ALLOCATING FR. 46A K. WITHIN THE PLOT OF EURIPIDES' *ALEXANDROS* : A REINSPECTION AND REASSESSMENT OF P.STRAS. 2342, 1

Ioanna Karamanou[1]

The *Alexandros* was staged in 415 BC in the same production as the *Palamedes*, *Trojan Women* and the satyr-play *Sisyphos*[2]. Research on this play has benefited enormously from papyrus-finds preserving a large number of fragments (P.Stras. 2342–44) and a major part of its narrative *hypothesis* (P.Oxy. LII 3650, col. i)[3].

The latter mentions that when Alexandros was born, Hecabe had him exposed due to an ill-omened dream, according to which he would bring disaster to Troy. The child was raised by a herdsman, who named him Paris (4–7). Hecabe, still grieving over his exposure, persuaded Priam to establish athletic games in his memory (7–12). When twenty years had passed, the boy excelled among his fellow herdsmen, who accused him of arrogance in front of Priam. After defending himself before the king, Alexandros was allowed to participate in his own funeral games (12–21). Having been crowned winner, he infuriated his brother Deiphobus and his companions who, realizing that they had been defeated by a slave, demanded that Hecabe should kill him (21–25). The *hypothesis* then reports that Cassandra recognized him in a state of prophetic frenzy and foretold the forthcoming disaster (25–28), and that Hecabe was prevented from killing him (29–30)[4]. His foster-father arrived and because of the danger was compelled to tell the truth (30–32). Alexandros thus returned to the Trojan palace.

This survey focuses on fr. 46a K. (P.Stras. inv. 2342, 1 ; see fig. 1), which is perhaps the most tantalizing fragment of the *Alexandros* in terms of dramatic context ; it aims at reinspecting its text and revisiting the evidence for its location and function within the dramatic plot[5].

col. i   col. ii

.   .   .   .

                    ]ει ̣[c[
                    ]τας[. . . . .]ριους   λ[
              ἀ]θλιω[. . . . . .]κραν   oc[
                    ]ην[. .] ̣c ̣[. ̣ ̣]αλοις ἔριν   ────
5   ] ̣τ[. ̣]ως ̣[̣ ̣]δηις λάτρις   oγ[
    × – ᷉ – × –]νδε πω[λι]κοῖς ὄχοις   5   ζ[
        × – ᷉ – ὄ]ντας < ᷉ > τη[λίκ]ους θανεῖν   πρ[
        × – ᷉ – ×]ον τετίμη[κ]ας τέκνων   κε ̣[
            ] ̣ελα[̣ ̣ ̣]υ[̣ ̣]αι γένος   μα[
10   × – ᷉ – ×]ρ οἵπερ ἵσταν[τ]αι πόν[οι   γοω[ν
    × – ᷉ – ×] τήνδ᾽ ἀφαγνίζεις χθόνα   10   κελ [
    × – ᷉ – × κα]ὶ ἐπικηδείους πόνους   μα[

[2]   ΣAr. *Vesp.* 1326b ; Ael. *VH* 2, 8.
[3]   The *hypothesis* was first edited by Coles (1974) 1–22 ; subsequently by Luppe (1976) 12–20 ; Diggle (1998) 80–81 ; van Rossum-Steenbeek (1998) 186–187 ; Kannicht (2004) I 174–176.
[4]   The obscurity of the *hypothesis* at this point has been noted by Coles (1974) 32 ; Scodel (1980) 21 and 42 ; Collard / Cropp / Gibert (2004) 40. For an exploration of the attack scene, see Karamanou (2012).
[5]   The abbreviation K. refers to Kannicht's numbering of the fragments. The divergences from his text are discussed below.

```
      × – ◡ – × – ◡  ]ων ηδη πόλιν
          × – ◡ – × –  ]ονωι cπουδὴ λάβηι
15            × – ◡ – ×  ]υ̣δεν ὦ νέμων πόλιν
      × – ◡ – × –  ἀνάc]ταcίν τε γῆc
      × – ◡ – × – ◡ π]ορc[ύν]οιc κακῶν
      × – ◡ – × – ◡ τ]ῷ̣ι τεθ[ν]ηκότι
      × – ◡◡ – × – ◡ – ]̣ καλὸν τόδε
20    × – ◡ – × – ◡ – × ]ν̣αι γονάc
      × – ◡ – × – ◡ – × – ]ξαμην
              (margo)
```

```
                    παν[
                    ἱερο.[
                    λαc.[
                    (coronis)
15    (ΧΟ.) ὲ̃ ὲ̃ πειν[
                    και π[
                    τα τε[
                    (margo)
```

