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Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann

Johann Joachim Winckelmann's claim that he founded a completely new kind of art history has been described as one of the foundational myths characteristic of the Enlightenment; despite the recent attention he has received, little has been done to dispel this myth.¹ This chapter, a summary of the author's recent research, attempts to point the way to a newer understanding of the origins of the historiography of art before Winckelmann. A search for these origins can be fruitfully pursued in the vastly underexamined German world of scholarship of the late seventeenth century and early eighteenth century, a period following the appearance of the first substantial collection of lives of the artists in German, Joachim von Sandrart's Teutsche Akademie of 1675.² A starting point for this research was the observation that formal critical and historical discussion of the visual arts similar to that found elsewhere in Europe came comparatively late to the German-speaking world. Yet within the space of less than fifty years there appeared the origins of philosophical aesthetics signaled by Alexander Gottlieb Baumgarten, of the historiography of architecture with Johann Bernhard Fischer von Erlach, and of the history of art with Winckelmann. A substantial field of art criticism, represented by such authors as Moses Mendelssohn and G. E. Lessing also developed at this time.³

Although much less familiar than comparable literature from other parts of the continent, in Central Europe writings treating the visual arts poured forth in profusion in the late seventeenth and especially in the early eighteenth century. As exemplified by Sandrart, the abundance of literature on the arts can be regarded as part of a conscious effort to reconstruct culture and society after the devastation of the Thirty Years' War. Sandrart's work further exemplifies that the production of a German literature on the arts resulted from the assimilation of European models, French, Italian, Dutch. This is a pattern familiar from accounts of other fields of cultural endeavor. In addition to collections of lives of artists in the manner of Vasari or Karel von Mander's Schilder-boeck, there appeared in Germany lives of the architects in
the tradition of J. F. Félibien, whose work in translation J. J. Marperger continued and applied to Central Europe.⁴ There also appeared art theory, represented soon after Sandrart's basic text by translations of Henri Testelin and Roger De Piles, produced in the same circle of the Nuremberg academy to which Sandrart belonged, and of Charles du Fresnoy by Samuel Theodore Gerike for the Berlin academy.⁵ Art instructional literature was also produced in the ambit of the Nuremberg and Augsburg academies by artists and architects such as members of the Preissler family and J. G. Bergmüller.⁶ Finally, as in France during the course of the early eighteenth century, German-language journals commenting on the visual arts began to appear.⁷

The standard handbook on Kunstliteratur by Julius von Schlosser comments little on this literature; rather, it sends the reader to K. K. Eberlein's somewhat misnamed if not misleading dissertation of 1916, "Die deutsche Litterargeschichte der Kunst im 18. Jahrhundert." Eberlein's was the last full treatment of the subject.⁸ Eberlein did cite numerous sources on the arts, among them genres in which some discussion of its history appeared. These included what Eberlein described as the traditions of the polyhistor, museography, travel accounts, encyclopedias, and "academies." These are handbooks for noblemen, such as the Geöffnete Ritterplatz and its related volumes. These traditions all deserve more attention because of their importance for historiography, and because they are not as clearly distinguished from each other as Eberlein suggested; as he also correctly noted, these interests may have paved the way for the appearance of professional art history and art criticism in the late eighteenth century.

But, although there was much discussion about the visual arts in Germany before Winckelmann, how could a change in conception specifically of the historiography of art have occurred? The transformation of the conceptualization of the history of art involved a newer understanding of history and of art. A good deal has been learned about these subjects in the past eight decades. Several subjects not studied by Eberlein or really elucidated in relation to the history of art by many other scholars have proved especially fruitful for investigation. Pursuits that will lead closer to the origins of a new conceptualization of the history of art involve an investigation of universal history, including philosophical and literary history as they were understood (and not as these terms have been misappropriated) by Eberlein and others; the nature of antiquarian and historical scholarship before Winckelmann, particularly at several German universities and gymnasia; and finally the development of writing on what can be identified as a history of arts and especially of visual art before Winckelmann.
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I. Universal History and the Historiography of Art

In his critique of predecessors who used the term history of art without an understanding of art, Winckelmann acknowledged that works dealing with the topic, however unsatisfactorily in his eyes, did exist. Winckelmann cited a book by Pierre Monier published in 1698, *Histoire des arts, leurs origines, chutes et leur rétablissement*. This book traces the history of the *translatio artium* from the Garden of Eden to the Garden of Versailles. Taking his story up to the time of the rule of Louis XIV, Monier applies a universal historical scheme to the visual arts. This procedure remained in use for histories of culture until at least M. F. Dandré Bardon’s universal history related to the arts of design of 1765.

