ENTRY

The panel, with the frontal figure of the standing saint, who is not accompanied to the sides by a series of superimposed narrative scenes of his legend as in so-called biographical icons, belongs to a type of image that began to appear in Florence and in other cities in Italy in the thirteenth century and remained widespread throughout the following century: narrow and elongated in format, these paintings were probably intended to be hung against a pillar in a church. [1] Paintings of this kind, however, were more frequently painted directly onto the pillar or onto the wall of the church with the more economical technique of fresco. [2] Panels with single figures of saints were realized either with a votive intention, as for instance the one by Daddi himself representing Saint Catherine of Alexandria and a kneeling donor, now in the Museo dell’Opera del Duomo in Florence, [3] or as an expression of the cult of a confraternity or a religious lay company that met to pray and sing before the image at particular times. Both the number of the minuscule kneeling figures below the saint—six men and six women...
—and the absence of any name or coat of arms of a donor family make it likely that a confraternity commissioned our panel. [4]

The composition of the painting is decidedly archaic: the device of placing the inscription of the name of the saint over a red ground against the gold on both sides, divided into two syllables by the figure, is especially found in paintings dating to the last decades of the thirteenth and early decades of the fourteenth centuries. [5] Also archaizing seems to be the exclusive use of decorations incised by hand, without any punched motifs, in the ornament of the halo [fig. 1]: in the years in which Bernardo painted this panel, major Florentine painters preferred to use the more rapid and labor-saving as well as more showy method of decorations impressed with punches in the gold ground. On the other hand, ornamental motifs very similar to those that decorate the halo of Saint Paul in this panel are also found in the lateral panels of the polyptych painted by Bernardo Daddi for the Ospedale della Misericordia in Prato only a few years later. [6] So the incised decoration, if it is not a deliberate archaism, is at any rate somewhat demodé, though it would recur throughout the painter’s work. Clearly, this archaic character of the image, the form itself of the panel with the triangular gable (without the inscribed Gothic arch and other decorative elements that usually embellished painted panels from the 1330s on), and the severity of expression of the frontally standing saint misled art historians, who failed for so long to recognize the master who painted it. Osvald Sirén’s attribution to the Master of Santa Cecilia, or to Buonamico Buffalmacco, with whom the art historian thought he could identify the anonymous master (1919, 1920), was the first attempt to establish an authorship. [7] Raimond van Marle (1924) accepted his reference to the Master of Santa Cecilia, but Richard Offner (1927, 1931, 1947) firmly rejected it, though without suggesting an alternative name. [8] By 1931, Bernard Berenson had given the painting to “a contemporary and close follower of Giotto,” and George Martin Richter was “inclined to feel [the painting] is too good for Maso, and [thought it] could be by Orcagna.” [9] Lionello Venturi’s alternative proposal (1931, 1933) of the authorship of Maso di Banco was probably formulated after the restoration commissioned by Duveen Brothers, Inc., a treatment that attenuated the grandeur and softened the rather rough character of the original image. [10] Wilhelm Valentiner (1933, 1935) accepted the proposed attribution to Maso, as did Luigi Coletti (1942, 1946), at least initially; Ugo Galetti and Ettore Camesasca (1951) endorsed it, and Walter Paatz reported it skeptically (1941) before the later literature jettisoned it for good. [11] Emilio Cecchi gave the panel to Giotto (Florentine, c. 1265 - 1337) himself (1937). The more cautious definition “School (or follower) of Giotto,” with which the
painting was first labeled in its present location (“The Mellon Gift” 1937), was promulgated by the earlier catalogs of the National Gallery of Art (NGA 1941, NGA 1949) and by the volume Duveen Pictures (1941), in which an attribution with a question mark to Giotto himself was hazarded; the postwar studies also abandoned it (Salvini 1952, Vigorelli and Baccheschi 1966). [12] David George Wilkins (1969, 1985), however, did not exclude the possibility that it might have been “a product of the late Giotto workshop,” while Arno Preiser (1973) preferred to speak vaguely of “Florentine school.” [13] Richter (1941) returned to the old identification proposed by Sirén and conjectured an attribution to Buffalmacco, a point of view that remained without any following. [14] So, too, did the hypothesis of Richard Offner (1958), who compared the panel in the Gallery with four lateral panels of a dismantled polyptych in the Galleria dell’Accademia in Florence (nos. 8704, 8705, 8708, 8709), subsequently given to Lorenzo Monaco (Florentine, c. 1370 - c. 1425) by Federico Zeri and by most modern authorities. [15] Berenson, in letters to Edward Fowles and Joseph Duveen, had altered his opinion in favor of Daddi by 1935, and the dealer recorded it on the 1936 bill of sale to the Mellon Trust while describing the painting as “attributed to Giotto.” [16] Coletti (1950) reproposed Daddi’s authorship, perhaps independently and with considerable caution. [17] This view finally achieved almost unanimous acceptance after being cited in the posthumous edition of Berenson’s Lists (1963) and then in the catalogs of the Gallery from 1965 onwards. [18]

