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Abstract: The purpose of this paper is to demonstrate the widespread diffusion of Sinopean wine and its importance as evidence for economic and social exchange in Thrace during Roman and Late Roman times. The study analyses, through using *amphorae* as key-evidence, the phenomena that controlled trading networks and long-distance maritime routes in particular, since these would have been conditioned by political and economic evolutions. Evidence from various sources has been used in order to map what we know about the distribution of Sinopean wine, in particular in two specific regions within the Roman Empire: the western coast of the Black Sea and the Lower Danube territory. After analysing some regional contexts, a wider view on distribution patterns is considered. The analysed deposits indicate the significant role that the Thracian market played for the Sinopean wine trade. Thrace seems to be part of a broader mechanism that included also the territories along the Lower Danube.
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INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to demonstrate the widespread diffusion of Sinopean wine and its importance as evidence for economic and social exchange in Thrace during Roman and Late Roman times. Although some recent studies treat the presence of Pontic wine in Mediterranean sites, we are still far from outlining a comprehensive model that would explain the usual patterns existing in Antiquity.

This investigation will analyse, through using *amphorae* as key-evidence, the phenomena that controlled trading networks and long-distance maritime routes in particular, since these would have been conditioned by political and economic evolution. In the first part of this study will be considered three groups of *amphorae* that were used to transport Sinopean wine from the mid-1st century BC to the early 6th century AD. Following on, evidence from various sources will be used in order to map what we know about the distribution of Sinopean wine, particularly in two specific regions within the Roman Empire: the western coast of the Black Sea and the Lower Danube territory. After analysing the regional contexts, a wider view on distribution patterns will be considered.

THE ROLE OF SINOPLE WITHIN THE PONTIC TRADING NETWORKS

The diversity of cultures and available resources along the coasts of the Black Sea provided strong incentive for exchange. One of the main commodities had to be wine, as proved by the big quantity of wine *amphorae* found during archaeological excavations or kept in the local
museum collections. In this wide-ranging context Sinope assumed a strategic role, inasmuch it owned a territory that was especially favourable for viticulture, whereby it was associated with an important production activity during the Classical period. The prosperity of Sinope in Antiquity came certainly from its favourable location on the northern Anatolic coast. Situated on a promontory that is cut off from mainland Anatolia by the forbidding Pontic Mountains, the city benefitted from moderate weather conditions, while its two harbours offered a safe position for the ships that were sailing in the Black Sea, famous to be quite a difficult sea because of its many surface currents. Since the trade was dependent on the currents, it followed a coastal navigation along the eastern and western Black Sea coast, or a road going from Sinope directly to the Crimea. Sinope, being established in the middle of the southern coast, enjoyed an excellent location since it was founded at the crossroad of Pontic trade routes and it had the only safe harbour on the southern Black Sea coast (de Boer 2006, 39-40). One of the main economic resources for the city was related to the sphere of agriculture and fishing, well documented by the literary sources (Strab. 12.3.11-12). According to Strabo, there were many olive-trees in the vicinity and also intensive tuna fishing was practiced. Already in Classical and Hellenistic times Sinope developed an important amphorae production, traditionally considered to be a demonstration of a flourishing viticulture and wine-making, as well as olive oil production.

**Sinopean amphora production in Roman times**

Since the middle of the 1st century BC and until the mid-/end of the 1st century AD on the southern coast of the Black Sea started an amphorae production activity which manufactured copies of the famous Koan containers in order to face the local demand of wine commercialisation. The pseudo-Koan amphorae of Sinopean production are distinguished by the typical bifid handles, the cylindrical neck, the rounded shoulders, and the slender body that ends in a cylindrical or troncoconical toe. The amphora type amounts to 14-15 lt of capacity (fig. 1). These morphological features are also common to the amphorae manufactured at Heraclea Pontica, another important production centre located on the southern coast of the Pontus Euxinus. In order to recognize the two productions, it is necessary to take a closer look at their fabric. In the case of Sinope, the fabric is hard and the colour ranges from light grey to yellow-greenish; there is an orange-to red-coloured surface, which appears coarse-grained on touch. The inclusions of pyroxene in the fabric show one of the typical elements that characterise all Sinopean productions, but are not an exclusive resource of its territory. The so-called ‘black sand’ seems to be common along the entire coast of the southern Black Sea, as well as to part of its eastern one, suggesting also other manufacture centres.