2 χοὰc ×] τάc[δε κηλητη]ρίο̣υc conieci, cf. Eur. *Hec.* 535
3 πι]κράν Wilamowitz : μα]κράν Crönert   4]ΗΝ *pot. qu.*
]ΜΝ   cκύ]μν[ον], ὃc [πο]λλοῖc ἔριν Kannicht :
cυ[μβ]άλοιc ἔριν *conieci*, cf. Eur. *Med.* 521, *Bacch.* 837,
Dictys fr. 338 K.   5 ἔ[ρ]δηιc Snell   6 ἐνθέ]νδε Lefke   7
ὄ]νταc < ◡ > τη[λίκ]ουc *legi*, cf. Eur. *Alc.* 643, *Meleagros*
fr. 533 K.   10 ΟΙΠ[Α]ˋΈΡ | πόν[οι Crönert : πόν[ωι
Kannicht   11 ΑΦΑΓΝΙΖΕΙˋΣ′   12 κἀπικηδείουc Kannicht
14 ἦν χρ]όνωι Crönert : cυντ]όνωι cπουδῆ Schadewaldt
apud Snell   15 ο]ὐδὲν ὦ νέμων πόλιν Crönert : ο]ὐδὲν ὦν
ἐμῶν (*an* ἐμὴν) πόλιν Kannicht   16 εἰc ἀνάc]ταcιν
Kannicht   17 ἀποcτροφὴν δ' ἂν τῶνδε π]ορc[ύν]οιc κακῶν
Snell *post* Crönert   18 παιδὶ τ]ῷι Crönert   21]ξαμην
Janko :]κ̣αμην Crönert

4 *paragraphus*   5 *aut* Ζ[*aut* Ξ[*vel*
Τ[7 *vel* ΚΟ[9 γόω[ν *conieci*
13 *aut* ἱερός *aut* ἱερόν *vel* ἱεροί

(...) [these appeasing offerings] (...) wretched (...) [bitter] (...) [may you (not) set] strife [5]
(...) servant (...) in a horse-drawn carriage (...) to die at such a young age (...) the child you
have honoured (...) family [10] (...) the games which have been established (...) you are
purifying this land (...) and funeral games (...) already the city (...) eagerness seizes [you]
[15] (...) o ruler of this city (...) [the destruction] of the land (…) you could offer [an
escape] from harm (...) for the dead (...) this [is / is not] right (...) [20] offspring (...).

The text of the first column is better preserved and has widely been regarded as coming
from a scene in which Priam participates[6]. More specifically, he enters upon a horse-drawn
carriage (6), which is an exclusive means of royal transport, and is then addressed as
parent of the child commemorated in the games (8) and probably also as ruler of the city
(15)[7]. Priam is also attested to have established the funeral games, which is congruent with
lines 12 and 10 (cf. *hyp.* 10–12). In this fragment he is additionally mentioned as having
undertaken the task of purifying the Trojan land (11) and as protecting it from disaster (16–
17).

　　According to the *hypothesis* (16–21), Alexandros is brought to Priam by his fellow
herdsmen and the king grants him permission to participate in the funeral games. This
fragment is suggestive of Priam's entry and participation in the performance of a ritual
preceding the athletic contest and accords with the *hypothesis* regarding his on-stage
appearance before the games. It is therefore likely that the trial of Alexandros before Priam

---

[6]　See Crönert (1922) 13 ; Lefke (1936) 48 ; Snell (1937) 34–35 ; Hanson (1964) 177 ; Jouan (1966) 118 ;
　　Webster (1967) 169 ; Coles (1974) 41–42 ; Scodel (1980) 27 ; Jouan / Van Looy (1998–2003) I 49 ; Kannicht
　　(2004) I 184 ; Collard / Cropp / Gibert (2004) 73–74.
[7]　For carriage as an élite means of transport, see Snell (1937) 34, n. 3 and Collard / Cropp / Gibert (2004) 74
　　citing Eur. *El.* 966, 998–999 and 1135–1136, *IT* 370, *IA* 613 and 623. I would add Aesch. *Pers.* 607–608, *Ag.*
　　905–906.

follows this scene[8]. A reinspection of the papyrus may shed more light on the text and this particular dramatic situation.

