**Abstract.**

The paper describes the general condition of the unpublished papyrological items, particularly those in the Latin language, from the excavations of Dura-Europos which are currently preserved at the Beinecke Library in New Haven (CT). It provides an edition for the less damaged of them, which seems to fit the already known typologies of Latin military papyri within the Durene group.

**Unpublished Latin Papyri from Dura-Europos at the Beinecke Library**[[1]](#footnote-1)

In September 2017, while re-assessing the *corpus* of the Latin *P.Dura* in New Haven at the Beinecke Library, I was able to inspect P.CtYBR. inv. DP 121 and five boxes of almost entirely unpublished material, preserved in the premises of the Library itself. The present paper offers a general description of these items, for the perusal of future scholars; and an edition for a small selection of papyri fragments which appear to contain a significant enough amount of text (even if consisting of one or two complete words)[[2]](#footnote-2).

**1. A context.**

In his 1979 book, Hopkins has given a full account of the excavations, jointly led between 1920 and 1936 by Yale University and the French *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, on the site of the ancient town of Dura-Europos[[3]](#footnote-3). The series of the *Excavations at Dura Europos* has brought to worldwide audience all sort of priceless findings from the ancient town. What most concerns us here is the rich papyrological collection known as *P.Dura*; most of all, the section of that collection which referred to the *cohors XX Palmyrenorum* (*P.Dura* 54-145), an auxiliary unit of the Roman army which was stationed in town for more than fifty years, till the very end of the town itself (AD 256[[4]](#footnote-4)). Inside the Roman garrison in Dura, i.e. in the northern section, lay the Temple of Artemis Azzanathkona: and in 1931/1932, during the 5th archaeological campaign[[5]](#footnote-5), a great quantity of fragmentary papyri and parchments was found in room W13, a portion of the temple which bordered on the northern wall. While reinforcing the wall with ramparts in order to face the incoming Sasanian army, Romans had vacated the room, and thrown in the fill every available object, including dismissed documents which they did not feel the need of keeping; other papyri and parchments were found nearby, ‘along the fortification between the Main Gate and Tower 3 at Block E7[[6]](#footnote-6)’. They were protected from the worst effects of time and wear by the very fact that they had been covered with mud and raw materials in order to build the rampart itself. Most of the papyri and parchments found in room W13 (which constitute the greatest majority of papyri and parchments found in Dura-Europos) were in Latin language, and referred to the *cohors XX Palmyrenorum*; they have been subsequently almost all published[[7]](#footnote-7), but for a handful of tiny scraps collected in a number of boxes, now preserved in the Beinecke Library at New Haven (CT), and whose content has remained only briefly described. Very little has survived on these scraps, that can be even remotely useful to modern scholarship; yet, for the sake of completeness and clarity, and in the hope that future scholars and techniques may rise that will shed light on these leftovers, I provided an editions for the least damaged of the fragments I found in the boxes. A full account of the total number and content of the boxes will be given in the final *Appendix*.

**2. P.CtYBR. inv. DP 121**[[8]](#footnote-8).

This item consists of a box containing five to six bricks of baked mud, one of which (ca. 10x7 cm) presents layers of small papyrus fragments attached to its surface, and some writing on them. No clue is given in the box on the origin of this piece of evidence; a passage in Hopkins’ report on the excavations in Dura, however, probably reveals where these bricks came from. While describing the deplorable condition in which the first papyri were found – they immediately turned to dust if touched – Hopkins adds that ‘we had stumbled upon a room of stored documents, for there was no sign of box or bag, only documents gathered in packages. We tried to cut out small sections; the slightest movement shattered the entire segment. The immediate transformation was not even into dust – just powder. In desperation we cut out a brick-sized piece, sealed it in paraffin, and sent it back to Yale. All was futile: a dark powdery dust arrived’[[9]](#footnote-9). Aside from the results of this operation, it seems that Hopkins and his colleagues tried, before Dave Clark was able to retrieve the papyri and parchments in a less damaging way[[10]](#footnote-10), to cut mixed sections of papyri and other material, and send them to Yale. Not all of these sections turned to powder when they got to New Haven. C.B. Welles notes that while excavating Tower 3 and the Temple of Artemis Azzanathkona, Hopkins and his colleagues brought to light

