bellerophon comes on to the stage and gives the prologue³. We have a substantial part of this, which enables the reader to sense the mood of the play. The young man begins by saying:

Οὐκ ἔστιν, ὅστις πάντ' ἀνὴρ εὐδαιμονεῖ·
 ἢ γὰρ πεφυκῶς ἐσθλὸς οὐκ ἔχει βίον
 ἢ δυσγενῆς ὦν πλουσίαν ἀροῖ πλάκα.
 πολλοὺς δὲ πλούτῳ καὶ γένει γαυρουμένους
 γυνὴ κατήσχυν' ἐν δόμοισι νηπία. 5
 τοιαῦδε Προΐτος <νῦν> ἀναξ νόσω νοσεῖ,
 <'Αβαντος υἱός· τῆσδε γὰρ Τιρυνθίας
 <σκήπτροις ἀνάσσων ἐν δόμοις δάμαρτ' ἔχει
 <Σθενέβοιαν, αἰσχρὰ μηχανωμένην λάθρα.
 ἕξενον γὰρ ἱκέτην τῆσδ' ἔμ' ἔλθόντα στέγης 10
 <Γλαύκου μὲν υἱὸν ὄντα τοῦ Κορινθίου
 <καὶ Βελλεροφόντην ὄνομ' ἔχειν κεκλημένον,
 <πάτραν δὲ φεύγονθ' αἵματος μιάσματι,

1. For my standpoint see below, pp. 62, 69.

2. On this question see below.

3. Just before the argument above we read, ταῦτο λέγει Εὐριπίδης ἐν Σθενεβοίᾳ τῷ δράματι εἰσάγων τὸν Βελλεροφόντην γνωμολογούντα; see Nauck *ibid.*, «Scholion Greg. Cor. e codice Mediceo partim in Rhet. vol. 7 p. 1321, plenius ab Welckero Tragoed. p. 777 editum.»

λόγιοι πείθει καὶ δόλω θηρεύεται
 κρυφαῖον εὐνῆς εἰς ὀμιλίαν πεσεῖν. 15
 αἰεὶ γὰρ ἤπερ τῷδ' ἐφέστηκεν λόγῳ
 τροφὸς γεραῖά καὶ ξυνίστησιν λέχος,
 ὕμνεϊ τὸν αὐτὸν μῦθον· «ὦ κακῶς φρονῶν,
 τί ταῦτ' ἀνάινη; τλήθι δεσποίνης ἐμῆς
 <ἔρωτι δεινῷ φιλοφρόνως ὑπηρετεῖν· 20
 κτήσει δ' ἀνακτος δώμαθ' ἐν πεισθεῖς βραχύ.»
 ἐγὼ δὲ θεσμούς Ζηνὸς ἱκεσίου σέβων
 Προῖτόν τε τιμῶν, ὅς μ' ἐδέξατ' εἰς δόμους
 λιπόντα γαῖαν Σισύφου φόνον τ' ἐμῆς
 ἔνιψε χειρὸς αἰμ' ἐπισφάξας νέον, 25
 οὐπώποτ' ἠθέλησα δέξασθαι λόγους
 οὐδ' εἰς νοσοῦντας ὑβρίσαι δόμους ξένος
 μισῶν ἔρωτα δεινόν, ὅς φθείρει βροτούς.
 διπλοῖ γὰρ <εἶσ' > ἔρωτες ἔντροφοι χθονί·
 ὁ μὲν γεγῶς αἰσχιστος αἰσχύνῃν φέρει, 30
 ὁ δ' εἰς τὸ σῶφρον ἐπ' ἀρετὴν τ' ἄγων ἔρωσ
 ζηλωτὸς ἀνθρώποισιν· ὧν εἶην ἐγώ.
 <ζῆν > οὖν νομίζω καὶ θανεῖν γε σωφρονῶν.
 ἀλλ' ἐξ ἀγρῶν τῶνδ' ἀπιέναι βουλήσομαι.
 οὐ γὰρ με λύει τοῖσδ' ἐφήμενον δόμοις 35
 κακορροθεῖσθαι μὴ θέλοντ' εἶναι κακόν,
 οὐδ' αἴ κατεπειν καὶ γυναικὶ προσβαλεῖν
 κηλῦδα Προίτου καὶ διασπάσαι δόμον¹.

There is no man in the world who is happy in all respects. Either he is born noble, but he has no livelihood, or he is well-off, but he is low-born. There are many who boast of their riches and noble birth together, yet a foolish wife at home often brings shame upon them. From such an affliction suffers Proetos, Abas's son, the king of this country. I came here, to this palace, as a guest and suppliant, but she, the king's wife, seeks with words and wily thoughts to persuade me to secretly share her bed, for the old Nurse who is charged with bringing me this message and contrives to bring about this union, repeatedly stresses its attractive aspects: «stupid man, why do you reject this? Be bold and lie in love with my mistress....by giving in for a while, you will become the master of the palace.» But I have due respect for ordinances of Zeus, the protector of suppliants, and esteem for Proctos, who, when I left Sisypchos'land, received

1. The text is from H. v. Arnim's («Εὐριπίδου Σθενέβοιαν») *Suppl. Eur.*

me in his house and washed my hands clean of murder by shedding new blood upon them, so I have not consented to her request, nor, being a guest, to outrage this stricken house, for I hate blind passion, which destroys men. There are two kinds of love that exist on earth: One is our greatest enemy and leads to Hades; the other leads to self-control and virtue. This last kind is coveted by men such as I aspire to be. That is what I think. I would rather be σώφρων, decent and virtuous, even if I have to pay with my life for it. Now I had better go out to the field¹. It is not in my interest to remain sitting in this house and be reviled on account of my declining to be wicked, nor do I want to denounce her and bring shame on Proetus' wife, rending the house asunder.

Bellerophon brings the prologue to an end and apparently leaves the stage. The gap from this point up to the time Bellerophon departs from Tiryns to go to Iobates must unfortunately be filled by conjecture—in particular with regard to which characters and how many scenes were necessary for the tragedy to run smoothly in accordance with the plot². Keeping in mind the plot of the story and parallel plays of the dramatist we can maintain with a high degree of certainty that there were at least two scenes³.

Some time after the prologue—if the Nurse stepped for a while on to the stage to say something about the situation of her mistress, or immediately after it, if neither the Nurse nor Stheneboea appeared to complete the exposition of the particulars of the play—we would have the *parodos* of the Chorus. Its members were very likely women of Tiryns. We would expect them not to know at this early stage anything about what has happened, though it is reasonable to suppose, as it often happens with the Chorus, and particularly the Chorus of women in such situations, that they would have sensed something unusual in the behaviour of their queen. If so, their ode must have been of rather indefinite nature, for instance how precarious human life is, how passions disrupt one's prosperity, and the like.

1. I adopt at this point the text ἀλλ' εἰς ἀγρὸν γὰρ ἐξίεναι... Joh., verb. A.; Wilam., *Class. Philol.* III. 3, July 1908, p. 228; G. Sellner, *De Euripidis Stheneboea, quaestiones selectae*. Diss., Ienae 1910, p. 29.

2. τυχεῖν δὲ μὴ δυναμένη τῶν ἐπιθυμημάτων διέβαλεν ὡς ἐπιθέμενον αὐτῇ τὸν Κορινθίων· πεισθεὶς δὲ ὁ Προῖτος ἐξέπεμψε αὐτὸν εἰς Καρίαν, ἵνα ἀπόληται· δέλτον γὰρ αὐτοῦ δοῦς ἐκέλευσε πρὸς Ἰοβάτην διακομίζειν.