How, then, can this panel be inserted in the sequence of the painter’s works, assuming that the date in the inscription should be transcribed as 1333? [19] Observing the imposing figure of Saint Paul and especially his brooding face, rigidly frontal, dilated eyes, as well as the forms modeled (as the old photo testifies) with extreme delicacy, we may at first be reminded of certain paintings by Giotto himself, especially in his earlier phase. But the elements that exclude a Giottesque authorship are too many to be ignored. The proportions of the figure (in which the ratio between head and overall height of the figure lies between 8:1 and 9:1) are without parallel in Giotto’s oeuvre, with the exception of the final phase in his career, for example in the frescoes in the chapel of the Bargello, Florence, where the scenes painted by the artist (or by his pupils) are populated by very tall figures. [20] The subtle detailing of the garments and the saint’s furrowed brow are also quite alien to Giotto. The works most closely related to the Saint Paul in Washington are to be found, instead, in the output of Bernardo Daddi, especially among those paintings that reveal affinities with Giotto’s pupil Taddeo Gaddi, with whom Bernardo seems to have established a kind of collaborative venture around
In his cycle of frescoes in the Baroncelli Chapel in Santa Croce, Florence, Taddeo adopted extremely tall figures of powerful monumentality. On the other hand, the rhythm of the draperies in the Washington panel is too refined, too static, and the chiaroscuro modeling of the forms too delicate for an artist trained exclusively in the school of Giotto. Admittedly, the physiognomic type of the saint is rather unusual in the production of Daddi’s shop; nonetheless a Saint Paul with a youthful face framed by a short and silky beard does occasionally appear in Daddi’s paintings dating to the early 1330s. The delicately calligraphic pictorial modeling of the face can be compared with that of the frontal bust of Christ in the votive Madonna, now in the Museo dell’Opera del Duomo, Florence, executed in February 1335. The soft fabric of our saint’s mantle, breaking into sweeping folds that further emphasize the figure’s corporeal substance, seems very similar to that presented by Daddi in the already cited figure of Saint Catherine, dated 1333. In conclusion, that Bernardo Daddi was the artist of the Gallery panel can, I think, be unhesitatingly confirmed.

Miklós Boskovits (1935–2011)

March 21, 2016
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NOTES


[2] Pillar frescoes with figures of saints, the patrons of a family or guild, are common in fourteenth-century Florence; we may cite those in the church of Santa Maria Maggiore and in Orsanmichele. See Walter Paatz and Elisabeth Paatz, Die Kirchen von Florenz: Ein kunstgeschichtliches Handbuch, 6 vols. (Frankfurt am Main, 1940–1953), 3:625–629; and Diane Finiello Zervas, ed., Orsanmichele a Firenze, 2 vols., Mirabilia Italiae (Modena, 1996), 1:549–557.

The painting's votive character is suggested by the presence of the donor as devotee—evidently a member of the Medici family, as is indicated by the well-known family coat of arms at the foot of the panel.

[4] For more on this question, see Ronald F.E. Weissman, *Ritual Brotherhood in Renaissance Florence, Population and Social Structure* (New York and London, 1982); John Henderson, *Piety and Charity in Late Medieval Florence* (Oxford, 1994). An appendix in Henderson lists confraternities active in Florence between the mid-thirteenth and the mid-fifteenth centuries. He included among them a Compagnia di San Paolo, founded in 1434, which used to meet in the Badia Fiorentina, and a Compagnia di San Paolo dei Sarti, founded in 1435, whose meeting place is unknown. One should not forget, however, that confraternities were often active many years or even decades before their first documentation.

