

A Catalogue of Mythographic Papyri (CMP): Presentation of the Electronic Database

1. Scope of the database and inclusion policy

The *Catalogue of Mythographic Papyri* (CMP) is, in its present form, an electronic database of some 240 papyri, made in Filemaker Pro 4. It can be consulted in its original Filemaker format as well as in a html-format published on the internet. Because the latter version, albeit in a provisional form, is now freely accessible (<http://cmp.arts.kuleuven.ac.be/searchform.html>), the Filemaker database has not been released on CD-ROM. Later, a book version will be issued which will contain more detailed information on each papyrus and a general chapter on the importance of mythology in each of the genres represented in our catalogue.

The aim of the CMP-project is to bring together all papyrological evidence of ancient mythology and of mythographic elements in several kinds of texts. So not only fragments belonging to the well-defined literary genre of mythography are included — in fact they constitute only a small minority of the collection — but also fragments of all sorts of subliterary prose texts dealing with stories, heroes or other aspects of Greek mythology.

As a separate genre, mythography was certainly well established from the early Hellenistic period onwards with authors as Asklepiades of Tragilos and Philochoros — the word μυθογράφος is first attested in the pseudo-Aristotelian treatise *On the Flooding of the Nile* (cf. P.Oxy. 4458)¹. As an established genre it was distinguished from history by a more or less fixed chronological boundary, viz. the return of the Herakleidai, from theology or cosmology by its systematic and scholarly presentation of the myths and legends of gods and heroes, stripped of any religious or cultic function, and finally from novel and romance again by its scholarly non-fictional approach. For the so-called “early mythographers”, such as Pherekydes of Athens, Hellanikos and Akousilaos, the situation is far less clear and has been dealt with in detail by R. L. Fowler in the introduction to his recent edition of early Greek mythography²: for us this problem is less important because only a few papyri contain fragments of mythographic works prior to the Hellenistic period. However, for the Hellenistic and Roman periods as well, although mythography flourished as a literary genre, the papyrological evidence is rather disappointing. Many famous authors of mythographic studies and handbooks, such as Asklepiades, Philochoros, Istros, Lysimachos and even the Βιβλιοθήκη of Ps-Apollodoros are not attested in any papyrus. One exception seems to be the Ὑποθέσεις τῶν Εὐριπίδου καὶ Σοφοκλέους μύθων attributed to Dikaiarchos, but it remains a matter of speculation whether the numerous papyri with fragments of such hypotheseis are really all copies of this book³. Another exception is the so-called *Mythographus Homericus*, an anonymous mythographic commentary on the *Iliad* of which 10 papyrus fragments have been preserved⁴.

But an interest in mythography can easily be detected in papyrus texts which cannot be classed under mythography as a literary genre, but which were often influenced by it. Since the subject-matter of Greek poetry was predominantly mythological, and since the reading of poetry, especially of Homer, held a central

¹ Cf. R. L. Fowler, *P. Oxy. 4458: Poseidonios*, ZPE 132 (2000) 133–142.

² R. L. Fowler, *Greek Mythography — Volume 1: Text and Introduction*, Oxford 2000, XXVIII–XXIX.

³ Cf. J. Rusten, *Dicaearchus and the Tales from Euripides*, GRBS 23 (1982) 357–367.

⁴ Cf. F. Montanari, *The Mythographus Homericus*, in: J. G. J. Abbenes, S. R. Slings and I. Sluiter (edd.), *Greek Literary Theory after Aristotle: A Collection of Papers in Honour of D. M. Schenkeveld*, Amsterdam 1995, 135–172; idem, *Ancora sul Mythographus Homericus (e l’Odissea)*, in: A. Hurst and F. Létonblon (edd.), *La mythologie et l’Odyssée. Hommage à Gabriel Germain*, Genève 2002, 129–144.