3. See Wilamowitz, «De Euripidis Stheneboea», *Class. Philol.* III. 3, July 1908, p. 228: «Postquam Bellerophontes exiit, Proetus Stheneboeae calumniis excitatus in Cariam eum misit, ut ab Iobate occideretur. Quae duas ut minimum scaenas requirebant.»

At any rate, after the choral ode in the first episode we would need a scene in which the Nurse and her mistress prepared their plan in detail. The old woman would play a role parallel to that of the Nurse in the second *Hippolytos* as a go-between¹ and would have to be a woman with initiative and daring. These characteristics are already clearly recognizable in the prologue². It is thus probable that she herself conceived the plan of the false accusation. This must not have been so simple in the play, and some arrangements were doubtless made. Some proof of Bellerophon's alleged rape of the queen may have been falsely presented to the king, her husband. Unless the Nurse was presented as a false witness, in which case she could well have borne her own evidence or testimony of the alleged rape, though she might as well have undertaken to speak on behalf of and in the interest of her mistress. In that case Stheneboea would have had nothing to say personally to Proetos unless questioned by him. The accusation, after the plan had been worked out, was in all likelihood made off-stage (This seems to be more likely, for thus Stheneboea would have appeared prudish, saved face and extricated herself rather easily from an embarrassing situation. This arrangement would make it easy for the tragedy to proceed without great complications at this stage. These would still have to come), while the Chorus had its first stasimon. This time they must have sung something more concrete and to the point, for they must have tried in the meantime to obtain information about the things that had befallen their queen. Even if the whole truth had been somehow confided to them, they at any rate would have pretended throughout the play that they did not know anything at all. The Chorus of women would have been made to sympathize and stand by an unfortunate woman³. This, however, would not have prevented them from singing about how bad women can be, citing a number of notorious examples. But, if something was confided to the Chorus for dramatic reasons, this does not mean that the secret leaked out or was supposed to be betrayed. It must have remained during the whole play practically a secret of the persons immediately concerned. Above all it would have been in the dramatic interest of the playwright to present a

1. *Apollod. Bibl. II. 3, 1*: και αὐτοῦ Σθενέβωια ἔρωτα ἴσχει, και προσπέμπει λόγους περὶ συνουσίης τοῦ δὲ ἀπαρνουμένου, λέγει πρὸς Προῖτον ἔτι Βελλεροφόντης αὐτῇ περὶ φθορᾶς προσεπέμψατο λόγους.

2. See vv. 16 ff., p. 52.

3. Cf. *Hippolytos*, v. 816 τίς ἄρα σάν, τάλαιν', ἀμαυροῖ ζόαν;

The Chorus of women sympathize with the queen and pretend to be ignorant of what has happened.

Proetos on the stage who believed thoroughly the accusation and thought he knew everything. And not only that, Euripides would have obviously caused Proetos to also find it in his own interest to pretend to Bellerophon and the others (except of course his wife and the Nurse, who doubtless revealed the alleged rape to him) that he did not know anything at all, that in fact he was as good a friend and on such good terms with Bellerophon as he had ever been. In addition to other dramatic tricks we shall see, this extreme degree of tragic irony would render this play really tragic with a tinge of fine, in places sarcastic, humour.

Dramatically, Bellerophon cannot have known for a relatively long time that he had been accused and that Proetos knew something regarding him and Stheneboea, for if he had known that he had been accused, he would not have gone to Iobates on the kind of mission on which he was sent; he would have tried to avoid being caught in the trap. On the other hand, if Proetos had sensed that Bellerophon knew even the least thing about the accusation, he would not have trusted him to carry out the mission. He would have thought that it would be a very good chance for Bellerophon to get away unscathed. But the tragic irony doubtless reached its peak with Bellerophon and Proetos in the second episode. Very soon, in the prologue, the young man indeed expressed his wish to go away, but he certainly did not tell Proetos that he wanted to free himself from the lady's repeated, tempting advances made through the old Nurse. One imagines Proetos and Bellerophon, host and guest, on stage conversing about that 'important' mission to Caria¹. They seem to be on the best of terms. Although the king is pretending, Bellerophon is really sincere. Proetos holds a written tablet in his hand, and the young man looks up to him with respect and compliance. After Proetos gives some preliminary instructions, both men agree with pleasure that this long trip should be undertaken. In the actual play, both Proetos and Bellerophon must have wished the same thing, their separation once and for all, but for quite different reasons—The question here is who brought the subject up first. We may suppose that the noble nature and good intentions of Bellerophon, which he already shows in the prologue, caused him to express his wish first, which Proetos was only too glad to grant.—Proetos probably tried somehow to give some mean-

1. Wilam., 'De Eur. Sthen.', *Class. Philol.* III. 3, 1908, p. 228, n. 4: «Cariam pro Lycia appellat poeta. Nimirum Lycii usque ad annum 439 Cariae provinciae ab Atheniensibus erant attributi.»

ing to this kind of mission and stressed its significance. Confidence was of paramount importance; the message was without doubt stated in the letter Bellerophon apparently was to hand to Iobates in person. It would of course have added to the dramatic effect of the scene, if in answer to Bellerophon's question, what that message in the letter contained—so that, if it were lost or destroyed, he would be able to deliver it orally to the recipient—Proetos had made up something quite fictitious. This would have heightened the irony of the scene in its tragicomical phase for the audience¹. The poor young man, who certainly could not imagine what Stheneboea had contrived in the meantime, would have shown himself happy and grateful that he was in a position to obtain two things at the same time: to get away from something that vexed him so much, and to render valuable services to the man to whom he was thankful (no less now than in the past).

The probability of this arrangement is supported by three different kinds of evidence: by the plot of the play (and the account in the *Iliad*), by the nature of the Potiphar motif, in which intrigue and irony are inseparably interwoven, and to some extent by vase-painting².

To continue with our reconstruction, Bellerophon must have thanked Proetos cordially and sincerely for his kindness and generosity and, after taking leave, the young hero set out. One can imagine him walking away on the stage and holding the 'valuable' tablet in his hand, believing it to be in some way a letter of recommendation as well.

The Chorus probably then sang the second stasimon. About what? Possibly something about hypocrisy and double-facedness, about reality and *phaenomena*, cruelty and innocence.

This scene must have given grounds for serious thought among some of the Athenian spectators. At least a few of them surely considered the situation from a realistic point of view as well, as they concentrated on this very remarkable scene and inevitably formed their own opinions. Until the next scene they were certainly preoccupied with what they had just watched. If we could only have peeped into the most private parts of their brains and read their ideas, we would most likely have found there an innocent Bellerophon, smiling and happy because he was going away without offending either his host or his hostess. And not only that—he had got everything he needed for the trip—money, food, and

1. Cf. *I. T.* 755-795; something of the sort, though not quite the same.

2. See Excursus: Vase-painting on the *Stheneboea*, pp. 70 ff.

other things. He was taking the message from one host to the other. How good was the world! How could one not be thankful to men and the gods?

Then would appear the image of Proetos, bursting out in sarcastic and irresistible laughter. When he managed to stop, he would say, «That dupe! He cannot have the least idea what is awaiting him. He thinks I was a simpleton like him to swallow what the others tell me. When he gets snared in my trap, he will realize how clever I am. But I will teach him never to touch another man's wife again, particularly his host's».

And last would appear the cunning Stheneboea herself. She would say something like, «How nice to play coy and prudish and do your work tidily and safely. Truly, all men are stupid, some more than others. Look at that young boy, so innocent and shy. How could he dare say a word? Perhaps I still love him? No, I hate him! He must pay for scorning my love. And that old fool, my husband, he believes so easily whatever I tell him. But he loves me. Would he, if he found out I was willing to cheat him?» «That is what tragic irony means, and there is a lot of it in this scene», someone in the audience would probably have said, and another might have added, «Should you not better call it sarcasm?»