It is also known that Winckelmann was not the first to employ the term “history of art” (or art history, *Geschichte der Kunst* or *Kunstgeschichte*) even in the German language. The term *Geschichte der Kunst* was, as Eberlein also noted, used as the title of a periodical (*Geschichte der Natur und der Kunst*) that began publication in Breslau (Wroclaw) in 1717 and continued there for several years. What has not been noticed was that this periodical was largely devoted to natural history and, more important, that its editor, Johann Kanold, was the same person who had previously edited a book entitled *Historiographia*: this is the pseudonymous C. F. Neickel’s discussion of *Kunst- und Wunderkammern*. The periodical *Geschichte der Natur und der Kunst* is also called a *Sammlung von Natur und Medizin*; and this very title recalls the world of collections of which the so-called *Kunst- und Wunderkammer* is the most notorious contemporaneous example. The periodical’s mixture of essays not only devotes attention to the visual arts and to collections, including painting and porcelain production, and to an account of the installation of the *Kunst- und Naturalien-Cabinett* in Dresden, but does indeed not appear unlike the *Kunst- und Wunderkammern* familiar to its authors. One of the authors who contributed to the *Geschichte der Natur und der Kunst*, Johann Christian Kundtmann, wrote two descriptions of collections in Breslau (Wroclaw) in which he mentioned his contributions to the periodical.

Discussions of the *Kunstkammer* in the late seventeenth and eighteenth century are universal in describing collections throughout the world and tracing the history of collecting. Histories of *Kunstkammern* could also be the subject of university dissertations. Similarly, a later periodical, *Neue Versuche nutzlichen Sammlungen zu der Natur- und Kunstgeschichte*, contains accounts of artistic inventions, archival studies of important artists such as the architect Giovanni Maria Nosseni, and accounts of “Gothic” altarpieces, for example the one attributed to
Master HW (Hans Witten?) in Ehrenfriedersdorf. Later works employing the title "history of arts" also treat the history of the visual arts as a part of a history of all the arts and sciences; the same pertains to the sections of the Neueröffnete Ritterplatz, a compendium of knowledge about the arts and other human activities.

The outlines of the tradition of universal history as it influenced art history deserve further attention, as the scheme created by universal history continued to be employed in Winckelmann's time and entered into his consciousness. As it was understood from the sixteenth century onward, the theoretical project of universal history included the possibility of writing a history of the visual arts as part of a history of all times and places. Francis Bacon articulated what is probably for English speakers the most famous endorsement of this possibility in his tract on the advancement of learning. Bacon proposed that histories of all the arts should be written. Approximately at the same time, the Gdansk scholar Bartholomäus Keckermann wrote on the nature of history, stating that universal history included all the arts, their invention, progress, outstanding artists, and individual examples of artwork. Not only Keckermann's book but also Bacon's text were known in Germany; Bacon's plan and his call for a history of the various arts and sciences were cited by many later writers in the tradition of universal history. Best known among them is D. G. Morhof, who refers to Bacon in the introductory passages of his Polyhistor.

According to the scheme of universal history, history can treat all subjects and areas of the world (i.e., be universal), or one subject or place in particular. Under the rubric of literary history, of historia literaria, of the history of scholarship, as it was most generally understood at the time, appeared both historia philosophica and historia artificialis. Historia artificialis provided the possibility of writing a history of the arts. This meant the traditional liberal arts, the intellectual disciplines; but it included in the conception also the notion of the mechanical or, as they came ultimately to be defined, the visual arts. Eighteenth-century writers realized that the visual arts could be part of the more general discussion. Their writings may contain not only a theoretical outline of a historia artificialis, which in the words of one historian is said to contain lives of the artists, the origin, progress, invention, and loss of the arts, a tradition related to Renaissance discussions of invention. Other books in this tradition also present fairly extensive historical accounts of the visual arts, including discussions of medieval art, and of artists such as Albrecht Dürer.