position in Greek παιδεία, both simple school texts and scholarly commentaries or literary treatises often reflect mythological interest. Learned ὑπομνήματα, which may sometimes be attributed to famous names such as Didymos and Theon, commented upon variants in the legends followed by the poets and their sources, but even simple word-lists used as reading or spelling exercises traditionally consisted to a greater or smaller extent of mythological names. Subliterary papyri with mythographic interest encompass the whole array of name-lists, scholia minora, prose summaries, paraphrases and catechisms as well as the learned products of Alexandrian scholarship, such as commentaries (ὑπομνήματα) and specialized treatises on literary criticism or other specific questions (usually called συγγράμματα). In all these texts the interest in mythography may be secondary to the main focus but its value should not be underestimated, even in simple school texts: an ostrakon with name-lists such as O.Crum 525 may have been used primarily for reading exercises but at the same time it offers an impressive didactic series of mythological names clearly borrowed from literary sources⁵.

This does not mean that all papyri containing mythological information in prose are included in the database: for example the papyrus fragment MPER N. S. 3.42 (= Pack² 1275, LDAB 2541) from Isocrates' *Helena* (23–24, 26), although it contains a comparison of the feats of Theseus and those of Herakles with plenty of mythological lore, has not been included. Yet it is a clear example of a passage with mythographic interest within another genre. However, for a student studying the presence and function of mythology in Greek oratory or in Isocrates this papyrus fragment is useless, since the entire text of the *Helena* is known from the medieval manuscript tradition.

Rather, then, than theoretical considerations on the nature of mythography, the aim of providing a practical tool that can answer the question “What is the evidence for a given myth or legend in the papyri?” has served as a guideline for our enterprise. As a consequence, in general, the following practical criteria for selection have been used:

— for literary texts:

- ◆ mythological prose fragments from known non-mythographic works have been excluded (*e. g.* mythological exempla in philosophical and rhetorical prose).
- ◆ all fragments from mythographic texts have been included and the boundaries of mythography are broadly interpreted: because the preserved material of the mythographic genre is so scanty, it seemed inappropriate to reject texts on the verge of mythography and the novel (*Dictys Cretensis*) or of mythography and theology (*Apollodoros' Περὶ Θεῶν*).
- ◆ fragments from unknown literary prose texts have generally been included as soon as they contain relevant mythological information.

— for subliterate texts:

all subliterate papyrus fragments containing mythological information (theoretical, narrative or genealogical) have been included. An additional criterion has been the scope with which the text has been written (to explain legendary proper names, rituals, mythological allusions in a poetic text, or to give a systematic account of some myth or legend) but for tiny scraps of papyrus this criterion often remains a matter of speculation. The combination of these criteria has led to the inclusion of:

- ◆ word-lists containing some or many mythological names (one may accept that the choice of mythological names for such reading and writing exercises was at least partly due to an interest in mythology).
- ◆ prose summaries and hypophyses of poetic texts: in such summaries the text is reduced to the bare outline of the story, the legendary events as such. Again one may subsume that there is an interest in these mythical events.
- ◆ catechisms.
- ◆ scholia minora and paraphrases only so far as they add mythological information to the poetic text. This implies that most lexica, glossaries and interlinear explanations, even when they contain information such as “*Peleides* = the son of *Peleus*” are excluded: the scope is not mythographic but philological or linguistic. Also excluded are most Homeric paraphrases when they simply retell

⁵ See our edition with commentary: *The Syllabic Name-Lists on O.Crum 525 (UC inv. 32222): Re-edition and Commentary*, ZPE 134 (2001) 145–162.

the Homeric model or translate it into prose without the intention of getting at the legendary facts: the scope is again philological (grammatical paraphrases) or literary and rhetorical (rhetorical paraphrases) and not mythographic.

- ◆ commentaries, learned discussions or treatises when they go into mythological topics: *e. g.* the commentaries of Didymus and Theon often contain mythological explanations excerpted from the works of Hellenistic mythographers.