Some serious problems arise here, mainly the question of how Bellerophon reached Iobates' country and how, after that, he slew the Chimaera. The plot is so brief that important details are left out. It introduces Pegasus rather late. That was, as we shall see, an innovation, something spectacular, when Pegasus appeared on the stage. But at this point we may have to make some assumptions after we examine the evidence. Luckily some very good evidence as well as dramatic reasons speak for the use of Pegasus by Bellerophon much earlier than his appearance on the stage. Once Euripides decided to use Pegasus in his play, following to some extent the myth, and, as this device was a useful dramatic trick, he would, we expect, have made full use of it in tying together some parts of the myth and would not have limited himself to having it used by his hero only as a means of bringing about Stheneboea's punishment. We have a fragment from the play in Photios s.v. ἀθήρ¹, in which Bellerophon, after he has come back to Tiryns, reports that he has used Pegasus to kill the Chimaera. This, as we have seen,

1. λέγεται μὲν οἷον καὶ ἐπιδορατὶς. λέγεται δὲ καὶ ἀθήρ πυρός, ὡς Εὐριπίδης Σθeneβοία·
παῖω Χιμαίρας εἰς σφαγὰς, πυρός δ' ἀθήρ
βάλλει με καὶ τοῦδ' αἰθάλῃ πυκνὸν πτερόν·

cf. Reitzenstein, *Der Anfang des Lexikons des Photios*, Leipzig u. Berlin 1907, p. 42, 20; Wilam., *Class. Phil.* III. 3, 1908, p. 229; G. Sellner, op. cit., pp. 54 f.

was already an established part of the tradition, and Hesiod and Pindar mention it as well. Euripides brings up this incident very briefly once again in *Electra* (verses 472 ff., see footnote) where he calls Pegasus Πειρηναῖος. This coincides with Pindar's account (*Olympia* XIII. 61 ff.) that the horse, when he was drinking at the fountain Πειρήνη¹ was caught and tamed by the young hero Bellerophon, who achieved this after Athene² gave him a bridle with a golden band. Until then he had suffered sorely.

Exactly at this point Homer writes (*Iliad* Z -6-, 171),

αὐτὰρ ὁ βῆ Λυκίηνδε θεῶν ὑπ' ἀμύμονι πομπῇ.

This great favour on the part of the gods, exhibited towards the son of Δαμαῖος, «the tamer of the horses»³, could very well have meant for Euripides the possession of Pegasus. Bellerophon needed the horse badly for the trip. His fellow men had actually betrayed him; the gods would have pitied him in this plight, if ever, and according to the best evidence we have, Πειρήνη was close at hand. Euripides needed this useful trick no less than his hero to minimize spatial and temporal distance, for by this means unity of time would not be so blatantly broken, and occurrences that would otherwise be clearly impossible could then be depicted in a plausible way. What in normal circumstances would take months to do could be accomplished relatively quickly and without many complications by using this mythological device. Moreover, everyone understood that in the world of theatre allowances had to be made for things that were not absolutely congruent with what they considered reality.

In the third episode, with Bellerophon absent, we could expect scenes, in which Stheneboea and her Nurse would have much to say, possibly by themselves, in small monologues. There would also be occasional comments by the Chorus, and perhaps a dialogue between the queen and her old servant. We would expect Stheneboea in this part of the play to express some kind of remorse and perhaps a sort of repentance for having

1. Eur. *Electra*:...περιπλεύ- /ρω δὲ κύτει πύρπυρος ἔ- /σπευδε δρόμω λέαινα χα- /λαῖς Πειρη- /ναῖον ὄρωσα πῶλον. Corinth is called by Pindar ἄστῳ Πειρήνας.

2. See also above; Paus. 'Corinthiaca' II. 4,1 says on this: (χαλινίτιδα) Ἰπποκράτης γὰρ θεῶν μάλιστα συγκατεργάσασθαι τὰ τε ἄλλα Βελλεροφόντη φασὶ καὶ ὡς τὸν Πήγγασόν οἱ παραδοίη χειρωσαμένη τε καὶ ἐνθεῖσα αὐτῇ τῷ ἵππῳ χαλινόν.

3. That is Poseidon; in his capacity as master of horses, he bears the name Ἀμφιδάμας, Ἰπποκράτης, Ἰππομένης, Ἰπποκῶων, Ποσειδῶν Ἴππιος, while elsewhere he is called κυανοχαίτης (Hom. II. 20, 144, Od. 9, 536, Hesiod *Theog.* 278), ἐνοστήθων (Hom. II. 7, 445), γαιήοχος ἐνοσίγαιος (Hom. II. 13, 43).

accused the man she loved and having planned his death. She would think, «He must be dead by now.» In this psychological situation it is almost certain that her hatred would abate and her passion would grow again. This seems to be expressed by the Nurse in fr. 664:

πεσον δέ νιν λέληθεν οὐδὲν ἐκ χερσός,
ἀλλ' εὐθύς αὐδ᾽ ἄτῳ Κορινθίῳ ξένῳ¹,

who describes her mistress's persistent recalling of Bellerophon's name as an indication of her great love for him. It must have been so strong that Stheneboea often showed herself obsessed and absent-minded. Her husband may have suspected something of her love for his former guest, but, in view of the accusation brought against Bellerophon, he was doubtless quickly misled. Something of this sort is suggested by Aristophanes (*Thesm.* 399 ff.):

...τοιαῦθ' οὗτος (sc. ὁ Εὐριπίδης) ἐδίδαξεν κακὰ
τοὺς ἄνδρας ἡμῶν· ὥστ' ἐάνπερ τις πλέκη
γυνή στέφανον, ἐρᾶν δοκεῖ· κἂν ἐκβάλλῃ
σκευδός τι κατὰ τὴν οἰκίαν πλανωμένη,
ἀνὴρ ἐρωτᾷ, ἄτῳ κατέαγεν ἡ χύτρα;
οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅπως οὐ τῷ Κορινθίῳ ξένῳ².

This could be rendered as follows, «.....surely it can't be otherwise explained. I bet you are dreaming again of the Corinthian guest.»

That fragment together with Aristophanes' parody, which depicts the psychological situation of a woman in love, is a useful bit of information that throws light on some dark points in the plot of the play. It may well point to the solution of the difficulty that will soon arise; that is, how Bellerophon managed to make Stheneboea follow him, for the plot is not very clear as to whether he threatened her when he came back or pretended to be in love with her³. Indeed, it suggests that he did both.

1. Athen. X p. 427 E. (fr. 664 Nauck²): τοῖς δὲ τετελευτηκόσι τῶν φίλων ἀπένεμον τὰ πίπτοντα τῆς τροφῆς ἀπὸ τῶν τραπεζῶν· διὸ καὶ Εὐριπίδης περὶ τῆς Σθενεβοίας φησὶν, ἐπειδὴ νομίζει τὸν Βελλεροφόντην τεθνάναι, 'πεσον - ξένῳ' Hesychios II. p. 512 (ed. K. Latte, Copenhagen, 1966), s. Κορίνθιος ξένος· ἐπὶ τῶν τὰς λάταγας ριπτούντων (*Ar. Thesm.* 404). [*κορίνουσι· κοινορτὸν ἐγείρουσιν A] ἀπὸ τῆς παρ' Εὐριπίδῃ Σθενεβοίας τῷ Βελλεροφόντῃ ἀποχουούσης (fr. 664 N.²), ὡς δὲ "Ατταλος ἐν τῷ περὶ παροιμιῶν, ἐπὶ τῷ...διὰ κάλλος ὡς ὁ Βελλεροφόντης.

2. Cratinus (*Fr. Com. Gr.* II, ed. A. Meineke, XVI. p. 179):

πιεῖν δὲ θάνατος οἶνον ἦν ὕδωρ ἐπῆ.