During the 2nd century AD in the bay of Demirci, 15 km south of Sinope, amphora production was established. The excavated area shows kilns that manufactured series of amphorae types, in use till the 6th century AD (Kassab Tezgör 2010). The most typical amphora of the 2nd and the 3rd centuries AD presents a barrelled rim and a cylindrical neck signed before firing by one or two incised lines on it. The body has a pear-shaped profile that ends in a little conical toe. Based on the

1 The type is also known as Dressel 2-4 of Eastern production; Dressel 5; Vnukov Sin III; Black Sea pseudo-Koan; Zeest 61, 62b; Popilian I; Brukner 6; Opaiţ 1987 type IV, see Dobreva 2017.
2 The production centre lies 12 km south of Ereğli (Turkey), see Внуков 1993; Arsen’eva et al. 1997, 191, fig. 1.
Dominique Kassab-Tezgör isolates three variants that differ mainly by the form of the neck and the shoulder (B Snp I-II-III). To the different variants occur diverse dimensional models, while the average capacity of the form could reach 70 lt (fig. 2). The fabric of the amphorae manufactured at Demirci varies in colour from rose to light orange and beige, rich in pyroxene, which presents as small black inclusions (Erten et al. 2004, 103-104).

Another group of Sinopean amphorae includes a repertoire of types that precede and identify the so-called ‘carrot-form’ amphora. The shape is very common for the Black Sea coast and appears variably classified in the existing literature (Zeest 100; Sazanov 12, 14; Delakeu type; Rădulescu 9; Scorpan XVII-R; Opaţ 1980, type IX; Opaţ 1991, type E I-a, b, d; Böttger I-6; Kuzmanov X, XI; Antonova III; Bjelajac XXIII; Brukner 19; Zemer 40, see Dobreva 2017). All subtypes of the group are characterised by a cylindrical rim with the top and the exterior having wide grooves, conical body evolving from a bulkier to a slimmer ‘carrot’ shape. The vessel ends in a conical base. The fabric varies from orange-red to light red and is very rich in pyroxene, visible on the surface of the neck and of the handles. These black inclusions are more infrequently on the shoulder and on the body. The archaeological investigations at Demirci confirmed their production from the beginning of the 4th to the early 6th century AD and allow recognising three types C Snp I-II-III that differ mainly by the shape of the rim and the neck and concur to three dimensional models (fig. 3). Their capacity ranges between 6 and 36 lt (Kassab Tezgör 2010, 127-131, 139).

For all of the three groups of amphorae it is generally accepted that they transported wine, a hypothesis mainly based on their formal characteristics and traditions, as well as on some pitched examples discovered at Sinope (Kassab Tezgör et al. 2003, 177; 2010, 127, note 39).

Regional contexts

In order to examine the distribution patterns of Sinopean wine in the Black Sea, regional studies have been taken into consideration. Sample
distribution maps of Sinopean *amphorae* (figs. 4-6) in the western Black Sea coast zone, together with the Lower Danube territory have been put together using published and unpublished materials, in order to demonstrate transportation trends. Tracing networks in these regions is strongly conditioned by the presence of two important communication routes: the Danube River and the Black Sea, which often integrate one another.

By necessity, for the two regions chosen similar statistical approaches have been used and can effectively be employed to ask different questions, and broad comparisons of their conclusions can be attempted.

**The western Black Sea coast**

The distribution map of the western Black Sea coast region has been put together using an extensive study of *amphora* finds discovered during regular and rescue excavations in some sites, chosen as case studies for this research. As a result, we can date to the late 1st century BC the earliest presence of Sinopean imports in the western Pontic zone, as proved

---

*Fig. 2. Mid-Roman Sinopean *amphorae*: 1 B Snp II; 2 B Snp III (Kassab Tezgör 2010, Pl. 15, 2b and 4); 3-4 Knossos 26-27 (Hayes 1983, fig. 24, 67-68); 5 Anchialos. *Amphora* of Sinopean production (photo by the author, courtesy of Burgas Archaeological Museum)*
by some pseudo-Koan amphorae found at Histria (Suceveanu 1982, 104, pl. 10)\(^7\), Bizone, Kaliakra (Кузманов / Салкин 1992, 31-32, табл. II, кат. № 23-26)\(^8\) and Odessos (Лазаров 1973, 43-44, табл. ХХIV, 201). From the coast, Sinopean wine had an easy access to inland Thrace through the Tonzos River reaching Kabyle (Dyczek 2001, 59) (fig. 4).