2. How to do searches in the database

A detailed description of the search syntax and of the contents of each field of the catalogue can now be easily accessed on the Help Page of the website (<http://perswww.kuleuven.ac.be/~u0013314/cmphelp.htm>). Therefore, the concrete working of the database is only briefly presented here.

The online CMP works on three levels:

- the *Search Page* is the main page through which the user accesses the database: it allows searches to be formulated according to various search criteria (see description below);
- the *Search Results Page* gives a continuous list of all the items matching the search criteria, with links to each individual record;
- the *Record Page* contains the actual information about each papyrus. There are thus currently some 240 record pages in the database, one for each individual papyrus. Each item will eventually receive its own identification number which will appear in the title box of each page and should become the standard number for reference in scientific literature.

For the sake of clarity, our description starts with this third level.

The Record Page(s)

Each record page contains 25 fields grouped into 3 sections gathering information about the following aspects:

(a) identification and bibliography (13 fields):

Each papyrus is primarily identified through reference to its *editio princeps*, its location and inventory number, and the standard reference-number in the LDAB⁶ and in Pack² (or, when available, in Mertens-Pack³). Further reference is made to a series of catalogues more specifically relevant for our papyri: Raffaella Cribiore's catalogue of school texts⁸, Monique Van Rossum-Steenbeek's study of subliterate papyri⁹, Dana Sutton's online list of the Homeric papyri¹⁰, and finally Marcello Gigante's catalogue of the Herculaneum papyri¹¹. This section also includes information about the provenance and the date of each papyrus, a selected bibliography, and references to published plates and to images placed on the web.

(b) contents (5 fields):

This section does not give a full description of the contents — this will be the privilege of the printed catalogue — but is limited to the following information fields: the name of the author when known (most of the time, the fragment remains anonymous); the authors mentioned or quoted in the papyrus (this information may at times be of great interest, as will appear from one of the test-cases below); the genre (narrative, commentary, hypothesis, diegesis, summary, scholia minora, etc.), the text type, in which two broader categories are distinguished: the Homeric and the school texts; the “mythological names”, finally, which is probably one of most valuable fields of the database as it lists all the mythological names occurring on a papyrus and thus allows searches by any of these names throughout the database.

⁶ W. Clarysse, *The Leuven Database of Ancient Books*: <http://ldab.arts.kuleuven.ac.be/>

⁷ R. Pack, *The Greek and Latin Literary Texts from Greco-Roman Egypt*, Ann Arbor 1965²; on Mertens-Pack³, see: <http://www.ulg.ac.be/facphl/services/cedopal/MP3/index.shtml>.

⁸ R. Cribiore, *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt* (American Studies in Papyrology, 36), Atlanta 1996.

⁹ M. Van Rossum-Steenbeek, *Greek Readers' Digests? Studies on a Selection of Subliterary Papyri* (Mnemosyne Supplementa, 175), Leiden 1998.

¹⁰ D. Sutton, *Homer and the Papyri*, electronic database now under the care of the Center for Hellenic Studies, Washington D.C. (editor in chief: G. Nagy): http://www.chs.harvard.edu/homer_papyri/. This list, which takes its starting point from T. W. Allen's list, has recently been updated by M. L. West (*Studies in the Text and Transmission of the Iliad*, München, Leipzig 2001, 86–138), hence the abbreviation ASW [= Allen-Sutton-West] used in the CMP.

¹¹ M. Gigante, *Catalogo dei papiri Ercolanesi*, Napoli 1979.

(c) the material characteristics (7 fields):

For the material description of the papyri, only a selection of characteristics have been retained which may be useful for searches: these are the material on which the text is written (papyrus, parchment, ostrakon, wooden tablet), the bookform (roll, codex, sheet), the orientation of the script (along or across the fibres), the nature of the text on the reverse side of the mythographic text, the number of columns, the column width, and the lectional signs. A more elaborate description of the state of preservation and of the hand is lacking here and will be found only in the printed catalogue.