ἀλλ' ἴσον ἴσῳ μάλιστ' ἀκράτου δύο χόας

πίνουσ' ἀπ' ἀγκύλης ἐπονομάζουσα (-σ' αἰεὶ op. cit. I. XVI, p. 59. 1847)

ἴσει λάταγας τῷ Κορινθίῳ πέει.

3. On the other hand we must not forget that this plot has many gaps which

Almost the same idea occurs in fr. 665:

τοιᾶϋτ' ἀλύει νουθετούμενος δ' ἔρωσ
μᾶλλον πιέζει.

Phaedra says about the same thing in *Hippolytos*, verses 398 ff.,

... τὴν ἄνοιαν εὖ φέρειν
τῷ σωφρονεῖν νικῶσα προυνουησάμην.
... τοισίδ' οὐκ ἐξήνυτον
Κύπριν κρατῆσαι...

Wilamowitz also places these fragments (664, 665 and 663¹) here and rightly remarks that we have, so to speak, another prologue in this part of the play.

Possibly with some comments from the Chorus, this episode came to its end. The choral ode that followed, the third stasimon, probably dealt with love and its overpowering character. Possibly also with the two kinds of love, a theme that Bellerophon brought up briefly in the prologue and which appears as a *topos* in a number of tragedies, particularly those of Euripides. The women of the Chorus had in all likelihood just witnessed a clear instance of that in their mistress Stheneboea, but they could have reported a few cases from their stock of myths and legends. One would expect them to have also broadly hinted at some unexpected turn of events that the future might have in store for the house of Proetos.

By the end of the ode and at the beginning of the fourth episode, Bellerophon must have stepped on to the stage, leading a real steed that was very probably fitted with long, outstretched wings in the way vase-painting and art objects depict Pegasos². The fragment from Pho-tios belongs here³:

παῖω Χιμαίρας εἰς σφαγίας, πυρὸς δ' ἀθήρ
βάλλει με καὶ τοῦδ' αἰθάλη πυκνὸν πτερόν⁴.

This comes from the hero's account of the experiences he had apparently from the time he left the palace until he came back. This description was like a sort of messenger's speech, delivered by the actor and

have been filled in by the painstaking efforts of a great number of scholars; see Nauck², *TGF* ('Sthen.').

1. Wilam. op. cit., pp. 228 f. In connection with fr. 663 see below.

2. See Excursus: Vase-painting on the *Stheneboea*.

3. See also above, p. 57.

4. Emendavit Wilamowitz Χιμαίρας et αἰθάλη (coniciens Χιμαίραν et αἰθαλοῖ) in *Actis Berol.* 1907, 4.

'participant' in the experiences themselves. He may have been prompted to give his account by impatient questions either from the Nurse or the Chorus-leader or both, who were astonished to see him back safe and sound. Wilamowitz seems to be right when he remarks with regard to the horse that the Athenians (would have laughed and no doubt been very amused when they) saw a real horse fitted with wings being led by an actor¹. Even the mere appearance of the horse on the stage would have been very exciting and thrilling especially for a number of well-to-do young Athenians who were fond of horsemanship or who bet at the horseraces. A glimpse of this in the *Clouds* of Aristophanes helps us to appreciate the vivid interest that this scene probably elicited.

In this episode, we can be almost certain that there was a scene with Bellerophon and Proetos and one with Bellerophon and Stheneboea. When the young man was forced by Iobates to fight the monster, he must have realized² that he had been accused by the woman and plotted against by her husband. His reason for coming back was to mete out punishment. In accordance with the summary account of the play we have, he would first have reproached Proetos, but in all likelihood he did not then reveal that he had been repeatedly tempted by Proetos' wife. His integrity and honour would not have allowed it, and in this he was very like Hippolytos. That is why in the fragment 667,

τις ἄνδρα τιμᾶ ζεναπάτην;

which may have been spoken by Bellerophon, Proetos appears to be blamed for what he has done to him, his guest.

In this scene we have the ἀγῶν λόγων of the play. Both disputants have or, better expressed, think they have good reasons for accusing each other and defend themselves. Bellerophon blames Proetos for having wronged him, for having disregarded Zeus' precepts concerning the protection of guests, while the host³ for his part, believing that he has been cheated, insists on accusing his guest, who in his eyes has abused kindness and friendship, of misconduct. The virtuous character of the hero is demonstrated at this point: He is innocent; he has been accused altogether falsely and, although no oath whatsoever binds him to maintain

1. Wilamowitz, op. cit., p. 229 says: «...nobilem equum libenter commodabat choragus, libentissime spectabat populus equitandi studio ardens.»

2. Or after the deed, Iobates showed the tablet to him; see Apollod. *Bibl.* II 3, 2: ... τὰ τε γράμματα ἔδειξε καὶ παρ' αὐτῷ μένειν ἤξιωσε.

3. I.A. Hartung, *Euripides restitutus*, vol. I (Hamburg 1843), p. 81, assigns Proetos in this context fr. incert. 988: τέκτων γὰρ ὦν ἔπρασσεσ οὐ ζυλοουργικά. The fragment is of very general nature; it would suit many a context and situation, and we cannot say with more plausibility that it comes from this play than that it does not.

secrecy or prevents him from revealing the truth and refuting the accusation, he nevertheless prefers suffering this abuse to irretrievably tarnishing the honour of a married woman and breaking up a home. That is the hero's attitude in the prologue; this is his position here; it is attested by the course of events in the drama, and by the words of fr. 671:

κομίζετ' εἴσω τήνδε· πιστεύειν δὲ χρῆ
 γυναικί μηδὲν ὅστις εὖ φρονεῖ βροτῶν¹.

Judging from these ideas, Euripides presented to the Athenian public new notions of a morality far superior to that of the everyday practice. They are based on integrity of the character and stand next to Christian ethics. Bellerophon is in this respect a better man and much more likable than Hippolytos, at least the one we get to know in *Hippolytos* II.

Bellerophon may have been just as bitter and angry, and perhaps angrier with Stheneboea for what she had done. In a scene with her, he must have shown how he felt. Thus what we read in the plot surprises us at first glance because it is something we do not expect. Nonetheless it may be the case after all. We read ἀνέσεισε δὲ τὴν Σθενέβοιαν ὡς <εἰς> τὴν Καρίαν ἀπάξων. μαθὼν δὲ παρὰ τοῦ² ἐκ Προίτου δευτέραν ἐπιβουλήν φθάσας ἀνεχώρησεν. Here is the difficulty mentioned above: The arrangement practically doubles the essential features of the plot—accusation on the part of the wife and scheming on that of her husband. Although this is somewhat unusual, there are good dramatic reasons that would have suggested this handling of the action to the tragedian. There are no reasons or evidence against it. On the contrary, some indirect support for our interpretation comes from the very great passion of the heroine³. The more Stheneboea is despised and temporarily reacts with her apparent hatred, the more her love grows for Bellerophon, who ignores her. Moreover, if Stheneboea is to be compared, as was done⁴, to the Phaedra of the *Hippolytos*, we would expect that she, too, would try to seduce Bellerophon in person and on the stage⁵, and not simply send him a message through her Nurse, as she does in the prologue. It seems certain that Bellerophon at this stage was presented by the poet as not prepared or

1. See below, p. 68.

2. παρ' αὐτοῦ cod., παρὰ του corr. Rabe, Sellner, v. Arnim, παρ' αὐτῆς Wilam.; see below, pp. 64, 69 f.