2 τας[. . . . .]ριους. A possible supplement could be χοὰς ×] τάς[δε κηλητη]ρίους, which occurs within a funerary context and at the same position in the trimeter also in *Hec.* 535 : δέξαι χοάς μοι τάσδε κηλητηρίους. Libation offering was a constituent part of funerary ritual. See *e.g.* Alexiou (2002) 7–8 ; Burkert (1983) 54–55 ; Gregory (1999) 110–111. The task of pouring libations was, as a rule, undertaken by women (as by Atossa in Aesch. *Pers.* 609 ff. and Electra in *Cho.* 84 ff.) and Hecabe as the grieving mother of the exposed child could be the best candidate for this role. For the funerary references of this fragment, see the comments on lines 11–12 and col. ii, 15.

4 c ̣[̣ ̣]αλοις ἔριν. The missing letters between c and α seem to be three and not two, as reported until now (cf. similarly the three missing letters of the same lacuna in 7 : τη[λίκ]ους). The slight trace of the letter after C is congruent with a Y. I would suggest cυ[μβ]άλοις ἔριν, in view of *Med.* 521 : φίλοι φίλοιcι cυμβάλωc' ἔριν ; 44–45 : cυμβαλὼν | ἔχθραν ; *Dictys* fr. 338 K : ἔχθραν μεγίcτην coῖcι cυμβάλλων τέκνοιc ; *Bacch.* 837 : cυμβαλὼν βάκχαιc μάχην. The use of the optative in combination with the effort to eliminate any threat against Troy in 16–17 entails the use of negation to express the hope that the city is not to get involved into any kind of disastrous strife. The supplement πι]κράν suggested by Wilamowitz at the end of 3 is congruent with the sense of ἔρις « strife », as πικρός tends to describe strife and situations bringing disaster ; see Aesch. *Cho.* 80–81 : πικρὸν φρενῶν | cτύγος ; *Eum.* 832 : πικρὸν μένος ; Eur. *Andr.* 291 : πικρὰν δὲ cύγχυcιν βίου Φρυγῶν πόλει ; Soph. *Aj.* 1239–1240 : πικροὺς (…) | ἀγῶναc. As far as the line can be restored, it could hypothetically be translated as : « may you not involve our land in bitter strife ». This address may have been conveyed to the gods of the Underworld, who are often invoked in funerary contexts, or even to the seemingly dead child, as a prayer to avert calamity. Similar invocations to the gods below and the dead honoured with offerings occur in Eur. *Hec.* 525–541, Aesch. *Pers.* 621–622 and 627–628 (see also Garvie [2009] 250 and 258–260 ; Broadhead [1960] 163–164), *Cho.* 124–151 (and Garvie [1986] 75–82). The reference to ἔρις within a ritual context aptly corresponds to a purification-scene, as civil strife is commonly attributed to pollution or divine anger. In fact, in Aesch. *Ag.* 699–716 the Trojan War is mentioned as having occurred in order to fulfill the anger of Zeus Xenios against Alexandros for his violation of the unwritten law of hospitality. See Eur. fr. inc. 1082 K. For strife as a consequence of *miasma*, see Parker (1983) 257–258 and n. 5 ; Bacon (2001) 50–58 ; Easterling (1988) 99–100 ; Adkins (1960) 96 ; Burkert (1985) 77. Hence this fragment in combination with Hecabe's ill-omened dream perhaps mentioned in the prologue interestingly projects this type of anxiety for the possibility of a Trojan plight (for which see also 11, 16 and 17) into the future disaster which is to occur after Alexandros' return to the palace, as foreseen by Cassandra in this play and fulfilled in the third tragedy of the trilogy, the *Trojan Women*. For Cassandra's prophecies in the *Alexandros*, see *hyp.* 25–28, frr. 62e–h K. ; cf. Ennius *Alexander*, frr. 17, 25, 26 Jocelyn.