The Search Page

One of the advantages of the internet version over the printed catalogue is that searches can be done on any of the 25 fields described above (searches by CMP reference-number will also be possible in due course). In order to be as user-friendly as possible, the Search Page offers a selection of 9 criteria which we believe will be most commonly used for search purposes, i. e. the *editio princeps*, the inventory, the references to the various catalogues, the provenance, the date, the (quoted) ancient author, the genre, the text type, and the mythological names. However, two further boxes allow the user to select any of the categories contained on the record page. Combinations of search criteria are also possible, though only as Boolean “AND” searches. Furthermore, the “Sort by” option allows the user to sort the records to be listed on the Search Results Page by any of the above categories in ascending or descending order — by default the resulting records will be sorted by date.

The Search Results Page

This page lists all the items matching the selected search criteria, which are summarized at the top of the page. By default the following information is given for each item: the *editio princeps* and the reference-numbers in the LDAB, in Pack², and in the CMP (yet to be assigned). When the “Sort by” option has been selected, the chosen category appears as a fifth column next to the four just mentioned. Each item in the results list is linked to the individual record page by a small yellow arrow.

3. The benefit to be gained from the CMP

The CMP contains much information that cannot be found in any other publication, first of all concerning the material characteristics of the papyri. Sometimes our inspection of the papyri revealed that they had been inaccurately described in the *editio princeps*, especially in the case of older editions, and for some we even discovered additional fragments not included in the original editions: for instance we found a small papyrus scrap belonging to PSI XIV 1398 (LDAB 4670), perfectly fitting under the remains of the second column, but which for some reason was lacking in the PSI-edition. The obtained additional information, however, is limited to the scanty traces of four lines, which are difficult to interpret¹². More interesting, therefore, was our discovery, at the Royal Ontario Museum in Toronto, of an additional fragment of an ostrakon of which J. G. Milne¹³ had already assembled and edited three fragments (LDAB 1716). The text had been identified as a hypothesis to *Iliad* 20 previously, but we now have more substantial remains of the beginning of this summary and can better evaluate the differences with the corresponding hypotheses known from the manuscript tradition, as can be seen from our recent re-edition of this ostrakon¹⁴.

Besides, the CMP brings together and makes accessible information which, because these papyri have been published in scattered editions, is difficult to find and has often remained unnoticed. The texts themselves can only very rarely be found in the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (TLG) and not at all of course

¹² In an unpublished dissertation of 1987 L. Salvadori Baldascino had already re-edited the papyrus with the additional scrap.

¹³ In JHS 28 (1908)129, XII–XIII + JHS 43 (1923) 42–43. See also Van Rossum-Steenbeek, *Greek Readers' Digests?* (s. n. 9), no. 37 (p. 61–62 and 253–254).

¹⁴ *The Toronto Ostrakon with a Hypothesis of Iliad 20 (Pack² 2725): Re-edition Enlarged with a New Fragment*, APF 48 (2002) 213–221.

in the *Duke Data Bank of Documentary Papyri* (DDBDP)¹⁵. Because of their diversity they have never been grouped in one collection and Van Rossum-Steenbeek's book on subliterate papyri only presents the text of some specific categories. As a consequence these texts cannot be easily consulted or searched and have often been neglected as literary and mythological sources in spite of their obvious interest. Students of Greek mythology tend to forget them because a traditional encyclopedia as the Roscher-lexicon¹⁶ is obviously too old to track these sources and the same is true for most RE-articles, whereas in the LIMC¹⁷ they are generally considered not important enough to be mentioned.

We shall now develop some concrete examples of the neglect of these sources, a neglect which, as we hope, will be easily overcome through the use of our database.

