Choeroboscus’ *Prolegomena to Orthography*: The Evidence of *Psalm-Epimerisms* and Ps.-Theodosius

Stefano Valente

The body of Byzantine orthographical literature is quite enormous and, for the most part, studied rarely and edited poorly.¹ Most of the orthographical treatises are anonymous or falsely ascribed in antiquity to some famous grammarian; there are few critical editions, some careless transcriptions of single manuscripts, and few studies of the textual traditions of single works. Obviously, these are significant obstacles to understanding properly a basic part of the educational and grammatical system in the Byzantine world.

Among the Byzantine orthographers, George Choeroboscus,² a grammarian who lived in Byzantium in the eighth and ninth centuries,³ played an important role. He wrote many


---
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grammatical works, including an Orthography that was alphabetically arranged and tripartite—that is to say, divided into σύνταξις (“syntax,” dealing with problems of syllabification, especially the boundaries of syllables), ποιότης (“quality,” concerning doubts on the spelling of consonants), and ποσότης (“quantity,” handling doubts on the spelling of vowels). Unfortunately, the direct tradition preserves only an epitome of the latter part of this work. The only available printed edition is Cramer’s transcription of the most important witness, the MS Bodleian Barocci 50 (tenth cent.).

Following Hilgard, Alpers rightly stresses that “es gibt ...
deutliche Zeugnisse, daß die ursprüngliche Fassung, die καθό-λου καὶ κατὰ πλάτος αὐτοῦ Ὄρθογραφία, auch detaillierte Prolegomena besaß.”8 Some fragments of the prolegomena (as well as of the other two parts on σύνταξις and ποιότης) can be found elsewhere in Choeroboscus’ works.9 For instance, in his Psalm-Epimerisms, a work in erotematic form in which the biblical text is explained merely from a grammatical point of view, he often handles spelling problems.10 According to Alpers,11 “Reflexe der Prolegomena sind vielleicht auch in dem

8 Alpers 32 (n.130 for the quotation of Choerob. In Th. OR IV 2 156.35–36, ήμεις δὲ, εἰ δὲ φιλον, ἐν τοῖς προλεγομένοις τῆς Ὅρθογραφίας διαλάβομεν περὶ αὐτῶν, “if it pleases God, let us explain such things in the prolegomena of Orthography”).

9 See Alpers 31–33. Furthermore, a fuller version of Choeroboschus’ Orthography has been a direct source of Byzantine Etymologica (see Schneider, Les traités 235–255; Alpers 31 ff.). For example, Hilgard (Theodosii LXXI) points out that Et.Magn. 816.52 Gaisford may come from this lost preface: see Choerob. Orth. 275.19 ~ Et.Gud. 566.26–36 Sturz (Hdn., Gramm.Gr III 2 604.30); Alpers (32 n.130) rejects the ascription of this entry to Charax suggested by Schneider (435 n.56). Moreover, Alpers (8 n.26) suggests that the similar definitions of the four canons in schol. Lond. Dion. Thrax, Gramm.Gr I 3 454.14 (dealing with the twelve canons of ἀνάγνωσις, “reading”: see D. Fehling, “Varro und die grammatische Lehre von der Analogie und der Flexion,” Glotta 35 [1956] 251) may also come from Choeroboscus. (E. Siebenborn, Die Lehre von der Sprachrichtigkeit und ihren Kriterien. Studien zur antiken normativen Grammatik [Amsterdam 1967] 159, cites this scholion, but does not identify the source nor the close relationship with the entry of the Et. Magn.)

10 The only available edition is that of T. Gaisford, Georgii Choerobosci Epimerismi in Psalmos (Oxford 1842), based on Paris.gr. 2756: see Schneider, Les traités 437–441, and particularly Alpers 35–36, for a survey of the textual tradition of this work. Marcian.gr. 492, mid-fifteenth century, can be added to the ten MSS. listed there: E. Mioni, Bibliothecae Divi Marci Venetiarum codices Graeci manuscripti II (Rome 1985) 302.