The tradition of integrating a history of the visual arts into literary history continued up until the 1780s, and perhaps longer. Collections
of lives of the artists can also be counted under this rubric. As the divisions of history were defined by Martin Schmeizel, lives of the artists would be a form of singular history, a part of universal history. In similar manner, lengthy lives of painters, sculptors, architects, and engravers appeared in French publications such as those gathered by Abbé Lambert’s 1751 *Histoire litteraire* of the reign of Louis XIV. Studies of the historiography of art have long since established that a historical framework underlies the tradition of *vitae* of the artists since Vasari; conversely, works such as Lambert’s suggest that within the tradition of universal history there could be complete biographies, not merely perfunctory mentions of the arts. This point has not been recognized by historiographic scholarship to date.

Moreover, although their opinions were expressed in a somewhat stereotypical manner, many of the schemes given in universal histories followed a historical pattern similar to that employed since Vasari and modified by later writers such as G. P. Bellori. They do this even when they do not assume the Vasarian form of accumulations of artists’ lives. These histories trace a pattern of origin, rise, decline, birth, rebirth, decline, and renewal. This is the pattern Winckelmann was to adopt.

But how could this older type of philosophical or literary history, which treated the visual arts as one of many arts, develop not merely into a different kind of *histoire philosophique*, familiar in other eighteenth-century writings, but into a more specific kind of systematized history of the visual arts? One answer is that it combined history with visual material. Although Monier does not bring us to Winckelmann, we do not seem far from Johann Bernard Fischer von Erlach. When the universal scheme informs a selection of images of monuments used to illuminate history, Fischer’s *Entwurff einer Historischen Architektur* of 1721 appears. This is the first work to mention a history of architecture in its title.

II. Antiquarianism and the Early Historiography of Art

Sources for images in Fischer’s work have been traced to the antiquarian tradition in Italy, but it is equally important to trace the sources of his notion of history. It is also important to understand how comparable developments may be found in the tradition of antiquarianism in the German-speaking world, although antiquarianism is not as familiar here as it is in Italy, France, or even England. So-called antiquarian studies could involve a critique of texts and of objects, practicing both the philological and the visual approach. The distinction between
antiquarian and art-historical interests also can not be drawn as sharply. For example, the compilation of handbooks of artists’ monograms by Sigmund Apin in Altdorf or Johann Friedrich Christ in Leipzig, while resembling antiquarian endeavors, obviously contained what can be called an art-historical dimension. Christ specifically said that his compendium was meant to support the construction of a history of art.31

Significantly, these activities (not just antiquarianism, whose presence in this context has also been ignored) and the discussion of the visual arts enjoyed an active life at German universities (and gymnasia). One example among many is provided in the work of Christoff Gottlieb Schwarz, who in 1705 at Leipzig presented a dissertation on ornament in the books of the ancients dealing not only with codicology, binding, calligraphy, and covers, but also with what may be called manuscript illumination. He lectured on this subject on numerous occasions as professor in Altdorf. He was also not the first to concern himself with dissertations on the arts.32 The material in Schwarz’s dissertations is culled from Latin, Greek, and Hebrew manuscripts. He deals with the use, history, text, and images of manuscripts. His work combines textual discussion with an analysis of the visual. Since his topic is ornament, it can not be considered merely historical or literary.

The same may be said for a dissertation on a consular diptych defended in Altdorf by Gustav Philipp Negelein with Schwarz acting as praeses. Negelein’s studies also continue an earlier tradition. He relies specifically on a treatise by Christian August Salig whose title page indicates that he used the Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel for the research presented in his compendium on diptychs.33

This tradition of the study of diptychs goes back to the work of the Liège Jesuit Alexander Wilthelm in the mid-seventeenth century.34 It is incorrect to describe this supposedly antiquarian study as devoid of interest in questions of style. While the antiquarian pursuits of numismatists resemble those of the early modern connoisseur in that they were concerned with authentication, Wilthelm’s approach to ivories recalls Morelli’s famed method of connoisseurship. Morelli’s method is the approach to the attribution of works of art wherein the division of hands is based on the analysis of an artist’s treatment of significant details. Wilthelm also provides an almost Morellian image of the artistic treatment of hands holding boxes in diptychs as signs of their date.35 He uses visual particulars to date works.