7 ὄ]ντας < ◡ > τη[λίκ]ους θανεῖν. There are traces of a letter between ὄ]ντα and τη[λίκ]ους, which has not been reported so far. It is most likely to be a C, thus providing the reading ὄ]ντας τη[λίκ]ους, for which see *Alc.* 643 : ὃς τηλικόςδ' ὤν ; *Meleagros* fr. 533 K. : ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν γεγῶcα τηλικήδ'. A short syllable is needed before τη[λίκ]ους, otherwise the line is unmetrical. Scribal omissions of short words are very common ; see *e.g.* West (1973) 24. Nonetheless, some unclear traces of ink above the line should be noted, perhaps pointing to a supralinear addition, as in ἀφαγνίζειc' (11). I would suggest an emphatic particle, such as γε underlining the baby's untimely death. Δέ is also feasible, if the sentence begins with ὄ]ντας ; cf. *Alc.* 799 : ὄντας δὲ θνητοὺς θνητὰ καὶ φρονεῖν χρεών.

11–12 τήνδ' ἀφαγνίζειc χθόνα | [× – ◡ – × κα]ὶ ἐπικηδείους πόνους. Most critics have aptly interpreted ἀφαγνίζω as referring to ritual cleansing ; see Coles (1974) 42 ; Scodel (1980) 28 ; Huys (1995) 128–129 ; Di Giuseppe (2001) 72–73 ; Collard / Cropp / Gibert (2004) 74. Nonetheless, the reasons for this ritual purification have not been sufficiently investigated so far and are worth exploring towards a deeper understanding of this fragment. The verb ἀφαγνίζω means « to deconsecrate » ; its opposite, ἁγνίζω « to consecrate », conveys the sense of dedication to the Gods of the Underworld. Accordingly, in Eur. *Alc.* 76 Death consecrates Alcestis to the gods below by cutting

8   See Scodel (1980) 27–28 ; Jouan / Van Looy (1998–2003) I 49 ; Collard / Cropp / Gibert (2004) 74.

off a lock of her hair, while in 1145–1146 she needs to be deconsecrated, as she has just returned from the dead. See Garland (1985) 46–47 ; Rudhardt (1992) 171–172 ; Parker (2007) 67–68 and 280–281. Deconsecration thus involves the ritualized removal of any ties with the Underworld.

This verb with its particular funerary connotations is better interpreted in conjunction with the reference to ἐπικηδείους πόνους « funeral games » in the next line. Several fragments, probably from the first episode, underline Hecabe's mourning for her seemingly dead child and her consolation by the chorus-leader[9]. Mourning involves pollution, as it is closely connected with death ; as the mourners and the participating community are in a liminal, metaphysically polluted state, they need to be purified through the regular performance of ritual, which diminishes the ties between the dead person and the living, while lifting the *miasma* surrounding the mourners[10]. Funerary ritual and the games that follow thus lead to the reintegration of the living community and the reaffirmation of the structure of the society which has participated in mourning[11]. In the case of Troy, this periodically perfor-med ritual, in combination with the aforementioned invocations for blessings conferred by Hades (see on line 4, above), also seems to function towards ensuring the welfare of the Trojan people against the foretold disaster.

At the same time, funeral athletic contests have an expiatory role corresponding to the need for atonement for the untimely death of a child. The foundation of a regularly held civic festival often gives expression to a feeling of parental guilt, especially when a parent is directly or indirectly responsible for the child's demise. Alexandros is exposed in the wilderness by his parents, like baby Opheltes who is incautiously left in the meadow and killed by a snake in Euripides' *Hypsipyle*, and Linos who is exposed by his mother and torn apart by sheepdogs[12]. In each of these cases, a ritual is established to appease the anger of the dead and atone for the guilt of the living : like Alexandros, Opheltes is honou-red with the establishment of funeral games, the well-known Nemean Games, and the Linos-song is created to purify Argos from the plague sent by Apollo for Linos' unjust death[13]. Hecabe's distress at the loss of her baby son thus contains elements from myths of child-heroes : the emphasis on mourning, the ritualization of maternal grief in the cases of both Hecabe and Opheltes' mother Eurydice and the establishment of athletic games in compensation for the child's death.