In his 1974 Michigan dissertation Timothy Renner¹⁸ published a papyrus with a list of five metamorphoses of mythical persons whose names begin with alpha, probably as part of a mythological dictionary. One of the metamorphoses is unattested elsewhere, viz. the transformation of the Aethyia, while bewailing the death of Ino, into a kind of birds, to which the following information is added (Col. II, 13): *παρ' Αἰσχύλωι καλοῦνται μισοκόρων[οι]*. This compound is a hapax and could be translated as "crow-haters". Although Renner explicitly states that this "constitutes a new fragment of Aeschylus" (p. 291), we discovered with some surprise that it is absent from Stefan Radt's prestigious edition of the fragments of Aeschylus in the *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, published in 1985. As a consequence one looks in vain for an occurrence of the word *μισοκόρωνος* in the most recent version of the TLG. But even in the case of a scholar like Radt it would be unreasonable to expect him to have read through all papyrological publications. For the would-be editor of a new edition of the fragments of Aeschylus the task will be much easier. One simple search for "Aeschylus" in the CMP in the field "quoted author" yields the Michigan papyrus immediately.

Such examples can be easily multiplied: in a Florence papyrus published in 1971 containing a collection of proverbs with related mythological stories¹⁹ (LDAB 7130), one of these proverbs, (*Ἦλαν κραυγάζειν*, is explicitly connected with Aristophanes of Byzantium (fr. B, 6). Nevertheless, looking into the scholarly edition of the fragments of Aristophanes of Byzantium by W. J. Slater, published in 1986²⁰, a student cannot trace this testimony: it is simply not included among the fragments of Aristophanes' *Περὶ παροιμιῶν*²¹.

But the most obvious profit gained from the catalogue is to be found in the domain of mythology. We want to illustrate this with two examples.

In her recent commentary on the *Erotika pathemata* of Parthenius Jane Lightfoot systematically surveys the sources and testimonies for any of the stories in this booklet. In many cases they do not belong to the mainstream of Greek mythology but derive from local and rather obscure legendary traditions that are only sparingly attested in Greek literature. Thus for the story of Harpalyke, the victim of her father's incestuous passion who took revenge by slaughtering his son and serving him up to his father as a meal, she only refers to two poetic sources, Euphorion's *Thrax* and Nonnos' *Dionysiaca* 12. 72–75, and to some scholiasts and mythographers: Schol. *Ilias* 14. 291, Hyg., *F.* 206, 242, 246, 255, Lactant. *Plac. in Stat., Theb.* 5. 120–1²².

¹⁵ M. Pantelia et alii, *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* #E, Irvine 2000 (on CD-ROM); D. W. Packard, W. H. Willis, J. F. Oates and J. D. Sosin, *Duke Data Bank of Documentary Papyri* (CD-ROM PHI #7), Los Altos (online at <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/Texts/papyri.html>).

¹⁶ W. H. Roscher (ed.), *Ausführliches Lexicon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, Leipzig 1884–1937.

¹⁷ *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*, Zürich, München 1981–1999.

¹⁸ *Literary papyri from the University of Michigan collection*, diss. 1974. Re-edited by the same author in HSCP 82 (1978) 277–293.

¹⁹ A. Bussa, M. Ciantelli, F. Ferrari (edd.), *Nuovi Papiri Letterari Fiorentini presentati al XIII. Intern. Papyrologenkongress*, Marburg 1971, 8–13, no. 2.

²⁰ W. J. Slater, *Aristophanis Byzantii Fragmenta* (Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker, 6), Berlin 1986, 124–128.

²¹ Note that in neither of these examples the same result can be obtained by using the LDAB (*Leuven Database of Ancient Books*, see note 6), where "quotation" is a separate field as well but one that is filled out in a very selective way.

²² J. L. Lightfoot, *Parthenius of Nicaea: the Poetical Fragments and the Erotika Pathemata*, Oxford 1999, 447 n. 171.