3. See above, p. 59, and below 69*.

4. See above, p. 45.

5. This is apparently the case in the first *Hippolytos*. See my work, 'Ο Ἰππόλυτος τοῦ Εὐριπίδη καὶ ἡ Φαίδρα τοῦ Σενέκα. Συγκριτικὴ μελέτη...', Ἰωάννινα 1982.

wanting to carry out any plan of revenge. He doubtless only went so far as to accuse and probably menace. He surely threatened to take the shameless woman with him to Caria, and she, we presume, must have been very happy, if he really meant it. She may have made new advances, this time in person, and used enticing new means, which, however, the young man probably bluntly rejected. Here he may very well have said (fr. 666):

ὦ παγκακίστη καὶ γυνή· τί γὰρ λέγων
μειζόν σε τοῦδ' ὄνειδος ἐξείποι τις ἄν;

The speaker of these words is obviously a man, as is shown from the participle λέγων. They could not come from a servant or another subject of the queen, for they are bold and insulting. It is also improbable that Proetos could have said them. Thus there is no doubt that they must have been spoken by Bellerophon, whom they fit in this context. But the problem is more complicated with regard to the person to whom these words are spoken, for it is possible that, if Stheneboea kept sending her messages through the Nurse and did not appear herself, Bellerophon would say these things to the queen's old maid. This is Wecklein's view¹. Although the nature of the subject does not allow any categorical assertion, this assumption does not seem probable: The Nurse, as we hear in the prologue, has repeatedly tried and failed². Stheneboea would no longer have any reason to save face, and, after what had happened, she could be expected to be as bold-faced, shameless and reckless as a woman who deserves to be characterized as a «prostitute»³. Her passion appears to have been so great that no restraint or consideration of decorum could stop her. For the dramatist such a change would have been welcome. Lastly but not less decisively, this insult «παγκακίστη καὶ γυνή» expresses a term that describes her shamelessness better than any other, and suits Stheneboea, not her Nurse, who acts under the instructions of her mistress and without any responsibility. In any case, Stheneboea, frustrated in her new effort to entice Bellerophon, must have been rejected and, according to our assumption, this time personally. As her husband cannot have known that her first accusation of rape or attempted rape against the young man was groundless and since the accused obviously kept quiet, she doubtless decided on a momentary impulse and without much ado, out of hatred and in reaction to having been again treated with

1. Cf. Nauck², *TGF*, p. 570 (fr. 666).

2. See above the relevant section, pp. 52 f.

3. See pp. 45, 62. Notice also that in the prologue, vv. 9 ff., it is the mistress who is reproached, not her Nurse.

contempt, to put forward new slanders. This time she must have had more to say—that the reckless man had threatened to take her away to Caria by force. This naturally caused Proetos to devise a new plot. Bellerophon was probably somehow informed by a third party, possibly a servant, he must then have cast aside moral scruples and taken immediate action, anticipating the new scheme of Proetos¹. We can assume that in a scene between Stheneboea and Bellerophon the young man made love to her²; the woman was very surprised and perhaps asked him about the sudden change of his feelings, but he probably claimed he had been blind not to have paid attention to her for so long for one reason or another. Stheneboea, after believing his words, may have consented to go with him, saying with fr. 663 that it really must be so:

ποιητήν δ' ἄρα
Ἔρωσ διδάσκει, καὶν ἄμουσος ἦ τὸ πρίν.

Our sources on this point are rather scanty, and in the reconstruction of this scene we go somehow further than our evidence entitles us, but I cannot think of another way that Bellerophon could have made Stheneboea follow him of her own accord. Her great love, which we have seen above, can very well explain the situation along these lines, and without it the play could not be brought to this denouement.

Stheneboea and Bellerophon then probably quickly agreed that they should leave the palace. Some small fears that the queen must have expressed as to how she could manage to travel the distance are things we would expect to hear here. An echo of her fears may well be fr. 669:

	πέλας δὲ ταύτης δεινὸς ἵδρυται Κράγος ἐνθηρος, ἧ ληστῆρσι φρουρεῖται.. κλύδωνι δεινῷ καὶ βροτοστόνω βρέμει πηγνὸς πορεύσει·
(Βελλ.)	
and Aristoph.	<i>Peace</i> 124 ff.
(Παιδίον)	καὶ τίς πόρος σοι τῆς ὁδοῦ γενήσεται; ναῦς μὲν γὰρ οὐκ ἄξει σε ταύτην τὴν ὁδόν.
(Τρυγαῖος)	πηγνὸς πορεύσει πῶλος· οὐ ναυσθλώσομαι.
	...
(Πα.)	οὐκουν ἐχρῆν σε Πηγᾶσου ζεῦξαι πτερόν, ὅπως ἐφαίνου τοῖς θεοῖς τραγικώτερος; ...

1. Notice the particular emphasis on δευτέραν ἐπιβουλήν φθάσας and δις γὰρ ἐπιβουλεύθεις ὑπ' ἀμφοτέρων.

2. For evidence on this point see p. 69 and mainly 69*.

- (Πα.) τί δ', ἦν ἐς ὕγρον πόντιον πέσῃ βάθος;
πῶς ἐξολισθεῖν πτηνός ὦν δυνήσεται;
- (Τρ.) ἐπίτηδες εἶχον πηδάλιον, ᾧ χρῆσομαι.
τὸ δὲ πλοῖον ἔσται Ναξιουργῆς κάνθαρος.
- ...
- (Πα.) ἐκεῖνο τήρει, μὴ σφαλεῖς καταρρυῆς
ἐντεῦθεν, εἴτα χλωδὸς ὦν Εὐριπίδη
λόγον παρασχηῆς καὶ τραγωδία γένη.
- ...
- (Τρ.) ἀλλ' ἄγε, Πήγασε, χῶρει χαίρων,
χρυσοχάλινον πάταγον ψαλίω
διακινήσας φαιδροῖς ὤσιν.

It is not mere chance that in the play of Aristophanes these verses are spoken by (one of) Trygaeos' daughter(s) to her father. Surprised and anxious, she there asks her father, who is going to mount a huge beetle as another Bellerophon mounting his winged horse Pegasos, all about the dangers involved. Stheneboea probably did likewise towards her lover¹. The case is somewhat parallel. Bellerophon seems to have easily overcome her weak objections. One would expect him to have said to her, among other things, as Trygaeos does to his daughters, πτηνός πορεύσει πᾶλος· οὐ ναυσθλάσομαι, «the horse will get along flyng: I am not going by sea». In this context he (Bellerophon) might also have mentioned that one hopes to be lucky as well, for without luck, striving after something is not sufficient. Bellerophon was in a position to know more about this than anybody else in the play. He himself, as we have seen, had to try hard to catch Pegasos, and in spite of his great efforts, he would not have achieved it, had not Athene come to his aid². So it is not unlikely that fr. 668,

ἄνευ τύχης γάρ, ὥσπερ ἡ παροιμία,
πήνος μονωθεῖς οὐδὲν ὠφελεῖ³ βροτούς,

belongs in this context and is spoken by Bellerophon.

Stheneboea, seeing apparently no point in delaying any longer, fol-

1. H. v. Arnim, seeing a close connection between the (first three lines of) fr. 669 and the words of fr. 670 that are spoken by the fisherman, attributes the former to him as well.

2. See above, pp. 48, 58.

3. In Stob. Flor. 29, 36 (Nauck², fr. 668, p. 570) we get οὐκέτ' ἀλγύνει; this does not make sense in the context. Various emendations have been proposed. I find Blaydes' suggestion οὐδὲν ὠφελεῖ βροτούς (G. Sellner, *De Eur. Sthen., quaest. selectae*. Diss. Ienae 1910, p. 61) not far off the point.

lowed Bellerophon. It is probable that the Chorus did not appear during this scene which prepared everything for the ensuing elopement. Their presence would have been embarrassing, apart from the fact that, until Bellerophon and Stheneboea were safely out of reach, secrecy was necessary.