From the middle of the 1st century AD the pseudo-Koan containers are registered in big quantities in the late Scythian settlements of the Crimea. In other parts of the northern Pontic coast Sinopean imports appear mainly between the 1st and the 2nd century AD\(^9\). In the same period this amphora type is known also at Tanais, on the right bank of the Don River, and at Apsaros, an important urban site located on the eastern coast (Дашевская 1991, 20, табл. 29/3-10, 31/1-5; Крапивина 1993, 96, фиг. 29/27-29; Асеньева et al. 1997, 189).

The remarkable presence of light fabric amphora types Šelov A and B in funerary contexts in Thrace (in Odessos and in Kabyle) make us presume that from the middle and late 1st century AD the supremacy of the Sinopean wine would have been rivalled only by that originating from Heraclea Pontica\(^10\).

During Middle Imperial ages the presence of Pontic amphorae continues to be constant, as revealed by Odessos contexts where,
among the Pontic productions, are attested *amphorae* B Snp I, II and III (Кузманов 1985, 13, тип VI, # A 37-38). The wine of Sinope seems to have reached other towns along the western coast, like Histria, Tomis, Kallatis, Bizone, Tirizis-Kaliakra11, Anchialos12 and Deultum13, as well as inland Thrace, in Abritus14 (fig. 5).

The commercialisation of these *amphorae* involves mainly the southern coast of Pontus, as demonstrated by the evidence in Demirci and Sinope, and in almost all museum collections of the Turkish coast (Kassab Tezgör / Tatlican 1998, 424, fig. 5; Kassab Tezgör 2010, 125-127, Pl. 15, 1-4, nt. 28). They are also present in the main settlements along the eastern coast (at Gudava)15; on the northern seaboard (at Olbia)16, and on the Crimea (Chersonesos, Kimmerikon, Myrmekion, Pantikapaion)17, as well as on the Taman peninsula (Gorgippia) and on the Lower Don (Tanais)18.

Between the end of the 2nd and the first half of the 3rd century AD the distribution of the Sinope wine passed the borders of the Black Sea and reached the Eastern Mediterranean (at Knossos and Gortyn, Paphos19). From the Sinopean products are registered also in Sexaginta Prista (Dobreva 2011, fig. 6). Their diffusion involves almost all main cities along the coast and is also registered in the coastal cities of the southern20, as well as the eastern21 and northern seaboard, including the settlements of the Chernyakhov culture (at Olbia, Tyras, Chersonesos, Pantikapaion, Gorgippia, Dalakeu) and the Lower Don (at Tanais)22. This *amphora* shape became very popular and was widely imitated in the Bosporian region and probably along the eastern coast.

The peak of the imports of Sinopean *amphorae* in the Mediterranean was during the 5th century AD, a period when the city was extremely active not only on the western and northern Black Sea coasts, but also in the Aegean and Mediterranean in general. Recently *amphorae* of the C Snp group have been recognised at Athens23, Ephesus24 and Limyra25 and also in some sites of Northern Italy: at Treviso, Verona26 and Padua27. In the same period Sinopean trade expanded, reaching even the Atlantic coasts, as reveals an *amphora* found in a 5th century deposit at Troia (in Portugal)28.

**The Lower Danube territory**

Moving to the Lower Danube, significant is the case of Novae where the presence of pseudo-Koan containers is remarkable, although exceeded by the Pontic productions, mostly represented by the *amphora* type Šelov A. The analysed contexts from Novae exemplify in an excellent way the situation in the territories along the Lower Danube, where the Sinopean products are registered also in Sexaginta Prista (Dobreva 2017). Except for Novae and Sexaginta Prista, evidence of south Pontic