When faced with a “Gothic” diptych, Wilthelm describes its style not as Gothic in the sense of the Gothic destroyers of Rome, but Gothic in the sense of the Reims cathedral, with which he compares it. He then
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compares the diptych to the Church of Saint Lambert in Liège. Analyzing what came to be called period style, Wilthelm arrives at the correct conclusion that it is a work of the same period as the church, the late thirteenth or fourteenth century. By a process that he himself describes as one of observation and visual evaluation, Wilthelm undertakes a stylistic analysis.36

Beside studies of diptychs and manuscripts, other objects that may be described as being of interest to art history include Martin Schmeizel's study on crowns, a subject discussed by other authors as well.37 Other works deal with paintings, while treatises on ancient sculpture are of such abundance that they must be left to another occasion to be examined.38 It should nevertheless be noted that several treatises on libraries and sculpture adduce modern examples; it will not do to write these off as antiquarian treatments of the past.39

A perusal of many of these works, such as that by the Wolfenbüttel gymnasium director Johann Reiske, also suggests that these essays often employ a similar combination of methods, of textual examination and response to objects, that is little different from those of the better-known Abbé Montfaucon with whom Reiske engaged in a controversy.40 Although systematic in their approach, such works often include a chronological element. In this regard, it is difficult to distinguish the antiquarian from the historical since the writing of history could also be systematic.

With treatments of individual types of objects that would later be defined as the concerns of art history we have not yet left antiquarianism to reach a distinctive history of art. But it should also be said that, even within the earlier historical and antiquarian traditions, there existed accounts of individual genres, for example, of painting, that offered chronological accounts of these genres.41 As demonstrated not only by Reiske's work but also by essays that appeared in the periodical Neue Versuche, concerns with the history of objects and media—what later became art history—also had a place here. Similarly, other treatises handled the history of painting as a background to studying privileges of painters, pointing to the connection between legal and historical studies of art.42

III. Aesthetics, Jurisprudence, and Art History

These scholarly treatises parallel the better-known art-theoretical and biographical discussions since the Renaissance of the arti del disegno, meaning painting, sculpture, and architecture that distinguish what we
call the fine or visual arts. But Winckelmann's insistence on art as an independent entity removes art from other craft traditions, placing it in its own realm. Thus, what was needed for a new history of art was not only a definition of history, but a new concept of art. Such a new definition was provided by the development of philosophical aesthetics since Baumgarten in which discourse art came to be defined as a separate realm, related to a sensuous form of knowledge.

Conceptions of art and of history are bound up in their evolution. In his little-known class lectures at Halle, the contents of which are known from a publication of 1750, Baumgarten said: "Es wird nicht undienlich sein, eine kleine Einleitung in die Geschichte der Ästhetik zu geben. Die ganze Geschichte der Maler, Bildhauer, Musikverständigen, Dichter wird hierher gehören, denn alle diese verschiedenen Teile haben ihre allgemeinen Regeln in der Ästhetik." 43

Furthermore, through the reception of writings by Abbé Batteux during the course of the eighteenth century, the visual arts were listed under the category of the fine arts. This process occurred in Germany as it did elsewhere, but in Germany the idea of fine arts was combined with that of aesthetics. In his 1765 dissertation about classical poetry, Ernst Huch specifically linked Baumgarten's idea of aesthetics with Batteux's concept of fine arts. 44 Moreover, Huch was concerned with the visual arts because, in 1773, he published a book that considered painting a liberal art. 45 Aesthetics thus also was part of the evolution of the concept of the "fine arts" and its reception in Germany. 46 Both existed before Winckelmann.

Additional definitions of art and beauty that also treat art from a historical standpoint can be found before the time of Baumgarten. They come from yet another tradition where the issue of judgment is also crucial: from legal studies and juridical treatises. They do so in several ways.

First, it seems almost a corollary to the reconsideration of law, by figures like Samuel Pufendorf in the later seventeenth century, that objects, indeed statues, were treated in reference to their legal status as legal symbols. A series of dissertations devoted to a discussion of Roland statues originated at several juridical faculties in the seventeenth century. These tracts involved an empirical examination of the objects in relation to a historical and philosophical inquiry, namely their origin and hence their role as symbols of legal guarantees. 47 These studies presented a critique of an object as a basis for historical judgment.