rotted fragments of papyrus stuck together in layers so as to form little packets. Since it proved impossible to separate the layers or read anything more than an occasional letter, the excavator, Professor Clark Hopkins, had the fragments and the surrounding dirt packed in waxed cloth and returned to Yale at the end of the season. One of these packages, of about the size of an unbaked brick, was opened, but nothing could be made of the contents. The remaining three were left unexamined until this last summer, when I opened them and sorted out the papyri. […] It has continued to prove impossible to separate the layers, since the slightest pressure of a knife-blade causes the substance to crumble. Traces of writing are visible in a very few places, but actual letters can be made out only in part of one face of the largest packet. There, four layers of papyrus, receding shingle-fashion up to the left, show a neat, tiny Latin script very similar to that of P Dura 98 (ca. A.D. 218) and of P Dura 115 (A.D. 232). The original document was a roster. In one place the name,

Seleuc[

can be made out, in another the ends of names in the nominative

]us

]ianus[[11]](#footnote-11).

The description seems perfectly to match the bricks preserved in the box. I find no trace of the *Seleuc*[ Welles saw, but the sequence ]*us* and ]*ianus* I think I can detect in the largest written brick, which probably coincides with the brick described by Welles in 1965 as containing four layers of papyrus.

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| Complete view of the content of Box 1. The four layers of papyrus can be seen here |
|  |
| Enlarged view of the four layers. The most visible, and that described by Welles as containing ]*us* and ]*ianus*, is probably that pointed out by the arrow |

All the layers appear to have been written by the same hand, a bureaucratic Roman ancient cursive[[12]](#footnote-12), and Welles is right in pointing out parallels in *P.Dura* 98[[13]](#footnote-13) and 115[[14]](#footnote-14), as well as in thinking of a roster[[15]](#footnote-15). One might further date the scrap(s) between AD 200 and 230 ca. The reciprocal positon of the layers – each of which probably represents a separate fragment from the original document – within the roster itself is unfathomable. The layer to the right is apparently the best preserved. What follows is an attempt at a critical edition of that layer. The ]*us* described by Welles is probably to be interpreted as *or*, and to correspond to l. 2 of the fragment.

]n ̣[

] ̣cor

] ̣ ̣iaṇus

]no coṣ

**1** perhaps *i* || **2** before *c*, an oblique stroke, pointing downwards, connected to the upper portion of *c*, perhaps *a* or *r* | *c* might also be *p* || **3** uncertain traces, perhaps before *i* an *u*

**3. Other items.**

1. P.CtYBR. inv. DP 23 fr. *a* (11.5x23.7 cm)

Written in epistolary cursive[[16]](#footnote-16), perhaps from a letter. Fibres are torn and ridden with holes, and ink has almost everywhere completely vanished there is no way to identify margins. The same holds for the following fragment. The word *uexill*(*arius*) (?) ‘ensign-bearer’ is probably to be seen in l. 9. So little has survived, that the possible date of composition must be roughly equivalent to the maximum chronological fork one has for Durene Latin papyri, i.e. between AD 200 and 256. The same holds for the following frr. *b* and *h*.