But she is unaware that the same story is also told in some detail in a marginal scholion in a Theocritus codex from Antinoopolis, published already in 1930²³ (LDAB 4004 = *The Antinoë Theocritus*, B fol. 1v, ad *Id.* X. 26). Although this scholion does not contain any new variant of the story, it is still an interesting testimony: since the papyrus codex dates from the 5th or 6th century A.D., it shows, together with the passages from Nonnos and Lactantius Placidus, that for some reason there was a revived interest in this legend in late Antiquity. The marginal scholia in the Theocritus codex were clearly written by a man who did not understand much of the poetry he was commenting upon — in *Id.* X.26 he misunderstood κλύμενος, which is used here as an epithet, as the proper name Κλύμενος, the father of Harpalyke! So he must have copied his mythological notes mechanically from some Hyginus-like sourcebook or manual, perhaps the same as was used by Nonnos. Any student, then, who wants to trace the history of this legend cannot ignore the papyrus scholion. And by making use of our catalogue he will easily find this testimony: a simple search for “Harpalyke” in the field “mythological names” brings him straight to the Antinoë Theocritus.

Sometimes the information hidden in the neglected mythographic papyri is even of more critical value. In his recent and admirable monograph on the Meleagros-legend Peter Grossardt²⁴ has meticulously gathered all artistic and literary evidence of this legend throughout Antiquity to the early Middle Ages. Even minor scholia and testimonia are not passed over, as is clear from the index. A search for “Meleagros” in the field “mythological names” of our catalogue yields three papyri, two of which are mentioned in the study of Grossardt. However, these are mere catalogues where Meleagros just figures among other heroes without any additional information: P.Oxy. LXII 4307 (LDAB 4873), a list of mothers who killed their sons, similar to Hyginus, *F.* 239, and the Duke-papyrus Perkins Libr., inv. 752 (LDAB 4643) with a list of Calydonian boar-hunters²⁵. But the third papyrus, P.Würzb. 1 (LDAB 1002), a leaf from a codex published by U. Wilcken in 1934, is of much greater importance and yet it was obviously unknown to Grossardt, although it has been discussed again in an article by H. Maehler²⁶. Contrary to the two other papyri, this fragment cannot be found in Van Rossum-Steenbeek’s collection of subliterate papyri, so Grossardt could not trace these scholia by consulting an existing collection.

This papyrus contains an interesting account of Meleagros’ role in the Calydonian boar-hunt as part of the scholia on some verses from Euripides’ *Phoenissae*. This scholion is entirely different from those known through the manuscript tradition of the ancient Euripides scholia, where the Meleagros-and-Atalante-legend is only briefly touched upon²⁷. In the papyrus scholion we get a full account of the origin of Artemis’ wrath, her sending of the Calydonian boar, the devastations caused by the monster and the organization of the hunt. Then the narrative focuses on Meleagros and Atalante and here the scholiast presents two versions of the legend (l. 84–86): καί τινες μὲν λέγουσιν ὅτι αὐτὴ ἐφόνευσεν τὸν κά[προν, ἄλλοι δ’ ὅτι]ι Μελέαγρος ἦν ὁ φονεύσας αὐτὸν καὶ ἐρασθεὶς τῆς Ἀταλάντης [ἔδωκεν ἀριστεία] τῆς νίκης τὴν κεφαλὴν καὶ δέρμα τοῦ κάπρου.

Of these two versions the second, according to which Meleagros killed the boar but gave the “aristeia” to Atalante through love, is well attested in Greek literature, as is clear from Grossardt’s painstaking research. This version almost certainly goes back to Euripides’ *Meleagros*, in which the poet innovated by making Atalante the lover of Meleagros and by letting her be the first to hit the boar. Consequently, she received the

²³ *The Antinoë Theocritus*, in: A. S. Hunt, J. Johnson, *Two Theocritus Papyri*, London 1930, 19–87.

²⁴ P. Grossardt, *Die Erzählung von Meleagros: zur literarischen Entwicklung der kalydonischen Kultlegende* (Mnemosyne Supplementa, 215), Leiden 2001.