Infant exposure was not regarded legally as murder[14] ; inscriptional evidence, however, demonstrates that the exposure of a newborn is not free from pollution and thus requires a purification period[15]. Moreover, *miasma* tends to befall the community neglecting to honour its baby-victims, which emerges from Linos' story. Hence, considering the death impurity incurred even from baby corpses, the land as the place in which the baby was exposed and presumably met its death could be perceived as needing purification regularly performed along with the games held in his memory[16].

---

[9]   Fr. 46, 2 : θρηνῶ ; 46, 4 : ὡς ἴσμεν οἱ παθόντες ; 46, 5 : παλαιὰ καινοῖς δακρύοις οὐ χρὴ στένειν ; 43 : ἀλγεῖν ; 45, 2 : τοῦτο δ' εἰπεῖν ῥᾶιον ἢ φέρειν κακά ; *hyp.* 7–10 : Ἑκάβη δὲ τὴν ἡμέραν ἐκείνην πενθοῦσα (…) κατω-δύρατο μὲν τὸν ἐκτεθέντα.

[10] See Morris (1987) 30–32 ; Hertz (1960) 62–64 ; Marshall (2000) 10. On pollution involved in mourning, see Parker (1983) 38–39 ; Sourvinou-Inwood (1995) 111–112 ; Marshall (2000) 12 ; Morris (1992) 8–10. For the required repetition of funerary ritual, Burkert (1983) 53–56.

[11] See Burkert (1983) 53–56 ; Hertz (1960) 77–78 ; Huntington / Metcalf (1979) 67 ; Redfield (1994) 286, n. 78.

[12] On Linos : Paus. 1, 43, 7 ; Conon *FGrH* 26 F 1, 19. On Opheltes, see the sources in Collard / Cropp / Gibert (2004) 177–180.

[13] See Pache (2004) ch. 3 and 5 ; Burkert (1983) 97–152 ; Meuli (1968) *passim* ; Nagy (1990) 116–135 ; Meuli (1941) 189–208 ; Nagy (1986) 73–77 ; Burkert (1985) 105–107.

[14] See Harrison (1968) I 70–71 and n. 2 ; Parker (1983) 356–357 ; Garland (1985) 80–86.

[15] For the required purification after infant exposure or abortion, see *LSS* 119, 7 ; *LSA* 84, 3–4 ; Parker (1983) 356 ; Patterson (1985) 106–107.

[16] See Dem. 43, 51–58 ; Parker (1983) 35–39 ; Marshall (2000) 9–10.

On the whole, this ritual purification seems to acquire a multifaceted function. It aims at offering « deconsecration » by formally separating the living from the dead and lifting the pollution of the mourners, as well as by purifying the land which received the baby's corpse. Accordingly, the performance of funeral games leads to the reaffirmation of social structure, providing, at the same time, expiation for the baby's early demise. Priam as king of Troy undertakes the task of its ritual purification and is the symbolic vehicle of his people's welfare[17]. He seems to be addressed in solemn vocative (15 : ὦ νέμων πόλιν ; cf. Eur. *IT* 1255 and Soph. *OT* 201), which matches the ritual context of this fragment. The performance of this ritual is ironically linked to the scene which follows, in that by granting permission to Alexandros to participate in the games, Priam unknowingly leads to disaster for the city which he has been striving to protect[18].

The *coronis* in the margin of the second column (15) indicates the start of a choral passage. Each column of this papyrus is estimated to have contained 35–40 lines[19] ; thus this lyric passage is located about 33–38 lines after the end of the first column. The cry ἒ ἔ of the chorus (15) is typical of ritual lamentation revolving around a hero's death. It occurs in the sung exchanges (*amoibaia*) between Hypsipyle and the chorus for Opheltes' death (Eur. *Hypsipyle* fr. 753e–754 K.), between Admetus and the chorus upon Alcestis' funeral procession (*Alc.* 873 and 891), between Peleus and the chorus over Neoptolemus' corpse (*Andr.* 1188) and between Hecabe and the chorus at the burial of Astyanax (*Tro.* 1216, 1303 and 1318)[20]. The word γόω[ν (9) is a reference to γόοι « grieving cries » which are closely associated with ritual lamentation[21]. This type of collective lament usually aims at evoking a strong emotional response from the audience, though in this case it functions ironically, since the supposedly dead child is not only alive, but is to cause communal damage.