- - -

] ̣ ̣[ ̣ ̣] ̣[ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣]mas [

] ̣ ̣[ ̣ ̣] ̣ạ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣[

] ̣ ̣[ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣] ̣ ̣[

] ̣[ ̣]mil[ ̣ ̣] ̣s[ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣] ̣[

]e ̣ ̣di ̣[ 5

] ̣ ̣uba ̣[

] ̣[ ̣ ̣] ̣ ̣[

] ̣eb ̣ ̣ ̣[ ̣ ̣] ̣[

] uexill ̣ ̣e ̣ ̣[

- - -

**1** above this line, traces in a different ink, ending with *̣o*̣ ̣: perhaps the remnants of an *accepta*-formula (… *c̣ọṣ*)? || **2** before *a*, perhaps *i* or *l* || **4** perhaps ]*ẹs*[ || **5** *n* or *r* | *e* or *s* | an oblique stroke, pointing upwards || **6** ] ̣ ̣ two oblique strokes, pointing upwards | an oblique stroke pointing upwards, perhaps *s* || **7** perhaps *s* | *e, i* or *s* | *m* or *n* || **8** after *b*, an oblique stroke pointing upwards || **9** perhaps *o* | perhaps *s* | *e* is in ligature with a long oblique stroke, pointing upwards: *i* or *s* | an elliptical stroke, slightly elevated from the baseline; perhaps *c*

2. P.CtYBR. inv. DP 23 fr. *b* (3x8.5 cm)

- - -

̣ ̣[

e ̣[

n[

sin[

̣ ̣ ̣[ 5

**1** two oblique strokes, pointing upwards || **2** uncertain traces || **5** uncertain traces, the first *a* or *r*

3. P.CtYBR. inv. DP 23 fr. *h* (11.5x10.5 cm)

The fragment seems drawn up in a bureaucratic script; the word *sing* for *singularis*, a pay grade of Roman army, can be spotted; it is followed by an *interpunctum*. Perhaps a list of soldiers was included in the original document.

- - -

] ̣ ̣[

s]ing· ̣[ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣]aris[

] Iul[

]l[

- - -

**1** oblique strokes, pointing upwards and in ligature: *a, r, s* are possible || **2** perhaps *i*

**2** *fortasse* s]ing(ularis) I [

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Fr. *a* | Fr. *b* |
|  |  |
|  | |
| Fr. *h* | |

4. P.CtYBR. inv. DP 16 fr. *2 recto*

The fragment probably comes from a roster, either partial or complete. The script can be dated between AD 200 and 230 ca. The same holds for the following two scraps. The names preserved on the three fragments from DP 16 are very common among Durene soldiers: Salmanes[[17]](#footnote-17), Monimus[[18]](#footnote-18), and Aurelius Antonius or Antoninus[[19]](#footnote-19). Also a consular date (AD 212) emerges from fr. *3 recto.*

- - -

] ̣ ̣[ ̣] ̣ ̣ ̣[

] Ṣalmanes M[

Mo]nimụ[s

- - -

**2**  ̣ ̣[ perhaps *s* and then a circle: *b, o,* or *u*

5. P.CtYBR. inv. DP 16 fr. *3 recto*

- - -

]ẹṃ[

] ̣ ̣[ ̣] ̣

] duobus A[spris cos

] o[

] ̣ ̣[ 5

- - -

**2** ] ̣ perhaps *a* or *r*

6. P.CtYBR. inv. DP 16 fr. *1 verso*

- - -

Aur]el An[toni-

] ̣eus ̣ ̣ ̣[

] ̣[

- - -

**2** ] ̣ a long stroke in ligature with the top of the forked *e* | uncertain traces

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Frr. *2 recto, 3 recto* |
|  | Fr. *1 verso* |

7. P.CtYBR. inv. s.n. (box 3 folder 1)

A small fragment in epistolary cursive, probably mentioning Valerius Comazon; this, and similarities in the hand (particularly with *c, o* and *r* when in ligature), suggest a comparison with *P.Dura* 55[[20]](#footnote-20). The scrap might well have been written by the same hand of that who wrote *P.Dura* 55, or come from the group of scraps pertaining to that papyrus. The script can be dated between AD 200 and 230 ca.

- - -

Val]eri Com[azontis

]pli ̣[

- - -

**2** *c*, less likely *l*

**2** *fortasse* du]plic̣[ari-

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *P.Dura* 55 |
|  |  |
|  | *fr.* ***b***  - - -  [ ̣ ̣ ̣] ̣em Valeri C[o]mazonti[s ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣]  [a]ụctori**tate** **sacra** de ̣[ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣]  ṭe sin**e** **mora· comm**iliṭ[ones in castra]  sua inducere et de cetero [curare]  ut ex disciplina ag̣ạ[nt.] |

8. P.CtYBR. inv. s.n. (box 3 folder 2)

Another small fragment in epistolary cursive, which closely recalls the hand in *P.Dura* 60[[21]](#footnote-21): notice the ligature *um* and the artificial lengthening of final *m*. The script can be dated between AD 200 and 230 ca.

