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AN ARCHILOCHUS PAPYRUS?

P. Oxy. 2507 contains elegiacs doubtfully ascribed by Lobel to Archilochus. It has not I think been observed that the same hand wrote P. Oxy. 854, line-beginnings overlapping (6–9) a passage ascribed by Athenaeus (483d) to Ἄρχιλόχος ἐν ἐλέγειοις. As both fragments have in addition on the front cursive writing due to one and the same hand, it seems fairly reasonable to suppose that they belong to a single roll containing on the back works by a single author.
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1 Plate: P. Oxy. XXX, Pl. 1. I have examined the papyrus in the Ashmolean Library.  
2 Adesp. Eleg. 61 W. Notes on the text: 7. ‘ɿ, traces suggesting an upright’ (Lobel): ɿ (West) not particularly suggested.  
3 Plate: P. Oxy. VI, Pl. I. The papyrus is kept in the Toledo Museum of Art; I have examined recent photographs of both sides in the Ashmolean Library and refer to that of the back as ‘the photograph’ in what follows.  
4 Archil. fr. 4 W. Notes on the text: 1. ‘ɿ, the foot of a descender touching the paragraphus at its right tip; the foot of an upright; a dot on the line. 2. The supplement φράζω is anticipated in substance by W. Crönert, WKPh 26 (1909), 117 (φράζω). 3. ɿ (no accent). After ɿ, I read from the photograph: ɿ: a dot on the line; another dot on the line; the foot of a descender; a dot on the line. 4. Hunt records in the margin of his copy of P. Oxy. VI (now in the Ashmolean Library, shelfmark 303 G. 108), 150, ‘a thin faint mark (?)ink) opposite l. 4’, visible in both plate and photograph. ɿτε is proposed by Crönert, loc. cit.: cf. his paraphrase (118), ‘Speise ist weder den andern noch mir bereitet’. 5. The circumflex over α which Crönert, Archilochi elegiae (1911), 8, and West see in the plate is merely a shadow. 7. κούλων: of ɿ, the left-hand arc of a circle. 9. ɿ: the second ɿ is certain, the traces before it compatible with the top of a rounded letter; ɿ (e. p.) is too long. (Grenfell and Hunt state that ‘the fourth letter can hardly be ɿ, and therefore νήφονες does not suit’. Part of the ink has flaked off, but the reading is perfectly satisfactory; it is accepted by Dr R. A. Coles, to whom I am grateful for his advice.) ɿ disappears excluded as an interpretation of the final traces, which ‘suggest a round letter like ɿ’ (Grenfell and Hunt). The adjective νήφονες is unambiguously attested elsewhere only at Thgn. 481 and 627 (both dat. pl.) and Hsch. ν 549 νήφονες-νήφονες (so to read), perhaps a reference to the present passage. The accent in the papyrus is unexpected, but II. 24.253 κοινήνες is prima facie parallel; on the accentuation of words of the third declension in -νες, see H. W. Chandler, A practical introduction to Greek accentuation (1881), §§ 584–619 (§ 605 on words in -νονές). ɿνευ (Ath.) might well be written in place of νήφονες by someone who wished to quote lines 6–9 as a self-contained unit: in the papyrus, νήφονες-ɿνευ (Musurus: μυν Ath. cod.) φυλακῆς τήδε δυνηγόμεθα will have been followed by an infinitive, probably in the next line.  
5 Confirmed by Dr Coles.