Then the Chorus alone on the stage had its fourth stasimon. What they sang we do not know, but, judging from other plays and from the way the Chorus usually behaves, we would expect them to have expressed some ideas of what passion and in particular love can do, possibly also foreboding of an impending calamity that had been looming over the palace for a long time. But if the Chorus did not know much about the elopement, it is most likely that the Nurse, Stheneboea's confidante, did, and, sympathizing with her mistress's suffering, not only kept quiet but helped her as well.

In the fifth and last episode and directly after the choral ode, the king must have been on the stage, very agitated. He had certainly noticed his wife's absence and that Bellerophon was not to be found either. Something appalling had happened. The Nurse probably pretended ignorance, while the Chorus showed themselves very perplexed. At this point we would expect the Messenger to run panting on to the stage and deliver his speech in the usual way Euripides constructs such speeches. To it apparently belongs that part of the argument that states: ἀναθέμενος δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν Πήγασον τὴν Σθενέβοιαν μετέωρος ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν ἔρθη. γενόμενος δὲ κατὰ Μῆλον τὴν νῆσον ταύτην ἀπέρριψεν. αὐτὴν μὲν οὖν ἀποθανούσσαν ἀλιεῖς ἀναλαβόντες διεκόμεσαν εἰς τὴν Τίρυνθα.

This speech, we expect, was a good specimen of tragic description and inspired artists in general and in particular the one who depicted this tragic scene on a multicoloured bowl (crater) in the Hermitage¹ Museum. Stheneboea is shown being thrown from the horse into the sea.

The Messenger, who is supposed to be an eye-witness of the tragic incident, possibly was one of the fishermen who pulled the drowned woman out of the water and carried her to the sovereign of the land of Tiryns. If so, the circumstances were explained and the Messenger as well as the fishermen, his companions, considered it their obligation to carry Stheneboea to Proetos' house. One would normally think that in the play they functioned in one way or another as his subjects. On this

1. See Excursus: Vase-painting on the *Stheneboea*, pp. 70 ff. Stéphan C.-Rendu de 1863, p. 244; *Annali*, 1874, p. 35 n° 77; cf. Séchan, *Ét. s. l. tragédie grecque*, pp. 500 f., fig. 148.

assumption the Messenger would have run ahead of the others to bring the bad news to the king of the country, while his friends were still some distance behind, carrying the corpse¹. They appeared on the stage by the end of the speech to prove the truth of his delivered message. Among other comments the Messenger would possibly have made as leader of the band of fishermen are the words of fr. 670:

βίος δὲ πορφυροῦς θαλάσσιος
οὐκ εὐτράπεζος, ἀλλ' ἐπάκτιοι φάτναι.
ὕγρα δὲ μήτηρ, οὐ πεδοστιβῆς τροφός
θάλασσα· τήνδ' ἀροῦμεν, ἐκ ταύτης βίος
βρόχοισι καὶ πέδαισιν οἴκαδ' ἔρχεται².

Proetos was no doubt at his wits' end and desperately confused, for he had not yet understood some essential details as to how and mainly why this had happened. What was the motive, if there was one, of the wrong-doer? The explanation and the clearing up of misunderstandings in such cases is regularly performed by the *deus ex machina* or somebody who can replace him. And here Bellerophon in all probability played this role³. We would expect Bellerophon during the denouement of the play to appear on a sort of contrivance representing Pegasos, high above the stage and out of reach of the king. Completely safe now from this position as the hero and more than that as one evidently favoured by the gods, he would explain to his former host who was responsible for all this and how it had happened—That he had been repeatedly tempted and, because he did not want to dishonour Proetos, he had not given in to Stheneboea's request; that in consequence of this he had been accused of violating her or of having attempted to do so; that he, Proetos, without having inquired as to the truth of the accusations, had plotted twice against his life. Now due punishment had been meted out: The woman, who was the author of this scandal, had paid with her life; Proetos himself with his deep sorrow. Misled by his excessive love for his wife and the trust he placed in her⁴, he had misused and broken Zeus'

1. Cf. *Hipp.* 1346-7 and *Bacchae* 1167-8.

2. Ath. x p. 421 F.; cf. Nauck², fr. 670, p. 571; Lobeck's suggestion πορφυρῶς in Phryn. p. 234 (or Meineke's πορφυρέων Ath. 4 p. 187) is preferable.

3. A good parallel scene at this point of the *exodos* is that in the *Medea* 1320 ff.:

λέγ', εἴ τι βούλη, χειρὶ δ' οὐ ψάψεις ποτέ.
τοιόνδ' ὄχημα πατρὸς Ἥλιος πατήρ
δίδωσιν ἡμῖν, ἔρυμα πολεμίας χειρός.

Bellerophon might also have said something along these lines.

4. These two are basic traits in all Potiphar motif stories.

ordinances for the protection of guests and suppliants. This is evidenced by the last words of the plot: *πάλιν δὲ ἐπιστρέψας ὁ Βελλεροφόντης πρὸς τὸν Προΐτον αὐτὸς ὡμολόγησε πεπραχέναι ταῦτα· δις γὰρ ἐπιβουλευθεὶς ὑπ' ἀμφοτέρων, δίκην εἰληφέναι τὴν πρέπουσαν, τῆς μὲν εἰς τὸ ζῆν, τοῦ δὲ εἰς τὸ λυπεῖσθαι.*

After this explanation Proetos, full of contrition, says (fr. 671):

κομίζετ' εἴσω τήνδε· πιστεύειν δὲ χρὴ
 γυναικὶ μηδὲν ὅστις εὖ φρονεῖ βροτῶν¹.

These are among the last words that we would hear in the play. The ekkyklema would then have turned round, brought the corpse inside the house, and the tragedy doubtless ended with few typical verses on the part of the Chorus, just as happens in many other Euripidean tragedies.

1. *Hipp.* verses 1250 ff. express more or less the same sense:

ἄτὰρ τοσοῦτόν γ' οὐ δυνήσομαι ποτε,
 τὸν σὸν πιθέσθαι παῖδ' ὕπως ἔστιν κακός,
 οὐδ' εἰ γυναικῶν πᾶν κρεμασθείη γένος
 καὶ τὴν ἐν Ἰδμῇ γραμμάτων πλήσειέ τις
 πεύκην· ἐπεὶ νιν ἔσθλόν ἔντ' ἐπίσταμαι.

EXCURSUS

on the plot of Euripides' play:

STHENEBOEA

παρ' αὐτοῦ cod., παρά του Rabe, παρ' αὐτῆς (sc. Σθενεβοίας) Wilamowitz, who thus gives a somewhat different interpretation; but δις γὰρ ἐπιβουλευθεὶς ὑπ' ἀμφοτέρων cannot be well reconciled with his view, it would better fit in with the interpretation attempted above.

The poet apparently avoided depraving his hero. He cannot have found the first accusation sufficient to make Bellerophon punish Stheneboea so severely*, and, as dramatic considerations demanded, he must have created a sort of balance between malignant and slanderous accusation on the one hand and severity of punishment on the other. The relatively young dramatist¹ probably did this as an experiment with his technique by which he wanted to test its efficacy. Thus another intrigue certainly ensued which involved more inextricably the persons already implicated—Stheneboea more shameless and dangerous for the young man, and her husband, as an instrument in the hands of his wife, lacking the ability to understand what was happening. But most of all it would have given the action proper a new impulse aiming at arousing the interest of the spectators at a time when the drama was slowing down in its fourth episode, and it would thus have reinforced Bellerophon's reason for righteously punishing the wrongdoers.