- - -

] ̣atur

]m

- - -

**1** the right portion of an oblique stroke, pointing upwards, in ligature with *a*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *P.Dura* 60 |
|  |  |
|  | *Letter* ***A*** *(= fr. a col. I)*.  - - -  ]m eorum  - - - |

9. P.CtYBR. inv. s.n. (box 3 folder 3)

The scrap contains a mention of *duplicarii* and probably comes from *acta diurna*[[22]](#footnote-22). The script can be dated between AD 200 and 230 ca. It is unclear whether the figure ]*VI* belongs to the same line of *dupl*: it may also be possible that there is no actual lacuna between *dupl* and the figure.

- - -

] dupl [ ̣ ̣ ̣]VI [ ̣ ̣ ̣] ̣[

- - -

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | |
| Notice the similarities with the word *dupl* and the figure *VII* in *P.Dura* 82, col. I l. 9[[23]](#footnote-23) |  |

10. P.CtYBR. inv. s.n. (box 3 folder 4 fr. 1)

A small scrap containing a figure and, perhaps, the inferior margin of a document. The particularly long second stroke of *l* might suggests the papyrus to have been drawn up in the early 3rd AD, but there is no real certainty.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| - - -  L[ ̣ ̣]XVI |  |

11. P.CtYBR. inv. s.n. (box 3 folder 4 fr. 2).

The scrap is written in a seemingly neat bureaucratic cursive. The script can be dated between AD 200 and 230 ca.

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| - - -  ]be[ ̣]e ̣ ̣ ̣i ex[  - - -  traces after *e* might be of *a, r, s, t* |

12. P.CtYBR. inv. s.n. (box 3 folder 5 fr. 4) (2.2x1.9 cm)

A small scrap in epistolary cursive, perhaps mentioning *eq*(*uites*). The script can be dated between AD 200 and 230 ca.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Fr. *4* →  - - -  ] ̣eq[  ]orum[  - - -  **1** thick speck of ink |  |

13. P.CtYBR. inv. s.n. (box 3 folder 6 fr. 3) (3.2x2.7 cm)

A small scrap in epistolary cursive; the verb *retinui* (l. 2) suggests that the original document might have been a letter. The *n* is drawn in two strokes. The script, which closely recalls the hand in *P.Dura* 60, particularly in the ligature *ui* and final *m* (l. 1), can be dated between AD 200 and 230 ca.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Fr. *3* →  - - -  ]ṛụm  ] ̣ retinui [  ] ̣ ̣ ̣[  - - -  **2** perhaps *s* | after *retinui*, perhaps the right margin || **3** uncertain traces |  |

14. P.CtYBR. inv. s.n. (box 3 folder 6 fr. 4) (4.2x2.3 cm)

A small scrap, written in epistolary cursive which closely recalls the hand in *P.Dura* 55, particularly in the ligature *as* and *l*, which still features quite an elongated second stroke. The script can be dated between AD 200 and 230 ca. The document mentions two names, Malcus – i.e. Malchus[[24]](#footnote-24) – and perhaps Maximus. They were probably required for a specific errand, or sent for by a commanding officer. The situation might be similar to that featured in *P.Dura* 63, where Themarsas and Hiereus are summoned in an official letter to the tribune of the cohort (letter *b*, ll. 4-5)[[25]](#footnote-25).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Fr. *4* →  - - -  ] Ṃalc̣um et Ṃax[im-  ] ̣eras [  - - -  **2** *i* or *l* |  |

15.P.CtYBR. inv. s.n. (box 3 folder 6 fr. 10)