11 Alpers 32 n.130, who cites Schneider, Les traités 439: “il est fait mention des quatre canons de l’orthographe. On trouve la doctrine complète p. 89.14ex–26in., avec une allusion (p. 89.18–19) au double sens du mot Ὅρθογραφία. Les exemples correspondent très bien à ceux du supplément 18, non à ceux de Charax.” On his latter statement see n.17 below.
Psalmepimerismen 89,14–26 Gaisford zu erkennen”; here, dealing with the adverb σήμερον (Ps. 2:7), the grammarian introduces the (orthographical) canon of παράδοσις to account for the spelling with epsilon of syllable -με-, adding a concise list and explanation of the four canons of orthography: analogy, dialect, etymology, and history. According to history. According to what canons of orthography? Four: analogy, dialect, etymology, history. What is analogy? Why is the syllable -με- spelt with epsilon? According to paradosis. According to what canon of orthography? According to history. And how many are the canons of orthography? Four: analogy, dialect, etymology, history. What is analogy? When we correct the spelling, or when we enunciate a canon, as we have demonstrated for the word πα-
χεία ("quick"). What is dialect? When I say that ἡµεῖς ("we") is spelt with the diphthong epsilon-iota, because the Aeolians say ἀµ<µ>ες pronouncing the present epsilon in the word. What is etymology? When I spell ἡπειρϱος ("land") with the diphthong epsilon-iota and I say because it has no limits, being ἀπειρϱος and ἀπειρϱος ("boundless"). What is history? When χίλιοι ("a thousand") is spelt with iota, I say “the paradosis has it spelt in this way.”

If we assume, following Alpers, that this passage reflects Choeroboscus’ own Prolegomena, the explanation of analogy-canon is surprising because here the grammarian says only ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τοῦ ταχεία ἐδηλώσαµεν, while he is never concerned with this adjective in the whole Psalm-Epimerisms. The same formula, indeed, occurs in the so-called Πσ.-Théodosius. This work was edited for the first (and last) time in 1822 by Goettling, on the basis of Paris.gr. 2553 and 2555, in a very unsatisfactory manner. As far as we can see, it is a hotchpotch of grammatical materials from many different and heterogeneous sources, some of them still unidentified, probably put together before the second half of the tenth century. Its tripartite orthographical part (pp.61–79) carries a general introduction to the matter (61.22–62.26), already edited in 1821 by Bekker on the basis of Vat.gr. 1370. After the definitions of orthography and of its three fields of investigation, the four canons are listed and described as follows:

Moreover, in the Psalms, the feminine adjective ταχεία never appears. Schneider, Les traités 439 (see n.11 above) considers it as simply an allusion to the double definition of orthography.

See G. Uhlig, Dionysii Thracis ars grammatica (Leipzig 1883) XXXVII; Egenolff 10–13; Alpers 23 ff. As Alpers rightly stresses, Schneider (Les traités 130–175) misleadingly calls it “Supplément 18” on the basis of Uhlig IV.


See Alpers 23–26.

See Egenolff 11; Alpers 8, 24.

I print Bekker’s text with some slight corrections and supplements on the basis of the variant readings of Goettling’s edition (n.19 above).
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δύο σημαίνει τὸ τῆς ὀρθογραφίας ὄνομα. ὀρθογραφία ἐστὶν ἡ ὀρθή γεγραμμένη λέξες, καὶ πάλιν ὀρθογραφία ἐστὶν οἱ κανονὶς οἱ ἀποδοτικοὶ καὶ ἀποδεικτικοὶ τῆς ὀρθῆς γεγραμμένης λέξεως. ἐὰν γὰρ τὸ ταχεῖα γράφω διὰ τῆς εἰ διαθέτω, καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ λέξες ὀρθῶς γραφεῖσα ὀρθογραφία καλεῖται, κἂν ἐρωτήσης τὴν ἀπόλυτη τῆς γραφῆς καὶ ἐπὶ ἐν τὸν κανόνα, ὅτι τὰ ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς ἐν ἀργοτόνων ἀρσενικῶν παρεξηγηματικά μεν θηλυκὸν διὰ τοῦ εἰς διὰ τῆς εἰ διαθέτημε γράφεται, ἐπὶ ταχεῖα ταχεῖα, ἡ βραδεία, ἡ βραδεία, ἢ ὁποῖος ὁ κανόνα ὀρθογραφία καλεῖται.