The fourth episode, as we have sketched it, seems indeed overloaded, and one might wonder if so much could fit in, but we know well that the dramatist finds his own ways by arranging some things behind the scenes or of assuming others and presenting on the stage only their final resolutions, while comments and indirect reports help to complete the picture.

* Schol. Ven. Ar. Pac. 140 (cf. Suid. v. τραγικώτερος): δοκεῖ ὁ Βελλεροφόντης τὴν τοῦ Προίτου γυναῖκα μετὰ τὴν τῆς Χιμαίρας ἀναίρεσιν ἐπανελθὼν εἰς Κόρινθον (Τίρυνθον scribi vult Hartung, Eur. rest. I p. 79) ἀπατῆσαι ὡς ἕξων (καὶ ἔξδν cod. Ven.) γυναῖκα καὶ ἐπιβιάσας τοῦ Πηγάσου εἰς μέσσην ῥῖψαι τὴν θάλασσαν. See Nauck², TGF, p. 568: «Iohannes Malalas postquam de Proeto, Stheneboea, Bellerophonte, Iobata suo more quaedam narravit, haec addit p. 84, 16: καθὼς συνεγράφατο Εὐριπίδης ὁ τραγικός ποιητῆς πληρώσας τὸ δράμα.» Suid. Lex. 894 τραγικώτερος: ...αἰνίττεται δὲ τὰ περὶ Ἰκάρου λεγόμενα. ἢ ἐπεὶ δοκεῖ ὁ Βελλεροφόντης τὴν τοῦ Προίτου γυναῖκα μετὰ τὴν τῆς Χιμαίρας ἀναίρεσιν ἐπανελθὼν εἰς Κόρινθον ἐξαπατῆσαι καὶ ὡς γυναῖκα ἐπιβιάσας τοῦ ἵππου τοῦ Πηγάσου εἰς μέσσην ῥῖψαι τὴν θάλασσαν.

1. The play is supposed to have been produced before the year 423 B.C.,

EXCURSUS: VASE-PAINTING ON THE *STHENEBOEA*

This kind of evidence seems to be questionable and, therefore, not of great value for the reconstruction of the play, though it points to the popularity of the theme and very likely to the influence Euripides had upon other people, particularly intellectuals and artists. This of course is valid only if the assumption one makes, that these pictures depict features of the Euripidean play, is correct. Here I shall deal only with those four figures which are contained in L. Séchan's «Sthénébée» (*Études sur la tragédie grecque*, Paris 1926), pp. 498 ff.

The first figure, n° 145 is on an amphora in the collection Jatta at Ruvo (*Cat.*, n° 1499. R. Rochette, *Peint. Inéd.*, pl. LXXVI, 8; cf. Séchan fig. 145, p. 498). It presents Bellerophon holding a lance, Pegasos behind him, and an older man supporting himself with a staff or sceptre and conversing with the young Bellerophon. Both are at the point of giving and taking with their right hands the tablet, but we cannot guess who is giving it to whom. Two women, one sitting on a chair and the other with a big fan, are at some distance from the men, but also from each other. Apparently the women do not have much in common, for the one sitting has her back turned to the other. They do not seem to be participating in what the two men are saying or doing. This has been identified with the scene in which Proetos gives the tablet to Bellerophon, the sitting woman as being Stheneboea, and the other with the fan as her Nurse. There are apparent difficulties here that make this interpretation, accepted by a number of scholars, questionable. We have no evidence whatsoever that Pegasos at this stage accompanied Bellerophon or was even owned by him. We would expect that Bellerophon brought Pegasos later on to the stage, for which we have irrefutable evidence. Moreover the woman with the fan does not look like the old Nurse. She seems to be about the same age as the one sitting, if not even younger. In view of these difficulties, we cannot agree that this scene is the one claimed. If we accept the interpretation maintained above, essential details of Euripides' play have been misrepresented by the artist, or, if they have not, then one might as well point to the scene with Iobates. As a matter of fact we do not know for certain that Bellerophon came to Iobates' land having already got Pegasos, but there are good reasons for supposing he did¹.

1. See the appropriate section in the reconstruction above, p. 58.

We have almost the same difficulty with the vase-painting of the Naples Museum (Heydemann, *Vasens.*, n° 2418; cf. Séchan, *op. cit.*, p. 499, fig. 146). Here the scene is not very different from the previous one. Bellerophon accompanied by Pegasus converses with an aged man; a woman is close behind the man with her eyes turned down, while the old man in a friendly gesture gently touches Bellerophon's shoulder. The hero holds the tablet with his right hand, and a lance as well as the reins of the horse with his left. Pegasus presents the same problem here as in the first figure, while we are equally uncertain here whether Bellerophon has just taken the tablet or is just going to hand it over.

The third painting is on a large bowl (crater) of Naples (Heydemann, *Vasens.*, n° 1891; cf. Séchan, p. 500, fig. 147). Here we have a scene in which Bellerophon, holding two lances and accompanied by Pegasus, speaks with a woman. She has a mirror and a bowl of some kind of fruit in her hands. At first scholars recognized here a scene in which Bellerophon was received in Caria (Séchan, *ibid.* n. 2. Heydemann, *Vasens.*, p. 128), but Vogel (*Scen. Eur. Trag.*, p. 86, as reported by Séchan, *ibid.* n. 3) was absolutely convinced that he had found the scene where the hero invited Stheneboea to follow him on Pegasus. This might well be the case, if we consider that in this play there is a scene between Bellerophon and Stheneboea, the only woman with whom he has dealings, assuming of course that the old Nurse and Iobates' daughter were of secondary importance and would not be interesting enough for the artist to portray either of them as chief figures in view of the close association between Bellerophon and Stheneboea. As a matter of fact Iobates' daughter does not play any role whatsoever in Euripides' play, and one could even doubt if she ever was mentioned (by name) at all.

As for the mirror and the bowl of fruit which Engelmann (*Annali*, 1874, p. 34), and to some extent Séchan (p. 500) saw as details presenting difficulties, I do not see them to be a serious obstacle, and in any case the views of these scholars¹ involve them in greater difficulties. We know nothing of a Bellerophon who, after taking revenge on Stheneboea presented himself to the public of Tiryns and in a way tried to justify what he had done. In the play this would mostly amount to an address to the Chorus. But, since he (Bellerophon), as we argued above, did something similar in his capacity as superman or *deus ex machina* towards Proetos in the presence of the Chorus—who practically stood for the people of Tiryns—we do not have to postulate anything beyond what

1. For L. Séchan's standpoint see further below, p. 72.

the setting of the theatre and its usual practice normally required and in so many other plays established. In other words this would be redundant and entail much repetition.

Séchan's suggestion is not tenable either, when he sees here a scene of Bellerophon's taking leave of Stheneboea before going on his mission to Iobates, for Séchan must first explain away the difficulty that the presence of Pegasus presents at this stage and secondly give some good reasons that would make possible such a scene in the Euripidean play (or even in Homer's account). But, if we assume with Vogel that this scene comes from the fourth episode, when Bellerophon and Stheneboea show themselves on seemingly good terms and decide to go away together, then we do away with these objections. We do not know whether such things as a bowl of fruit and a mirror belonged to the original scene. We should rather regard them as being additions on the part of the artist himself.