²⁵ Cf. Grossardt, *Meleagros* (s. n. 24), 200–201.

²⁶ H. Maehler, *Die Scholien der Papyri in ihrem Verhältnis zu den Scholiencorpora der Handschriften*, in: F. Montanari (ed.), *La philologie grecque à l’époque hellénistique et romaine* (Fondation Hardt, Entretiens sur l’Antiquité classique, 40), Vandoeuvres-Genève 1994, 109–111, 133–136; and again in: *L’évolution matérielle de l’hypomnème jusqu’à la basse époque*, in: M.-O. Goulet-Cazé (ed.), *Le commentaire entre tradition et innovation. Actes du colloque international de l’Institut des traditions textuelles* (Paris et Villejuif, 22–25 septembre 1999), Paris 2000, 32–34. Besides, this papyrus was re-examined and re-edited by Maehler’s student Nikolaos Athanassiou in an unpublished doctoral dissertation (non vidimus).

²⁷ There is, as Maehler points out, a more resembling account in the scholia recentiora generally considered to be of Byzantine origin (by Thomas Magister and Moschopoulos) and edited by W. Dindorf, *Scholia Graeca in Euripidis tragoedias ex codicibus aucta et emendata*, Oxford 1863, III p. 290. But even there the unusual version attested in this papyrus is lacking.

spoils of the boar from Meleagros. Some authors and scholia only mention the first hit by Atalante without the love-affair (Apollodorus, 1. 8. 2, Pausanias, 8. 45. 2, Tzetzes, *Historiai* 7. 66–67, Schol. in Lycophron, *Alex.* 491–492), others integrate both motifs (Ovid, *Met.* 8, 260–546, Johannes Malalas, *Chronographia* 6. 21 [p. 128 Thurn]) and still other sources pass over the first hit and only point to Meleagros' love: clearly the second version of the Würzburg scholion belongs to this last category together with Diodorus, 4. 34. 3–4, Hyginus, *F.* 174. 5–6, Schol. in Hom., *Il.* 9. 534 (I, p. 328–329 Dindorf) and Suppl. adnotationum super Lucanum, *ad Bell. Civ.* 6. 635 (II, p. 31 Cavajoni).

More interesting, however, is the first version of the Würzburg papyrus: that Atalante killed the boar herself is nowhere else explicitly stated. Only some poetic allusions may hint at such a version: in Callimachus, *H. Dianae*, v. 215–224 Atalante is described as σιοκτόνος (v. 216) and in Euripides' *Phoenissae* (v. 1108–1109), precisely in the verses commented upon in our scholion, she is represented on Parthenopaios' shield as subduing the boar: ἐκηβόλοις τόξοισιν Ἀταλάντην κάπρον χειρομένην Αἰτωλόν²⁸, but this formulation is rather ambiguous. Another possible testimonium would be Pausanias' description of the fronton of the temple of Athena Alea at Tegea (8. 45. 6), depicting a scene from the Calydonian boar-hunt in which Atalante occupied the central position. However, that this would present Atalante as the actual killer of the boar is only a modern interpretation, which is not at all endorsed by Pausanias's own words²⁹.

In conclusion, the testimonia for the version according to which Atalante killed the boar herself are all relatively weak. Roscher, for instance, does not refer at all to this version. P.Würzb. 1 is therefore an important testimony since it clearly shows that such a version did exist in Antiquity and Grossardt's study would have gained from considering it.

These examples, as we think, are sufficient to demonstrate that the CMP as a research tool can contribute to make accessible material, which, because of its subliterate character, has not always received the attention it deserves. We hope that gradually it will become known as a valuable companion to cope with this need.

²⁸ Cf. Grossardt, *Meleagros* (s. n. 24), 125, 271.

²⁹ Cf. Grossardt, *Meleagros* (s. n. 24), 204, 238.