Three fragments, *a* (3x10 cm) *b* (3.2x5) and *c* (3.2x3.5 cm), all coming from the same document, most likely a roster; more specifically, from the left portion of a single column. Horizontal lines, as expected, mark all the names, none of which is extant in its entirety. Only the toponym ‘Becchufrayn[[26]](#footnote-26)’ is actually legible in fr. *c*, l. 1. Frr. *a* and *b* probably were a portion from the same column: the distance between them is, however, uncertain. Likewise, the color of the fibres suggests that fr. *c* fragment was not very far from *a*+*b* in the original roll – at what distance, one cannot gather. Little can be said of the main hand; nevertheless, the hand which drew the marginal note *becchuf*[ in fr. c, l. 1 can be compared to informal hands responsible for marginal annotations in other rosters, such as *P.Dura* 100 and 101 (see the table below[[27]](#footnote-27)).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Fr. *10 a+b* →  - - -  [  [  [  A[  Si[ 5  A[  A[  Pl[  - - -[[28]](#footnote-28)  G[  Au[rel 10  - - - |  |
| Fr. *10c* →  - - -  Becchu[f  [  [  - - - |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | from *P.Dura* 100, col. XXXI l. 1. Notice the similarity between the *b* in fr. 10*c* and the *b* here (a small oval, then a serpentine-like stroke), the ligatures *ec* and *hu* |
|  | from *P.Dura* 101, col. XLI l. 19 (mistakenly written with only one *c*). The ligature *hu* is quite similar to the preceding ones; *b*, on the other hand, is drawn differently |

16. P.CtYBR. inv. s.n. (box 3 folder 7 fr. 1) (1.8x22 cm)

The typology of the document from which fr. 1 is taken is not easy to detect. The fragment contains names of soldiers (ll. 2, with the termination ]*hi* of the genitive for the patronymic; 5; 8); figures associated, probably with them (ll. 3; 4); perhaps a reference to a centurion (l. 1 *prior*[[[29]](#footnote-29)). One finds similarities with guard rosters[[30]](#footnote-30), such as *P.Dura* 106[[31]](#footnote-31), 107[[32]](#footnote-32) and 108[[33]](#footnote-33), where names of soldiers are in fact associated with figures – to no fathomable purpose – and the centuries to which the soldiers belong are duly noted. Between ll. 9 and 16, one can see a large blank space. The script can be dated to a later stage of Roman presence in Dura, i.e. AD 220-256 ca.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Fr. *1*[[34]](#footnote-34) →  - - -  ] prior[  ]hi Ael[  ] ̣II ̣ ̣ ̣[  ] ̣II A ̣[  ] ̣ Iadiḅẹ[l- 5  ] ̣ḍo ̣[  ]fe ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣[  ]us Mal[ch-  ]e ̣ ̣o ̣[  10  15  ] ̣[  ]adm[  **3** before *II*, two oblique strokes, one pointing upwards, the other downwards, as if in the right portion of *k*. perhaps right edge of *e* | faint traces of three oblique strokes, pointing upwards: the first one might be *i* or *l* || **4** same traces as in the beginning of l. 3 | *b, d,* less likely *u* || **5** small circle at the top of the writing line || **6** an oblique stroke, pointing upwards || **7** *r* or *s* | *ạụṛẹ*[*l* ? || **9** *rio* or *tio* or *apo* or *no* | bottom of an oblique stroke, pointing upwards || **10** speck of ink |  |
|  |

17. P.CtYBR. inv. s.n. (box 3 folder 7 fr. 8) (4.5x2.2 cm)

The writing seems here rather bureaucratic, but different from that normally found in rosters and military lists, and more coherent with *acta diurna*. It can be compared to hands in other morning reports, such as *P.Dura* 82 and 89: cfr. in particular the word *a]urel* in l. 1. The script can be dated roughly to AD 220-256 ca.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Fr. *8* ↓  - - -  A]urel ̣[  ] ̣eus P[  - - -  **1** *m* or *n* || **2** an oblique stroke, pointing upwards |  |

Giulio Iovine Università di Napoli ‘Federico II’

[giulio.iovine@unina.it](mailto:giulio.iovine@unina.it) Dipartimento di Studi Umanistici

Via Porta di Massa 1 – 80133 Napoli (NA)