Beyond this critique, several juridical dissertations were also written on what was just or allowable for images. These seem to stem from the post-Reformation debate on the permissibility of images; they appear
frequently in the first years of the eighteenth century. They deal specifically with the historical circumstances in which images could be made in antiquity. They were even incorporated into systems of study.\(^\text{48}\)

The extension of the field of jurisprudence also allowed for tracts more specifically devoted to considerations of categories of art. In Jena in 1692 Hulderich Rothmaler presented a treatise *De Pictura*, which considers the art of painting, and the rights and privileges of painters.\(^\text{49}\)

Finally, a series of treatises was devoted to the judgment of what is beautiful and of the use of the senses in law. These dissertations appear to coincide in time with a newer definition of criticism as it developed in these years; this theme needs more thorough investigation.\(^\text{50}\)

**IV. History of Art in and around the German Universities before Winckelmann**

Some of these treatises originated at Altdorf. Since the Altdorf academy (Nuremberg’s university) was associated with the Nuremberg academy of artists, it is no accident that many of the interests directed toward a history of art were represented there.\(^\text{51}\) Georg Andreas Will, for example, wrote a dissertation (1742) on Baumgarten’s aesthetics, which he then later read to the Nuremberg academy. He sought to ground aesthetics in the work of his predecessors, and to demonstrate its roots in antiquity. As professor of *Schöne Wissenschaften* at Altdorf from the 1750s, Will lectured regularly on Baumgarten’s aesthetics. He also wrote and lectured on universal historical schemes, where he allowed for a history of art. He also wrote a history of the Nuremberg academy of art, as well as treatises of Nuremberg art collections.\(^\text{52}\) Although Will’s drive to systematize did not lead him to undertake more detailed analyses, it does not take much to arrive at the establishment of university chairs in art history.

Actual art-historical works were, however, undertaken by other contemporaries, both within and without the university. Five years before Winckelmann’s *Geschichte*, Friedrich August Krubsacius published his *Gedanken on the Ursprunge, Wachstum und Verfall der Verzierung*, a work that applied a critique derived from a notion of aesthetics similar to that of Winckelmann’s to a universal history of ornament. Krubsacius’s *Gedanken* clearly combined observation with the study of texts and an aesthetic prejudice, as did Winckelmann.\(^\text{53}\)

One further figure should be mentioned, J. F. Christ. In his life of Cranach, published in 1726, Christ used earlier texts and monuments
that he had actually seen. This life was conceived not as part of a series of biographies, but of what Christ elsewhere announced was to be a history of newer painting. Already in this biography Christ revealed some of his historiographic principles; he spoke of schools and he related chronological divisions in history to style. As part of his duties as professor at Leipzig, he lectured regularly on art as a part of the history of literature, and he used monuments to discuss history and also history to discuss monuments. He worked on the four popular arts, including drawing. He owned a collection and he drew himself. In his 1747 book on monograms, compiled from observation of original works, he spoke specifically about constructing a history of art based on epochs, nations, schools, and individual masters.

Christ's significance has been recognized, though not emphasized sufficiently. Not noted has been his debt to an earlier tradition. He brought together several elements that we have been considering. Anticipating Winckelmann, those include not only a concern with the history of Greek art, but an involvement with antiquarian study; an interest in universal history; literary history; and a concern with style and iconography applied directly to what Christ calls a history of art. Christ's history of art is founded on certain fundamental principles. It does not seem a big step from Christ to Winckelmann, who knew his work.

An even closer step toward Winckelmann is taken by another professor who taught on similar subjects. This is Johann Heinrich Schulze, professor of medicine, eloquence, and also, significantly, of antiquities (Altertümer) at the University of Halle. Schulze's best-known publication is probably his Anleitung zur älteren Munzwissenschaft of 1766. The continuation of Schulze's title, Worin die dazu gehörigen Schriften beurtheilet, und die Alterthümer aus Münzen erleuteret werden, gives a good indication of the construction of this work and its standard procedure of explicating antiquities from their depiction on coins. As the introduction to Schulze's book by his son explains, it also taught ("wie man eine ächte alte Münze von einer nachgemachten unterscheiden soll") how one should distinguish an authentic old coin from a copy; hence, it presented a method of connoisseurship.