τῆς δὲ ὀρθογραφίας εἴδη τριά, σύνταξις, ποιότης καὶ ποσότης. καὶ σύνταξις μὲν ἑπὶ ὅταν ξητοὺς ποὺς ςυλλαβῆς ςυντάξουμεν τὰ στοιχεῖα, οἷον εἰ τῷ ἀσθενῆς τῷ σῖτον λητικὸν ἐστὶ τῆς πρώτης συλλαβῆς ἡ ἀρκτικῆς τῆς δευτέρας; ποιότης δὲ ὅταν ξητοὺς ποὺς στοιχεῖον γεγραμμένον εἰ τῷ ἑμποροῖς, τὸ ν ὅταν οἱ ποὺς ἑπὶ ὅταν ξητοὺς εἰ τῷ μέμορα στοιχεῖα ἑστί, μὴ μὲν. καὶ ταῦτα μὲν τὰ εἴδη τῆς ὀρθογραφίας.

κανόνες δὲ αὐτῆς τέτσαρες, ἀναλογία, διάλεκτος, ἐπιμολογία, ἱστορία. καὶ ἀναλογία μὲν κατορθοῦμεν γραφῆς, ὅταν κανόνα ἀποδομηθήκη, ὅσπερ ἐπὶ τοῦ ταχεῖα ἐθλοῦμεν διαλέκτῳ δὲ, ὅταν τῷ ἡμεῖς διὰ τῆς εἰ διαθέτημε γράφων εἰπὼ ὅτι Λοιμές ἔμμες λέγουσι, τῷ προσόντων εὐς πῇ λέξει ἐκ-φωνήσαντες. ἐπιμολογία δὲ, ὅταν τῷ ᾿ηπείρος ἑπὶ τοῦ τῇ πρῶτῃ συλλαβῆς καὶ διὰ τῆς εἰ διαθέτημε <τῇ δευτέρᾳ> γράφων εἰπὼ ἑπὶ ἔπειδα πέρας οὐκ ἐχει, ἀπερός τὶς οὐσία. ἤπειρος δὲ, ὅταν τὸ

23 62.3–7 Goettling: οἷον εἰ τῷ ἀσθενῆς πότεραν τῷ κατηκτικῶν ἐστὶ τῇ ἀποδομηθήκῃ ἢ ἦτο τῆς πρῶτης. η τῇ πρῶτης ἐστὶ λητικῆς τῆς δευτέρας ἀρκτικῆς. (for example, whether in ἀσθενής sigma belongs to the sylltable α, the first, or to the syllable θ, the second, that is to say whether we say ἀσθενής, or ἀ-σθενής, that is whether sigma ends the first syllable or begins the second).)

24 Scripsi coll. Chroesph. (see above), Charax (see below): ὅτι τῷ προσόν (αὐ) εἰ τῇ λέξει προφορήσαντες Vat.gr. 1370 (Bekker): ὅτι τῷ Δοφρείς ἕμες λέγουσι καὶ ἡμεῖς τῷ περισσόν εὐκαιρίαν διαθέτημεν εὔφωνον ἐποιήσαμεν Parag. 2533 and 2555 (62.6–18, 19 Goettling).

25 62.20–24 Goettling: ὅταν τῷ ᾿ηπείρος διὰ τοῦ τῇ πρῶτῃ συλλαβῆς καὶ διὰ διαθέτημεν τῇ δευτέρᾳ γράφωνἐποίησαν ἀπερός τὸς οὖν ἡ γῆ. ἦτον μὴ ἐχουσα πέρας, τροπῇ δὲ τοῦ τῷ εἰς τῇ καὶ πλεονασμῷ τοῦ ᾿ηπείρος "when we spell ᾿ηπείρος with eta in the first syllable and with the
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χίλιοι γράφων διὰ τοῦ εἶπον “οὔτως αὐτὸ βούλεται γράφεσθαι ἡ παράδοσις.”