[5] Examples of a bilateral placing of the inscription include the thirteenth-century panel of Saint Luke and two devotees attributed to the Magdalen Master, now in the Uffizi, Florence (no. 3493), and various Florentine paintings of the early Trecento, such as Giotto’s polyptych in the church of the Badia (now displayed in the Uffizi) or the panel of the Vicchio-Paris Master representing Saint Felix, formerly in the Cini collection in Venice; cf. Richard Offner, *A Critical and Historical Corpus of Florentine Painting: The Fourteenth Century*, sec. 3, vol. 6, *Following of the St. Cecilia Master, Lippus Benivieni, Master of the Fogg Pietà* (New York, 1956), 116.

[6] In the polyptych in Prato—probably dating to after 1334, when Fra Francesco di Tieri became rector of the hospital—the particular foliate motif in the halo of Saint Catherine (further embellished in the external and internal circles with tiny motifs impressed with metal tools) seems virtually identical with the decoration of the halo of Saint Paul in the National Gallery of Art. The year 1337, when Bernardo Daddi was entrusted with the commission to paint the altarpiece of the Cappella del Sacro Cingolo in what is now the cathedral (then pieve) of Prato, should be considered a probable *terminus ante quem* for the hospital polyptych; cf. Richard Offner, Miklós Boskovits, and Enrica Neri Lusanna, *A Critical and Historical Corpus of Florentine Painting: The Fourteenth Century*, sec. 3, vol. 3, *The Works of Bernardo Daddi*, new ed. (Florence, 1989), 45 n.53; Richard Offner and Miklós Boskovits, *A Critical and Historical Corpus of Florentine Painting: The Fourteenth Century*, sec. 3, vol. 4, *Bernardo Daddi, His Shop and Following*, new ed. (Florence, 1991), 124. Bernardo also used motifs incised by hand in the halo of a panel of Saint Catherine, its present whereabouts unknown, dated 1333 (the painting was auctioned at Christie’s, New York, January 24, 2003, lot 25); see also Offner (1991, 102–104), though here small punched motifs also appear in the external and internal circles of the halo.


These opinions are recorded by Duveen Brothers, Inc.; see cable, November 3, 1931, Duveen’s London office to Duveen’s Paris office; cable, November 4, 1931, Paris to London; and letter, July 9, 1935, Duveen’s New York office to Edward Fowles in the Paris office (Duveen Brothers Records, accession number 960015, Research Library, Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles: reel 101, box 246, folder 4; copies in NGA curatorial files). I wish to thank Anne Halpern in the National Gallery of Art department of curatorial records and files for this information.

Lionello Venturi, Pitture italiane in America (Milan, 1931), no. 27; Lionello Venturi, Italian Paintings in America, trans. Countess Vanden Heuvel and Charles Marriott, 3 vols. (New York and Milan, 1933), 1: no. 34. The restoration was done in 1928; see cables, April 30 and May 3, 1928, Duveen’s New York office to the Paris office (see note 9 for citation). Again, Anne Halpern kindly provided this information.


[16] Letters (see note 9 for citation): Bernard Berenson to Edward Fowles, July 13, 1935, in which Berenson wrote, “This attribution [to Bernardo Daddi] I came to years ago, and it has stood the test of time—for me”; Berenson to Joseph Duveen, October 20, 1935; Berenson to Joseph Duveen, October 15, 1936. Information kindly supplied by Anne Halpern. For the bill of sale, see Provenance, note 6.


[19] The reading of the date as 1333 seems to be safe (but see Inscription note 1). However, as Erling S. Skaug (2008) observed, it might mean any date between January 1, 1333, and March 24, 1334. In fact, in Florentine style the year began on March 25. Skaug recalled that a big punch mark that Bernardo used in a Madonna dated August 14, 1333 (inv. no. 6170, Galleria dell’Accademia, Florence), never appeared again in the artist’s later works and hypothesized that the punch, absent also in the Gallery’s Saint Paul, might have been lost at the time of the disastrous flood in November 1333. See Erling S. Skaug, “Bernardo Daddi’s Chronology and Workshop Structure as Defined by Technical Criteria,” in Da Giotto a Botticelli: Pittura fiorentina tra gotico e rinascimento; Atti del convegno internazionale Firenze, Università degli Studi e Museo di San Marco, May 20–21, 2005, ed. Francesca Pasut and Johannes Tripps (Florence, 2008), 82–83.