**Appendix.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **BOX 1** | This box contains several badly preserved scraps, all in Greek language, and to be linked therefore to Greek papyri among the Durene collection. |  |
| **BOX 2** | This box contains **eight** folders, each assigned to a specific DP number, linking the scraps with other published items in the Beinecke (e.g. DP 3, 13, 58…)[[35]](#footnote-35). The scraps in the folders are remarkably small, blank for the vast majority, and yield but little information. Here and in the folders of subsequent boxes I have put numbers and letters by pencil to identify fragments, should anybody see them in the future. |  |
|  | (1) P.CtYBR. inv. DP **21** | Almost no visible traces, and the hand is not the same as that of *P.Dura* 74. |
|  | (2) P.CtYBR. inv. DP **49** | 4 small scraps: *a* (2x4.2 cm), *b* (2.7x4.3 cm), *c* (1x1 cm), *d* (1.2x1.2 cm), all presenting a few traces. The first of them, fr. *a*, may be Greek. |
|  | (3) P.CtYBR. inv. DP **100** | Several scraps, all blank. |
|  | (4) P.CtYBR. inv. DP **8** | Several scraps, probably not belonging to *P.Dura* 56; almost nothing can be read on them. |
|  | (5) P.CtYBR. inv. DP **3** | A single fragment where a few fragmentary lines can be read, perhaps in Greek. No clue is provided about its belonging to *P.Dura* 82 or 97. |
|  | (6) P.CtYBR. inv. DP **58** | 4 scraps with minimal traces of writing. |
|  | (7) P.CtYBR. inv. DP **23** | 11 scraps (*a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, i, j, k*) with very faint traces of ink. No clue is given about their belonging to *P.Dura* 65. The most relevant (*a, b, h*) are published here. |
|  | (8) P.CtYBR. inv. DP **16** | 58 scraps, most of which are blank; those which still bear traces of writing are all written in a bureaucratic script and most likely contained a list of names with consular dates; they are written both on the *recto* and the *verso*, which most likely formed two separate documents. This all matches with the papyrus they supposedly refer to, *P.Dura* 67 (*verso*) and 102 (*recto*). Frr. *4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 21* on the *recto* clearly feature the typical apparatus of rosters, including horizontal lines, black dots and marginal notations; in fr. 20 a *theta nigrum* can be clearly seen. Frr. *2 recto*, *3 recto* and *1 verso* are published here. |
| **BOX 3** | This box contains **seven** folders. |  |
|  | Folder 1 | A handful of scraps in epistolary cursive. One scrap is published here. |
|  | Folder 2 | Likewise. One scrap is published here. |
|  | Folder 3 | Several scraps still attached one to another in layers, and in a number of scripts, mainly bureaucratic. Three fragments are published here. |
|  | Folder 4 | Divided in 4 sub-folders, only two of them offering Latin scraps. The former presents badly preserved fragments in a large epistolary cursive; the latter presents a seemingly neat bureaucratic script. Two of the scraps in this sub-folder are published here. |
|  | Folder 5 | Divided in 4 sub-folders; numbers 2, 3 and 4 host a few badly preserved or blank scraps; in sub-folder 1 there are scraps written in epistolary cursive. One of them (fr. 4) is published here. |
|  | Folder 6 | By far the richest of the box, preserving more than one hundred scraps; in fact, less than twelve provide some significant sequence of letters or recognizable layout. I have provided the most legible scraps with numbers. A selection of the most relevant is published here. |
|  | Folder 7 | Almost as rich as the previous one. I have divided it in two subfolders. Number 1 contains those fragments I have given a number to, two of which are published here; number 2 for blanks scraps and desperate cases. |
| **BOX 4** | This box contains archaeological material, including a leather fragment which is, in fact, already published under the name of *P.Dura* 131[[36]](#footnote-36). |  |
| **BOX 5** | Like BOX 1, this box contains several small scraps in the Greek language, all unpublished. |  |
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11. C.B. Welles, ‘An Additional Note on the Dura Papyri’, *BASP* 3, 1965, p. 28. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
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32. AD 240-241, TM 44839. [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
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