The noun orthography has two meanings: orthography is the word correctly spelt and the demonstrative canon of the word correctly spelt. For example, if I write ταχεία with the diphthong epsilon-iota, the word itself correctly spelt is called orthography; and if I am asked about the account of the spelling and I say the canon, that is “the feminine adjectives ending in -εία of masculine ending in -ος are spelt with the diphthong epsilon-iota, as ταχύς ταχεία (“quick”), ωκύς ωκεία (“swift”), ἡδύς ἡδεία (“sweet”), βραδύς βραδεία (“slow”), ὀξύς ὀξεία (“sharp””), then the canon itself is called orthography.

The noun orthography has two meanings: orthography is the word correctly spelt and the demonstrative canon of the word correctly spelt. For example, if I write ταχεία with the diphthong epsilon-iota, the word itself correctly spelt is called orthography; and if I am asked about the account of the spelling and I say the canon, that is “the feminine adjectives ending in -εία of masculine ending in -ος are spelt with the diphthong epsilon-iota, as ταχύς ταχεία (“quick”), ωκύς ωκεία (“swift”), ἡδύς ἡδεία (“sweet”), βραδύς βραδεία (“slow”), ὀξύς ὀξεία (“sharp””), then the canon itself is called orthography.

The fields of orthography are three: syntax, quality, and quantity. Syntax is when we inquire to which syllable we assign the letters: for example, whether the first sigma in ἀσθενής (“weak”) ends the first syllable or begins the second. Quality is when we inquire which is the letter to be spelt in the word ἐμπορός (“trader”), my or ny. Quantity is when we inquire which are the letters in µίµος (“mime”), my-iota or my-epsilon-iota. And these are the fields of orthography.

Its canons are four: analogy, dialect, etymology, history. And we correct the spelling with analogy, when we enunciate a canon, as we have demonstrated for the word ταχεία. With dialect, when I spell ἑις (“we”) with the diphthong epsilon-iota and I say that the Aeolians say ἐις pronouncing the epsilon present in the word. With etymology, when we spell ἠπειρός (“land”) with eta in the first syllable and with the diphthong epsilon-iota in the second and I say: “because it has no limits, being ἀπέρος.” With history, when I spell χίλιοι (“a thousand”) with iota and I say “the paradosis has it spelt in this way.”

The third paragraph shows striking coincidences with the Psalm-epimerism cited above, in particular with the canon of analogy, which is illustrated, just as in Choerobuscus’ passage,
only by ὃσπερ ἐπὶ τοῦ ταχεία ἐδηλώσαμεν. However, in Ps.-Theodosius, such a formula can be easily explained through the first paragraph dealing with the definition of orthography, where its second meaning—ὁ κανὼν ὁ ἀποδεικτικὸς τῆς ὁρθῆς γεγραμμένης λέξεως—is exemplified by the (analogue) canon of the adjective ταχύς ταχεῖα, which occurs elsewhere in Choeroboscus’ Orthography. The same example can thus be recalled a few lines below to account for the canon of analogy. Thus, if the Psalm-epimerism hints, as it seems, at this extended definition, then at least the entire passage of Ps.-Theodosius may have been gathered from Choeroboscus’ lost Prolegomena to orthography.

Moreover, two other possible pieces of evidence can be produced. In the entry ἥπειρος of Choeroboscus’s Orthography 26 See 179.20 (whence Et.Gud. 51.20 De Stefani, see [Zonar.] 81.14) αἱτεία διδοθηκὼν καὶ πάντα τὰ παρασχημασμένα τὴν ἀπὸ τὸ [Zonar.] ἱ. recte ἐις υς ταχύς, ταχεία βραδύς, βραδεῖα (“high: diphthong; and all the adjectives from those ending in -υς: ταχύς ταχεῖα, βραδύς βραδεῖα”), 208.5 (Hdn., Gramm.GrIII.2 513.25–27) εὐρθῆ διὰ τῆς εἰ διφθόγγου … τὰ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐις υς αρασικών διὰ τοῦ εἰ παρασχημασμένα θηλυκά, διὰ τῆς εἰ διφθόγγου γράφεται οἷον, βραδύς, βραδεῖα οὐτως καὶ υδύς, ηδεία, καὶ εὐρύς, εὐρεία (“wide: with the diphthong epsilon-iota … The feminine adjectives ending in -εια which derive from a masculine ending in -υς are spelt with the diphthong epsilon-iota, as βραδύς βραδεῖα, as well as υδύς ηδεία and εὐρύς εὐρεία”), 253.12 (~ El.Magn. 687.5 [Hdn. 573.5] πρεσβύς πρεσβεία κτλ. (“embassy: it is spelt with the diphthong epsilon-iota: as ταχύς ταχεῖα, so πρεσβύς πρεσβεία”). 27 Fehling (Glotta 35 [1956] 238) rightly stresses that “Analogie sei die Zusammenstellung des Ähnlichen, die zur Aufstellung der Regeln (worunter hier und im Folgenden speziell die ‘κανῶνες’ der antiken Flexionslehre verstanden sein sollen) führe … Sie—oder vielmehr der Grammatiker mit ihr—stellt die ähnlichen Wörter zusammen und bildet daraus die Regeln.” Thus, the enunciation of the canon suffices to find the correct spelling of a word; analogy can thus be the demonstrative canon (κανὼν ἀποδεικτικὸς) itself, corresponding to the second definition of orthography.
(217.7–13 [cf. Hdn., Gramm. Gr. III.2 517.32–35]), the account of its spellings according to the etymology (κατὰ ἐτυμολογίαν) is recalled with almost the same wording as in Ps.-Theodosius:

> ἤπειρος· ἤπειρος δὲ λέγεται ἡ γῆ γράφεται δὲ τὸ μὲν η ἐκ τοῦ ατοῦ στερητικοῦ, ἄπειρος γὰρ λέγεται κατὰ ἐτυμολογίαν· τὸ δὲ πεῖ διέθθηγον, ὅτι ἔχει ἀπὸ πρωτοτύπου φωνῆς τὸ ε´ πέρας γὰρ οὐκ ἔχει, ἄπειρος τις οὐσα καὶ ἤπειρος κτλ. 28

> ἤπειρος: the earth is called land; eta is spelt because of alpha privative, because ἄπειρος is said according to etymology. The diphthon epsilon-iota in πεἰ, because the word has epsilon from the primitive name, since it has no limits, being ἄπειρος and so ἤπειρος etc.

Furthermore, it seems worthwhile to cite the only other complete preface to orthography preserved, that of John Charax (second half of the sixth century), who wrote a complete and tripartite Περὶ ὀρθογραφίας (About orthography), still unedited as a whole, which closely depends on Herodian’s Orthography. 29 The structure of his introduction is close to that of Ps.-Theodosius, but some remarkable differences in wording can be observed. Therefore it is generally assumed that they do not derive one from another, but the similarities can be explained by their independent use of Herodian’s Orthography as a direct source: 30

28 See also Epim.Hom. A 485A (~ Et.Gen. codd. AB s.v. ἤπειρος, Et.Gud. 246.54–247.3 Sturz, Et.Magn. 433.54 Gaisford) ἤπειρος· ἤπειρος λέγεται ἡ γῆ παρὰ τὸ ἄπειρος τις οὐσα καὶ ἤπειρος κατὰ πλεονασμὸν τοῦ ἰ καὶ ἐκτάσει τοῦ α ("of land: the earth is called land according to the fact that it has no limits (ἄπειρος) and becomes ἤπειρος with the addition of iota and lengthening of alpha"). It is important to emphasise that the author of the anonymous Ἐπιμερισμὶ Ηομερίς can be possibly identified in Choeroboscus himself (see A. R. Dyck, Ἐπιμερισμὶ Ηομερίς [Berlin/New York 1983–1995] I 5–7, II 23–24).