[21] The composition of the small triptych with folding shutters now in the Museo
del Bigallo in Florence, which bears the date 1333, is virtually replicated by Taddeo Gaddi in a work of similar structure signed and dated 1334, now in the Gemäldegalerie in Berlin (nos. 1079–1081), a circumstance that has been variously interpreted. James Archer Crowe and Giovanni Battista Cavalcaselle (1864) believed that the Florentine triptych was also painted by Taddeo, while in more recent times, once Daddi’s authorship of it was universally accepted, the inference has been drawn that a now lost prototype from the hand of Giotto (Florentine, c. 1265 - 1337) himself (Coletti 1946) or of Maso di Banco (Longhi 1959) must have existed. The present writer (Boskovits 1987; cf. also 2001), on the other hand, conjectures, if not a shared shop, then perhaps a collaboration between the two artists and a kind of commercial arrangement whereby Bernardo painted only panels for Florentine churches, and Taddeo almost exclusively frescoes. See Joseph Archer Crowe and Giovan Battista Cavalcaselle, A New History of Painting in Italy from the Second to the Sixteenth Century, 3 vols. (London, 1864), 1:360–362; Luigi Coletti, I Primitivi, vol. 2, I senesi e i giotteschi (Novara, 1946), xliii; Roberto Longhi, “Qualità e industria in Taddeo Gaddi,” Paragone 10, no. 109 (1959): 34–35; Miklós Boskovits, ed., Frühe italienische Malerei: Gemäldegalerie Berlin, Katalog der Gemälde, trans. Erich Schleier (Berlin, 1988), 50; Richard Offner, A Critical and Historical Corpus of Florentine Painting: The Fourteenth Century, sec. 3, vol. 5, Bernardo Daddi and His Circle, ed. Miklós Boskovits, Ada Labriola, and Martina Ingendaay Rodio, new ed. (Florence, 2001), 12.


[23] I wonder whether it was not the saint’s youthful face, with its close-trimmed beard, that prompted so acute a connoisseur as Richard Offner to compare the Saint Paul in Washington with the image of the same saint in the Galleria dell’Accademia, Florence (inv. no. 8709), rather similar in facial type but in style clearly belonging to the last years of the fourteenth century.

[24] I refer, for example, to the image of the saint that appears in the left shutter of a portable triptych in the Fogg Art Museum in Cambridge, Massachusetts (no. 18.33), dated 1334.


[26] See note 3 above.

[27] Perhaps it may not be superfluous to refer briefly to the kinship sometimes suggested between the Saint Paul and a fresco now preserved in the
The wooden support, which has not been cradled, retains its original thickness of 3.3 cm. The engaged frame adds another 1.2 cm around the edges. The vertically grained panel is composed of three planks; the central one has a crack running the length of the panel. Three horizontal battens, attached with very large nails, reinforce the panel on the reverse; the lowest of these appears more recent than the other two, which are probably original. The wood panel was covered with fabric, and over it, gesso. [1] The craquelure is continuous over the panel and the inner part of the molding, indicating that the inner portion of the frame molding, attached with nails and dowels, is original. The outermost portion of the molding, however, is a later addition. Red bole serves as the preparation layer for the gold.
ground, upon which Saint Paul’s halo is incised rather than punched. The gold trim on Saint Paul’s robe and mantle was mordant gilded. The wooden support shows extensive worm damage, especially along the sides. The gold ground is much abraded. The silver leaf of Saint Paul’s sword has oxidized to black in some areas. A broad pattern of wide-aperture craquelure penetrates the painted surface, which contains many small, scattered losses, especially in the headaddresses of several small figures at the lower right, and a few scratches. The original engaged frame, decorated with silver leaf overlaid with orange and green pigments, has discolored in some of the areas where the leaf is exposed. [2] A small section of the original gable top, mostly underneath the frame, has been replaced. Photographs of the painting made in the years 1910–1915 [fig. 1] [3] show it much darkened by dust and somewhat opaque varnishes. Shortly after the 1916 sale the panel underwent partial varnish removal; the inscription with the date was discovered on this occasion [fig. 2]. [4] It was treated again in 1928, when the figures were inpainted and the frame completed above and re-gilded. [5] The painting was treated most recently between 1984 and 1989. [6] During this treatment the insecure areas in the wooden support were strengthened, the discolored varnish and old inpainting were removed, and losses were inpainted.

