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The fragment is broken at the top, at the left, and at the right hand side. Its bottom margin is 1.5 cm wide. The verso is blank. The text is written against the fibres in a tiny, upward rising cursive hand that can be dated to the fourth century: cf. the ‘Latin’ shaped delta (ll. 9, 14) and eta (ll. 13, 14) and the epsilons rising above the line (ll. 8, 9).1) There are almost no diacritics, although we find a dihaeresis on a iota in line 5 and a grave accent on an eta in line 16. There is no punctuation except the signs used to separate *scholia*, respectively *lemmata* from commentary (see below).

This fragment does not seem to belong to a codex or a roll (in the case of a codex leaf one would expect writing on the opposite side; in the case of a roll, its ‘recto’ side (where the writing would have been parallel to the fibre direction) would be blank, but the ‘verso’ side of a roll (where the writing was against the fibres) would not be expected to have been inscribed first). Unfortunately, we are not able to establish how much text has disappeared in the lacunas at the LH and RH side of the papyrus; therefore, it is impossible to prove that a topic occurring in line ‘x’ finds a continuation in line ‘x + 1’ (see below, our notes to ll. 13-5 and l. 20). In itself, the size of the writing may suggest that it is a set of *scholia* written in the margin of a codex, but the fragment is too large to support that hypothesis and there is insufficient basis for precisely calculating the size of the missing surface material. Moreover, the fact that *lemmata* from the Theocritus text are included suggests that it is a commentary, independent from its text (for such an independent commentary, cf. in particular *P.Oxy*. LXIV 4432).

*) We want to express our sincere gratitude to the Benedictine community of the Abbey of Montserrat for allowing us to publish this piece here, especially to Father Pius Tragan, who always received us at the monastery with generosity and helped us in every way he could. We also sincerely thank our colleagues Alberto Bernabé (Madrid), Ineke Sluiter (Leiden) and the anonymous *Mnemosyne* referee for their useful comments and Brian P. Muhs for polishing our English text. We quote papyri according to the standard abbreviations listed in John F. Oates, Roger S. Bagnall, Sarah J. Clackson, Alexandra A. O’Brien, Joshua D. Sosin, Terry G. Wilfong, and Klaas A. Worp, *Checklist of Greek, Latin, Demotic and Coptic Papyri, Ostraca and Tablets*, http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/texts/clist.html, December, 2007.

1) Cf. Seider 1967 I # 47; 1970 II # 53; Cavallo-Maehler 1987, ## 4a and 9a.