The introduction to Schulze's book also notes that, although the book was published in 1766, it had been written in 1738: this was the year in which Schulze taught on the subject in Halle. While it is known that Schulze gave instruction on antiquities and especially on numismatics in Halle, the contents of his private Collegium, a class on Munz-Wissenschaft und die daraus erläuternde Griechische und Römische Alterthümer, are unknown. A rediscovered copy of an Einladungs-Schrift to
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this class allows some insights into Schulze's teaching. As might be ex-
pected, Schulze taught how one could learn about the customs of the
ancient world through its remains, of which the best sources are coins.
Before Winckelmann and the Comte de Caylus, whom modern histori-
ans sometimes credit with this breakthrough, Schulze seems to have
taught how a history of culture and of art could be read from coins and
what might be called their style. This insight into a history of the arts
was gained from the practice of connoisseurship whereby date and lo-
cation could be determined by the visual characteristics of the coins
themselves, even without reference to inscriptions. Schulze's com-
ments merit quotation at length: "Das Abnehmen der Künste zu un-
rühigen und elenden Zeiten, und wie sich solche bald wieder erholet
haben, sobald Ruhe und Friede nur in etwas hergestellet worden; be-
mercket ein jeder beym ersten Anblick von selbsten, wenn er nur die
Reihe der Kayser <br /><br />
Obung
<br /><br />
so<br /><br />
weit kommen dass man auch in Müntzen, wo kein oder wenig Schrift
mehr zu sehen aus der Bildung und den Zügen die darauf vorkommen,
die Zeit wenn sie geschlagen sey, und wohin man sie ohngefehr zu
rechnen habe ziemlich genau errathen kann [sic]."

While Schulze was not unique in offering this kind of instruction at
universities, there is a specific reason why his teaching is significant. In
1738, Johann Joachim Winckelmann attended the University of Halle. It
is known that he attended Schulze's classes. Other than his presenta-
tion of objects to the future art historian, the impact of Schulze on
Winckelmann has been underplayed. Now that we have a better idea
of what Schulze may actually have taught, we may conjecture more
about the possible effect of his teaching on Winckelmann. If Winckel-
mann attended Schulze's Collegium as well as his lectures, he must have
learned about the connection between connoisseurship, antiquarian-
ism, and art history. A comprehensive history of art history before
Winckelmann remains to be written, but Wilthelm and Schulze suggest
that in this history the importance of connoisseurship, as taught and
practiced by antiquarians in scholarly circles, may prove to be of
greater significance than has yet been recognized.

V. Conclusion

This represents one of several corrections that can already be made in
currently prevailing theses regarding Winckelmann and the origins of
the modern historiography of art. It is clearly a misstatement that ig-
nores the role of people like Christ and Schwarz to argue that before
Winckelmann the discussions of ancient art were left to nonspecialists or men of letters outside the university. Mention of specialization in this context begs the question. The change in historiography involved the disruption of the notion of universal history, the gradual disappearance of topica, which was the result of the eighteenth-century development of specialized histories. The discussion of visual art in the context of historia philosophica or literaria, as well as the combined speculation on the general and the specific concerns with objects by men like Schwarz and Christ shows this process to be going on before Winckelmann. What needs to be explained is how philosophical history was redefined as a histoire philosophique. As Schwarz and his followers in Altdorf indicate, and as Wilthelm's work suggests, style and iconography were not always treated separately. Philology and archaeology, history and antiquarianism seem, from their inceptions, to have been closely linked. Winckelmann may have advanced new conceptions; and he certainly presented the most useful and complete handbook of antique monuments yet available. But Winckelmann was widely read and certainly knew much of what has been mentioned here. His accomplishments may look rather different when viewed against those of his predecessors whose stories deserve reconsideration. Although Winckelmann enjoyed a tremendous reception, he was not alone. When, in 1782, Christian Friedrich Prange mentioned books on the history of art, Winckelmann was only one of many figures who were considered to have written on the subject, and he did not stand beyond criticism.
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