TECHNICAL COMPARATIVE FIGURES

TECHNICAL NOTES

[1] The NGA scientific research department analyzed the ground layer using x-ray powder diffraction (XRD), and the gesso was identified as the dehydrate form of calcium sulfate (see report dated December 15, 1986, in NGA conservation files).

[2] The NGA scientific research department analyzed pigments using x-ray fluorescence spectrometry (XRF) and optical microscopy. The greens were mixtures of azurite and lead tin yellow; the browns contained massicot and red iron oxide; the reds contained red lakes, red iron oxides, and vermilion; the purples contained azurite and red lake; and the yellows were ocher pigments (see report dated December 15, 1986, in NGA conservation files).

[3] Apart from the small and rather dark reproduction published in the 1916 sale catalog, the painting’s state in these years is also illustrated by a photograph made c. 1910, apparently by the firm Brogi, in Florence. A copy of it is now in the photographic archive of the Fondazione Federico Zeri in
PROVENANCE

The often-repeated statement in the earlier literature that the panel comes from the Florentine monastery of San Felice in Piazza[1] does not seem to be based on any secure, or at any rate documented, evidence. Perhaps more plausible, based at least on the identity of the saint, is the more recent proposal of a provenance either from the Florentine Ospedale di San Paolo or from the nearby church of San Paolino, since a handwritten annotation on an old photograph indicated its provenance “dai padri di San Paolino.”[2] Elia Volpi[1858–1938], Florence, by the early 1900s;[3] (his sale, American Art Galleries, New York, 21-27 November 1916, seventh day, no. 1040, as “Primitive school of Tuscany, early XVth century”); (Bourgeois Galleries, New York);[4] purchased January 1920 by (Duveen Brothers, Inc. London, Paris, and New York);[5] sold 15 December 1936 to The A. W. Mellon Educational and Charitable Trust, Pittsburgh;[6] gift 1937 to NGA.

[1] In the introduction to the 1916 sale catalogue (n.p.), Elia Volpi states that among his pictures which “belong . . . to the School of Italian Primitives, the majority . . . [come] from the sacristy of the convent of St. Felice in Florence.” On this basis both Venturi and several other later authors claimed that the NGA Saint Paul formerly belonged to that church; however, as Lucia Meoni has (1993) pointed out, “nessuna fonte antica o le schede del Carocci testimoniano l’antica collocazione del San Paolo nella chiesa di San Felice. . . .” (“No early source nor the entries in Carocci’s Inventory [an inventory compiled in 1892 on behalf of the Soprintendenza of Florence] record the presence of the Saint Paul in the church of San Felice...”).

Bologna (no. PI 0044/2/32).

[4] Osvald Sirén, “A Great Contemporary of Giotto, 1,” The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs 35 (1919): 229, reported that by “the Spring of 1917 it had been very successfully cleaned.”

[5] This can be deduced both from a comparison of the photo reproduced by Sirén with Venturi’s reproduction (1931 and 1933) and from the Duveen Brothers’ habit of immediately cleaning the pictures they acquired. See, e.g., Edward Fowles, Memories of Duveen Brothers (London, 1976), 123; Meryle Secrest, Duveen: A Life in Art (New York, 2004), 334. See also Entry, note 9.

Roberta Ferrazza (Palazzo Davanzati e le collezioni di Elia Volpi, Florence, 1993: 216 n. 52) has found records of sales of art objects from the Conservatorio di San Pier Martire, annexed to the church of San Felice, in the years between 1884 and 1901, as well as a note in the photo archive of the Biblioteca Berenson at I Tatti (Harvard University Center for Italian Renaissance Studies, Florence), according to which Stephan Bourgeois, who bought the panel now in Washington at the Volpi sale, “went to see Mr. Guglielmetti, Mr. Volpi’s secretary, from whom he [Bourgeois] received the information that Mr. Volpi [said he had] bought the picture in 1907 from the administrators of the Monastery of S. Felice in Florence . . . .” NGA systematic catalogue author Miklós Boskovits is inclined, however, to think that the records of Volpi’s secretary were based on the same rather vague memories and should not be considered trustworthy.