The first episode seems to have comprised Hecabe's consolation by the chorus (fr. 44–46 K.) introducing the audience to her feeling of distress for the loss of her baby and her conversation with Cassandra (fr. 46, 11–12), perhaps with reference to the oracle which led to the exposure[22]. The ritual purification and lament of this fragment could also be allocated to the first episode, since they correspond to the idea of mourning for the loss of the child. Hecabe as the grieving mother is likely to have participated in the ritual lamentation for the boy and would be a good candidate for addressing the lines of the first column to Priam[23]. Hecabe's lament for her seemingly dead baby son interestingly mirrors her ritual lamentation during the actual funeral of her grandchild Astyanax in the third tragedy of the same trilogy (*Tro.* 1156–1255) ; ironically enough, the fate of Astyanax is sealed by Alexandros' survival.

As already noted, this scene is likely to be followed by the entry of Alexandros and the secondary chorus of his fellow herdsmen (for which, see ΣEur. *Hipp.* 58). The rhetorical

---

[17] On the magistrate's crucial role in ritual purification, see Parker (1983) 267–271.

[18] On the ironic substratum of Euripidean ritual, see Foley (1985).

[19] See Coles (1974) 57, n. 10.

[20] See Collard / Cropp / Gibert (2004) 240–241 ; Lloyd (1994) 160 ; Biehl (1989) 422–423 ; Barlow (1986) 224. On ritual lamentation in tragedy, Alexiou (2002) 11–14 and 102–103 ; Segal (1993) 13–33 ; Foley (2002) 21–29 ; McClure (1999) 40–47 ; Dué (2006) 8–11. On the *amoibaia* in lyric laments, Hose (1990) I 240–245 ; Kannicht (1957) 166–182 ; Bierl (2007) 21–22 ; Popp (1971) 267–268.

[21] See Tsagalis (2004) ch. 1–2 ; Alexiou (2002) 102–103 and 225, n. 6 ; Martin (2008) 118–138 ; Holst-Warhaft (1992) 106–137 ; McClure (1999) 42.

[22] See Jouan / Van Looy (1998–2003) I 49, referring to Ennius fr. 153 Jocelyn, which could belong to this scene. For the contents of the first episode, Snell (1937) 33 ; Coles (1974) 24 and 40 ; Scodel (1980) 26 ; Collard / Cropp / Gibert (2004) 37–38.

[23] Cassandra as a priestess seems rather unlikely to have participated in this ritual, since priests live in conditions of special purity and are thus excluded from rites connected with death, which incur pollution : see Paus. 5, 13, 3 ; *LSCG* 154 A 22 and 37 ; 156A 8–10 ; *LSS* 115A 21–25 ; Parker (1983) 38–39 and n. 25, 337–339.

elaboration and the contrasting arguments in the fragments assigned to this conflict (fr. 56, 61, 48, 60, 50 K.) point to a trial-debate held between Alexandros and an eloquent opponent (fr. 56 K.) accusing him of arrogance in front of Priam as a judge (*hyp.* 16–21)[24]. The first episode would have been of unusual length, had it comprised this *agon* as well. In the *Ion*, which has a similar plot-structure, the first episode focuses on maternal distress for the loss of a child, while the second motivates the plot by giving the exposed boy an active role in the dramatic incidents[25]. Likewise, the first episode of the *Alexandros* seems to illustrate the theme of maternal grief, which is closely associated with the ritual lamentation for the exposed child in the present fragment. Subsequently, the second episode could have comprised the *agon*, in which the unknown herdsman Alexandros gets actively involved in the dramatic plot. His entry may thus provide an ironic reflection of the previous episode which focused on the mourning for his loss. The long first episode of the *Helen* also closes ironically[26].