29 See Egenolff 4 ff., Alpers 7–8 and 19 ff.

30 Egenolff 12–13; see however Alpers 26: “so besteht zwar der Verdacht, daß Ps.-Theodosios für Einleitung, σύνταξις und ποιότης von Charax abhängt, in dem Konglomerat seines ποιότης-Teiles dagegen, mindestens neben anderen, den Anonymus Crameri benutzt hat. Bei dem gegenwärtigen Kenntnisstand kann aber auch nicht ausgeschlossen werden, daß
ἐνδίδωρον ἐγέραται ἕνωσιν γὰρ ἑπτά καὶ ἑτέραν ἕρωταν ὡς ἐκ τῶν ἄνδρων ἄμφι ἔρχεται ὡς ἡ ἑτέρα ἔρχεται ἀγαθὸν. ἔνωσις ἐνδίδωρον ἐγέραται ἕνωσιν γὰρ ἑπτά καὶ ἑτέραν ἑρωτήματα ἐνδίδωρον ἐγέραται ὡς ἐκ τῶν ἄνδρων ἄμφι ἔρχεται ὡς ἡ ἑτέρα ἔρχεται ἀγαθὸν.
Orthography has two meanings: it is both the exact spelling according to the word and the demonstrative canon which demonstrates the word correctly spelt. For instance, if I spell ἐαρχινός (“of spring”) with iota, the word itself correctly spelt is called orthography. And if I am asked about the account of the spelling and I say “all the adjectives indicating seasons or moments of the day ending in -ινος are spelt with iota, as ἡμερινός (‘diurnal’) and νυκτερινός (‘nocturnal’),” then the canon itself is called orthography.

The fields of orthography are three: syntax, quality, quantity. Syntax is the investigation about letters at the end and in the sequence of syllables, as when we inquire to which syllable we assign the letters: for example, does the first sigma in the adjective ἀσθενής (“weak”) end the first syllable or begin the second? Quality is the investigation about consonants and their change, as when we inquire which is the letter in the word ἐμπορος (“trader”), my or ny. Quantity is the investigation about diphthong or monophthong: for example, how must the word μίμος (“mime”) be spelt? With iota or the diphthong epsilon-iota? These are the fields of orthography.

The canons of orthography are four: analogy, dialect, etymology, and history. Analogy is the demonstrative canon, history the tradition of the ancients, dialect is a special form of a language, etymology is the concise and true demonstration of the matter of inquiry according to its genuine sense, that is, true origin. And we correct the spelling with analogy, when we enunciate a canon, as it has been made clear for the word ἡμερινός. With dialect, when I spell the word μελλιχος (“gentle”) with the diphthong epsilon-iota and I say: “because the Aeolians say μέλλιχος pronouncing the epsilon present in the word.” With etymology, when I spell ἑλωτες (“helots”) with the diphthong epsilon-iota and I say: “it comes from Ἑλος (‘Helos’),” or ἐλυκρινής (“pure”) from ἔλη (“warmth of the sun”), that is the brightness of the sun. With history, when I spell χίλιοι (“a thousand”) with iota and say that the paradosis has it spelt in this way. It is necessary to know that history often contradicts dialect: for instance, since the Aeolians say χέλλιοι, the dialect would require the spelling with the diphthong epsilon-iota, but the tradition of the ancients has iota.
Apart from the general identity of structure and contents due to their common source, conclusive differences include the double definition of orthography and its exemplification in the first paragraph, and the examples used for the four canons in the third. In particular, the analogy-canon is accounted for by the exemplification of the second meaning of orthography—ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ ἡμερινὸς ἐφάνη—which differs from that of Ps.-Theodosius (ταχεῖα).

Therefore, only Ps.-Theodosius 61.22–62.26 seems to agree with Epim.Ps. 89.5–30: here Choeroboscus lists and explains the four canons which assure the correctness of spelling, as is usual in all introductions to orthography, seemingly citing his own lost Prolegomena to Orthography. The wording of these two passages is nearly the same, and Ps.-Theodosius can also justify the otherwise unintelligible definition of analogy as ὡσπερ ἐπὶ τοῦ ταχεία ἐδηλώσαμεν. Thus, it can be inferred that these paragraphs of Ps.-Theodosius may be (or at least come from) Choeroboscus’ lost Prolegomena to his Orthography, being thus a primary witness. However, this remains a hypothesis until a new complete critical edition of these two works is produced, which will allow for a more accurate inquiry into their mutual textual relationships.31
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31 This paper is based on a lecture (“The Writing Identity of a Byzantine Man: Choeroboscus and the Canons of Greek Orthography”) given on 6 March 2010 at the conference Being Byzantine: Limits, Definitions and Realities (Oxford), organized by the Oxford Byzantine Society. I would like to express my gratitude to Marco Ercoles, Leonardo Fiorentini, Camillo Neri, Renzo Tosi, and the anonymous reader for GRBS for their valuable suggestions and criticism to my paper.
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