The fourth painting presents no problems. It is found on a multicoloured bowl (crater) in the Hermitage Museum (Stéphani *C. - Rendu de* 1863, p. 244; cf. Séchan, *op. cit.*, p. 500, fig. 148) and shows Bellerophon flying on the back of Pegasus and Stheneboea just having been thrown off and falling head first. He is watching her with his hand over his eyebrow, as if to get a better view, while she is falling headlong towards the water. High in the sky and over the falling woman is a bird like a dove (though it may well be a bird of prey). This picture agrees well with the Euripidean plot¹. Of course it does not represent an actual scene of something shown to the Athenian spectators, but it certainly depicts the most tragic incident described in the Messenger's speech and in all probability a genuine Euripidean feature here. We have before us the very moment in which the hero is bringing that which he possibly considers due retribution. This scene certainly borrows its power from the spectacular force of the preceding one with which it is immediately associated and which was familiar to the Athenian public in general, that is, the great scene in which Bellerophon steps on to the stage holding a real horse fitted with wings and, among other things, says:

παίω Χιμαίρας εἰς σφαγᾶς, πρὸς δ' ἄθῆρ
βάλλει με καὶ τοῦδ' αἰθάλῃ πυκνὸν πτερόν²

1. See the relevant part of the Messenger's speech as well, pp. 66 f.

2. See above, pp. 60 f.

ΙΛΙΑΔΟΣ Ζ.

- αὐτὰρ Γλαῦκος τίκτεν ἀμύμονα Βελλεροφόντην· 155
 τῷ δὲ θεοὶ κάλλος τε καὶ ἠγορέην ἐρατεινὴν
 ὤπασαν· αὐτὰρ οἱ Προΐτος κακὰ μῆσατο θυμῷ,
 ὅς ῥ' ἐκ δῆμου ἔλασσε, ἐπεὶ πολὺ φέρτερος ἦεν,
 Ἄργείων· Ζεὺς γάρ οἱ ὑπὸ σκήπτρῳ ἐδάμασσε.
 τῷ δὲ γυνὴ Προΐτου ἐπεμήνατο, δι' Ἄντεια, 160
 κρυπταδίῃ φιλότῃ μιγήμεναι· ἀλλὰ τὸν οὐ τι
 πεῖθ' ἀγαθὰ φρονέοντα, δαΐφρονα Βελλεροφόντην.
 ἢ δὲ ψευσαμένη Προΐτον βασιλῆα προσήυδα·
 ἔθναίης, ᾧ Προΐτ', ἣ κάκτανε Βελλεροφόντην,
 ὅς μ' ἔθελεν φιλότῃ μιγήμεναι οὐκ ἔθελούσῃ· 165
 ὡς φάτο, τὸν δὲ ἄνακτα χόλος λάβεν οἶον ἄκουσε·
 κτεῖναι μὲν ῥ' ἀλέεινε, σεβάσατο γὰρ τό γε θυμῷ,
 πέμπε δέ μιν Λυκίηνδε, πόρεν δ' ὅ γε σήματα λυγρὰ,
 γράψας ἐν πίνακι πτυκτῷ θυμοφθόρα πολλά,
 δεῖξαι δ' ἠνώγειν ᾧ πενθερῷ, ὅφρ' ἀπόλοιτο. 170
 αὐτὰρ ὁ βῆ Λυκίηνδε θεῶν ὑπ' ἀμύμονι πομπῇ.
 ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ Λυκίην ἴξε Ἐάνθον τε βέοντα,
 προφρονέως μιν τῖεν ἄναξ Λυκίης εὐρείης·
 ἐννῆμαρ ξείνισσε καὶ ἐννέα βοῦς ἰέρευσε.
 ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ δεκάτῃ ἐφάνη ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἥώς, 175
 καὶ τότε μιν ἐρέεινε καὶ ἤτεε σῆμα ἰδέσθαι,
 ὅττι ῥά οἱ γαμβροῖο πάρα Προΐτοιο φέροιο.
 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ σῆμα κακὸν παρεδέξατο γαμβροῦ,
 πρῶτον μὲν ῥα Χίμαιραν ἀμαιμακέτην ἐκέλευσε
 πεφνέμεν· ἢ δ' ἄρ' ἔην θεῖον γένος, οὐδ' ἀνθρώπων, 180
 πρόσθε λέων, ὀπίθεν δὲ δράκων, μέσση δὲ χίμαιρα,
 δεινὸν ἀποπνεύουσα πυρὸς μένος αἰθιομένοιο.
 καὶ τὴν μὲν κατέπεφνε θεῶν τεράεσσι πιθῆσας·
 δεῦτερον αὖ Σολύμοισι μαχέσσατο κυδαλίμοισι·
 καρτίστην δὴ τὴν γε μάχην φάτο δύμεναι ἀνδρῶν. 185
 τὸ τρίτον αὖ κατέπεφνε Ἀμαζόνας ἀντιανείρας.
 τῷ δ' ἄρ' ἀνερχομένῳ πυκινὸν δόλον ἄλλον ὕφαινε·
 κρίνας ἐκ Λυκίης εὐρείης φῶτας ἀρίστους
 εἴσε λόχον· τοὶ δ' οὐ τι πάλιν οἰκόνδε νέοντο·
 πάντας γὰρ κατέπεφνε ἀμύμων Βελλεροφόντης. 190
 ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ γίγνωσκε θεοῦ γόνον ἦν ἐόντα,

αὐτοῦ μιν κατέρυκε, δίδου δ' ὃ γε θυγατέρα ἦν,
 δῶκε δέ οἱ τιμῆς βασιληΐδος ἡμισυ πάσης·
 καὶ μὲν οἱ Λύκιοι τέμενος τάμον ἔζοχον ἄλλων,
 καλὸν φυταλιῆς καὶ ἀρούρης, ὄφρα νέμοιτο. 195
 ἢ δ' ἔτεκε τρία τέκνα δαΐφροσι Βελλεροφόντη,
 Ἴσανδρόν τε καὶ Ἴππόλοχον καὶ Λαοδάμειαν.
 Λαοδαμείη μὲν παρελέξατο μητίετα Ζεὺς,
 ἢ δ' ἔτεκ' ἀντίθεον Σαρπηδόνα χαλκοκορυστήν.
 ἀλλ' ὅτε δῆ καὶ κείνος ἀπήχθετο πᾶσι θεοῖσιν, 200
 ἦτοι ὁ κάπ πεδίον τὸ Ἀλήϊον οἶος ἀλᾶτο,
 ὃν θυμὸν κατέδων, πάτον ἀνθρώπων ἀλεείνων.

Apollod. *Bibl.* II. 2. 1:... οὗτοι (sc. οἱ τοῦ Ἄβαντος καὶ Ἀγλαίας¹ τῆς Μαντινέως δίδυμοι παῖδες, Ἀκρίσιος καὶ Προΐτος) καὶ κατὰ γαστρὸς μὲν ἔτι ἦντες ἐστασίαζον πρὸς ἀλλήλους, ὡς δὲ ἀνετράφησαν, περὶ τῆς βασιλείας ἐπολέμου, καὶ πολεμοῦντες εὗρον ἀσπίδας πρῶτοι. καὶ κρατήσας Ἀκρίσιος Προΐτον Ἄργους ἐξελαύνει. ὃ δ' ἦκεν εἰς Λυκίαν πρὸς Ἰοβάτην, ὡς δὲ τινὲς φασί, πρὸς Ἀμφιάνακτα· καὶ γαμεί τὴν τοῦτου θυγατέρα, ὡς μὲν Ὀμηρος, Ἄντειαν, ὡς δὲ οἱ τραγικοί, Σθενέβριαν. κατὰγει δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ κηδεστὴς μετὰ στρατοῦ Λυκίων, καὶ καταλαμβάνει Τίρυνθα, ταύτην αὐτῷ Κυκλώπων τειχισάντων. μερισάμενοι δὲ τὴν Ἀργεῖαν ἄπασαν κατέκουν, καὶ Ἀκρίσιος μὲν Ἄργους βασιλεύει, Προΐτος δὲ Τίρυνθος. ...

1. Ἀγλαίας Heyne, comparing Scholiast on Euripides, *Or.* 965: ἀγαλλίας A: Ὠκαλείας Aegius, Commelinus, Gale.