In the re-examination of this papyrus fragment, I have attempted to explore its ritual character and assess its dramatic implications. The ritual purification and lamentation illustrate the theme of mourning and the parental need for atonement for the baby's untimely death, as well as the anxiety for the ill-omened fortune of Troy. From this viewpoint, the fragment closely coheres with the background of the play and its possible opening with Hecabe's portrait as the distressed mother. At the same time, the veiled ironies of the ritual performed in memory of the exposed baby connect the fragment with the following scene of Alexandros' on stage appearance, which shifts the dramatic plot towards his homecoming and the impending disaster.

Bibliography

Adkins, A.W.H. (1960), *Merit and Responsibility* (Oxford).
Alexiou, M. (2002), *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition* (2nd ed., revised by D. Yatromanolakis and P. Roilos, Lanham).
Allan, W. (2006), *Euripides : Helen* (Cambridge).
Bacon, H.H. (2001), « The Furies' Homecoming », *CPh* 96, 48–59.
Barlow, S. (1986), *Euripides : Trojan Women* (Warminster).
Biehl, W. (1989), *Euripides : Troades* (Heidelberg).
Bierl, A. (2007), « Literatur und Religion als Rito- und Mythopoetik », *in* Bierl, A. / Lämmle, R. / Wesselmann, K. (Hrsg.), *Literatur und Religion* I (Berlin / New York) 1–76.
Broadhead, H.D. (1960), *The Persae of Aeschylus* (Cambridge).
Burkert, W. (1983), *Homo necans* (transl. by P. Bing, Berkeley / Los Angeles / London).
Burkert, W. (1985), *Greek Religion* (transl. by J. Raffan, Oxford / Malden / Victoria).
Coles, R.A. (1974), *A New Oxyrhynchus Papyrus : The Hypothesis to Euripides' Alexandros* (*BICS* Suppl. 32, London).
Collard, C. / Cropp, M.J. / Gibert, J. (2004), *Euripides. Selected Fragmentary Plays* II (Oxford).
Crönert, W. (1922), « Griechische literarische Papyri aus Strassburg, Freiburg und Berlin : 1. Der *Alexander* des Euripides », *Gött. Nachr. Phil-hist. Klasse*, 1–17.
Di Giuseppe, L. (2001), « Alcune considerazioni sul prologo dell' *Alexandros* di Euripide », *ARF* 3, 67–73.
Diggle, J. (1998), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta Selecta* (Oxford).
Dué, C. (2006), *The Captive Woman's Lament in Greek Tragedy* (Austin).
Easterling, P.E. (1988), « Tragedy and Ritual », *Metis* 3, 87–109.
Foley, H. (1985), *Ritual Irony : Poetry and Sacrifice in Euripides* (Ithaca / London).
Foley, H. (2002), *Female Acts in Greek Tragedy* (Princeton).
Garland, R. (1985), *The Greek Way of Death* (London).
Garvie, A.F. (1986), *Aeschylus : Choephori* (Oxford).
Garvie, A.F. (2009), *Aeschylus : Persae* (Oxford).

[24] See Coles (1974) 24–25 ; Scodel (1980) 28–31 ; Jouan / Van Looy (1998–2003) I 49–50 ; Collard / Cropp / Gibert (2004) 38–39. I shall discuss the identity of Alexandros' opponent in another paper.

[25] For the similar theme and plot-construction of the *Ion* and *Alexandros* (mother-son recognition following the former's murder attempt against her own son), see Huys (1986) 21–22 ; Collard / Cropp / Gibert (2004) 46 ; Huys (1995) *passim*.

[26] See Allan (2006) 35–36 and 179 ; Kannicht (1969) II 11.

Gregory, J. (1999), *Euripides : Hecuba* (Atlanta).

Hanson, J.O. De G. (1964), « Reconstruction of Euripides' *Alexandros* », *Hermes* 92, 171–181.

Harrison, A.R.W. (1968), *The Law of Athens* (Oxford).

Hertz, R. (1960), *Death and the Right Hand* (Aberdeen).

Holst-Warhaft, G. (1992), *Dangerous Voices : Womens' Laments and Greek Literature* (London / New York).

Hose, M. (1990), *Studien zum Chor bei Euripides* (Stuttgart).

Huntington, R. / Metcalf, P. (1979), *Celebrations of Death : The Anthropology of Mortuary Ritual* (Cambridge).