[2] According to the unpublished research of Kathleen Giles Arthur (c. 1991; copy in NGA curatorial files) “the Saint Paul most probably was commissioned by one of the major charitable institutions in fourteenth century Florence,” i.e., the Ospedale di San Paolo, and the worshippers of the saint can be identified as the members of the third order of Saint Francis, lay men and women who formed the staff of the hospital. The claim, however, is no more than speculation on the part of the author. The provenance from San Paolino, on the other hand, is asserted by a handwritten note on the reverse of an early photograph in the photo archive of Federico Zeri in Bologna (no. PI 0044/2/32; originally taken c. 1910 apparently by the firm Brogi in Florence); see also Miklós Boskovits, A Critical and Historical Corpus of Florentine Painting. The fourteenth century, The Painters of the Miniaturist Tendency, Sec.III, Vol. IX, Florence,1984: 350 n. 3). San Paolino (originally San Paolo), in the Quartiere Santa Maria Novella, was already a collegiate church in the eleventh century and, after various vicissitudes, was sold to the discalced Carmelites in 1618; they rebuilt the church in its present form later in the seventeenth century and still officiate it. After the suppression of religious orders in 1808, the friars had to abandon the church and its annexed convent, but it was restored to them in 1814, and they remained there until a second suppression of the convent in 1866 (Osanna Fantozzi Micali and Piero Rosselli, Le soppressioni dei conventi a Firenze, Montelupo Fiorentino, 2000: 233). Since the late nineteenth century, however, the church has once again been officiated by the discalced Carmelites; see Walter and Elisabeth Paatz, Die Kirchen von Florenz. Ein kunstgeschichtliches Handbuch, Vols. 1-6, Frankfurt am Main, 1940-1953: 4(1952): 591. There is no documentation of any confraternity dedicated to Saint Paul that met in this church, but the large group of

Saint Paul and a Group of Worshippers
© National Gallery of Art, Washington
donors at the foot of the NGA panel suggests that a lay confraternity commissioned it. It is known, on the other hand, that Daddi did work for San Paolino: another painting by him, representing the *Madonna and Child* and now in the Galleria dell’Accademia (no. 3466; see Angelo Tartuferi in *Cataloghi della Galleria dell’Accademia di Firenze. Vol. 1: Dipinti*, ed. Miklós Boskovits and Angelo Tartuferi, Florence, 2003: 60-63), also comes from this church and can be assumed to be close in date to the Gallery’s painting.

[3] After an early career as a painter and restorer, Volpi began to work as an art dealer in Città di Castello towards the end of the nineteenth century. He then moved to Florence, where he purchased the Palazzo Davanzati in 1904 and transformed it into a private museum, furnishing it with paintings and objets d'art from his collection. The museum was opened to the public in September 1910. Presumably by then the panel discussed here was already in Volpi’s possession; the Volpi sale catalogue of 1916 noted that it had come from the Palazzo Davanzati. Luigi Coletti (“Il Maestro colorista di Assisi,” *Critica d’Arte* 8-9 (1949-1950): 447) claims that the painting passed through the hands of the dealer Stefano Bardini (1836–1922), but Everett Fahy’s research (*L’Archivio storico fotografico di Stefano Bardini. Dipinti, disegni, miniature, stampe*, Florence, 2000) does not confirm this.


[6] The original bill of sale is in Records of The A. W. Mellon Educational and Charitable Trust, Subject Files, Box 2, Gallery Archives, NGA; copy in NGA curatorial files. The painting is attributed to Giotto, with a parenthetical note stating that Bernard Berenson gives it to Daddi.
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1910 Palazzo Davanzati, Florence, between September 1910 and 1916.

1921 Loan Exhibition of Painting and Sculpture by Italian Artists of the Fourteenth, Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries, Cincinnati Art Museum, 1921, no catalogue.

1933 Sixteenth Loan Exhibition of Old Masters. Italian Paintings of the XIV to XVI Century, Detroit Institute of Art, 1933, no. 3.
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