Huys, M. (1986), « The Plotting Scene in Euripides' *Alexandros* », *ZPE* 62, 9–36.

Huys, M. (1995), *The Tale of the Hero who was exposed at Birth in Euripidean Tragedy* (Louvain).

Jocelyn, H.D. (1967), *The Tragedies of Ennius* (Cambridge).

Jouan, F. (1966), *Euripide et les légendes des Chants Cypriens* (Paris).

Jouan, F. / Van Looy, H. (1998–2003), *Euripide : Fragments* (Paris).

Kannicht, R. (1957), *Untersuchungen zu Form und Funktion des Amoibaion in der attischen Tragödie* (Diss. Heidelberg).

Kannicht, R. (1969), *Euripides : Helena* (Heidelberg).

Kannicht, R. (2004), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* V.1–2 : Euripides (Göttingen).

Karamanou, I. (2012, forthcoming), « The Attack-Scene in Euripides' *Alexandros* and its Reception in Etruscan Art », *in* Bakogianni, A. (ed.) *Dialogues with the Past* II (*BICS* Suppl., London).

Lefke, C. (1936), *De Euripidis Alexandro* (Diss. Münster).

Lloyd, M. (1994), *Euripides : Andromache* (Warmister).

Luppe, W. (1976), « Die Hypothesis zu Euripides' *Alexandros* », *Philologus* 120, 12–20.

Marshall, E. (2000), « Death and Disease in Cyrene », *in* Hope, V.M. / Marshall, E. (ed.), *Death and Disease in the Ancient City* (London / New York) 8–23.

Martin, R.P. (2008), « Keens from the Absent Chorus : Troy to Ulster », *in* Suter, A. (ed.), *Lament. Studies in the Ancient Mediterranean and Beyond* (Oxford) 118–138.

McClure, L. (1999), *Spoken Like a Woman* (Princeton).

Meuli, K. (1941), « Der Ursprung der Olympischen Spiele », *Die Antike* 17, 189–208 [= *Ges. Schr.* II 881–906].

Meuli, K. (1968), *Der griechische Agon* (ed. R. Merkelbach, Köln).

Morris, I. (1987), *Burial and Ancient Society* (Cambridge).

Morris, I. (1992), *Death Ritual and Social Structure in Classical Antiquity* (Cambridge).

Nagy, G. (1986), « Pindar's Olympian I and the Aetiology of the Olympic Games », *TAPhA* 116, 71–88.

Nagy, G. (1990), *Pindar's Homer* (Baltimore).

Pache, C.O. (2004), *Baby and Child Heroes in Ancient Greece* (Urbana / Chicago).

Parker, R. (1983), *Miasma : Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion* (Oxford).

Parker, L. (2007), *Euripides : Alcestis* (Oxford).

Patterson, C. (1985), « Not Worth the Rearing : the Causes of Infant Exposure in Ancient Greece », *TAPhA* 115, 103–123.

Popp, H. (1971), « Das *Amoibaion* », *in* Jens, W. (Hrsg.), *Die Bauformen der griechischen Tragödie* (München) 221–276.

Redfield, J.M. (1994), *Nature and Culture in the* Iliad (North Carolina).

Rudhardt, J. (1992), *Notions fondamentales de la pensée religieuse et actes constitutifs du culte dans la Grèce antique* (2ᵉ éd., Paris).

Scodel, R. (1980), *The Trojan Trilogy of Euripides* (Göttingen).

Segal, R. (1993), *Euripides and the Poetics of Sorrow* (North Carolina).

Snell, B. (1937), *Euripides'* Alexandros *und andere Strassburger Papyri mit Fragmenten griechischer Dichter* (*Hermes* Einzelschr. 5, Berlin).

Sourvinou-Inwood, C. (1995), *« Reading » Greek Death* (Oxford).

Tsagalis, C. (2004), *Epic Grief : Personal Lament in Homer's Iliad* (Berlin / New York).

Van Rossum-Steenbeek, M. (1998), *Greek Readers' Digests ? Studies in a Selection of Subliterary Papyri* (Leiden).

Webster, T.B.L. (1967), *The Tragedies of Euripides* (London).

West, M.L. (1973), *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique* (Stuttgart).