14 In 2nd and 3rd century contexts, see Preschev 2008, 302, fig. 15. Three other examples are now kept in the storerooms of Burgas Archaeological Museum and in the Municipality Museum of Pomorie. Special thanks go to Dr. K. Gospodinov, Dr. M. Gjuzelev and Assoc. Prof. S. Torbatov for granting me permission to use these materials.
15 The *amphorae* are residual, being recovered in layers dated to the end of 4th and 5th century AD, see Dobrev 2017.
16 The container was found in a 6th century deposit, see Кузманов 1985, 13, бел. 21.
18 For Kassab Tezgör et al. 2007, 200-201, ## 1-6, fig. 10-14, 33-35.
19 Dated to the 4th century AD – see Крапивина 1993, 98.
21 For Knossos see Hayes 1983, 151, fig. 24, A 67-70; for Gortyn – Portale / Romeo 2001, 296-297, tav. LVXXVII, № 12-13. The *amphora* from Berytus comes from an early 3rd century context (Reynolds 2011, fig. 2e).
22 For Demirci and Sinope: Garlan / Kassab Tezgör 1996, 326, 331, fig. 9; Kassab Tezgör 1996, 349; Kassab Tezgör 2010, 128-129, Pl. 16/1-6, 18/1, 3-4.
23 Kassab Tezgör et al. 2007, 202-204, ## 7-9, 11, 13-19 (for Gudava) and ## 10, 12, 16-17 (for Ilor), figs. 15-27, 36-39.
24 Zeest 1960, 120, tabl. XXXIX, тип 100; Крапивина 1993, 98, tabl. 31/4-6; Sazanov 1997, 90, fig. 1/12; Krapivina 2010, 408-409, pl. 303-305, L-381-387; Kassab Tezgör et al. 2003, 177, notes 48-49.
26 Bezeczky 2013, 176-177, pl. 36, 83, ## 402-403 and pl. 48, 93, # 626.
27 Zeest 2014, fig. 6 and Bes 2015, fig. 7.
29 Pers. comm. Ines Vaz Pinto.
imports is traceable in the castra of Oescus and Dimum (Dyczek 2001, 59), in the area between the Danube Delta and the Black Sea and in the provinces of Dacia29 (fig. 4).

In the Middle Imperial deposits of the Lower Danube territory, the Pontic amphorae are attested almost as much as the Aegean and the Asia Minor imports. At novae, in 2nd and 3rd century levels, half of the containers can be referred to the B Snp type. In those at Sexaginta Prista the wine amphorae originating from Sinope represent 22% of the total, compared with 15% for the Aegean ones. The significant presence of the wine amphora Kapitän II in these sites, attested with over 14%, is probably connected to the military supply of the troops stationed along the Danube limes (Dobreva 2017). The stratigraphy of the castra located along the Middle Danube and its tributaries 30, and the ones situated on the limes Transalutanus, just as inland Dacia, confirms this hypothesis (negru et al. 2003, 213).

Despite the competition with Aegean wine, the products of Sinope seem, however, to have played a considerable role in the markets of the Lower Danube castra31. The finds of B Snp amphora type are also reported in the area between the Danube Delta and the Pontic coast32. The distribution of Sinopean wine also reached the Middle Danube territories, as confirmed by the evidence found in Pannonia33, Upper Moesia34 and in some sites of Dacia35 (fig. 5).

During Late Antiquity the status of the Pontic wine was threatened by the extra-regional imports, particularly from the Syro-Palestine territory, as attested in the contexts of the military camp of Trimammium36.

The supremacy of Sinopean wine, recorded by the plenty of finds of amphorae group C in many settlements of the Lower Danube in

---

Fig. 4. Distribution map of pseudo-Koan amphorae between the late 1st century BC and the early 2nd century AD

29 At Troesmis, Peceneaga, Barboşi, Noviodunum, Aegyssus, Halmyris, see Paraschiv 2006, 79, notes 23-24; Sanie 1981, 130-131, pl. 31/8; Sanie 1992, 71-80, pl. I-VI; Baumann 1995, 237, pl. XIV/14; Opaş 1987, type V, 151-153, fig. 5, 6-10.

30 About the regular military wine supply in Pannonia in the period between the middle of the 2nd and the third quarter of the 3rd century AD, see Magyar-Hárshegyi 2016, 630.

31 At Arrubium and Troesmis in 2nd-3rd century AD levels (Paraschiv 2006, 25), Sucidava (Popilian 1974, 142-143, pl. 2, 1), Tropaeum Traiani (Dyczek 2001, 241, fig. 160), Oescus (Καβάκη της 2000, 183, kat. # 55), Iatrus (Conrad 2007, 256, 263, Abb. 54), Novae, Trimanium and Sexaginta Prista (Dobreva 2017).

32 At Halmyris, Argamum, Sarichioi-Săratu, Aegyssus, Noviodunum, Revăsarea, Telita-Valea Morilor, Isaccea-Suhat, Ibida. All amphora finds are dated to the 2nd and 3rd centuries AD, see Paraschiv 2006, 25. For Halmyris and Argamum cf. also Opaş 2004, 31, pl. 20, 1, 5-6.

33 One example from Aquincum and one from Brigetio have been recently identified. Thanks to P. Hárshegyi for this pers. comm.

34 For Viminacium and Singidunum see
Moesia Secunda and Dacia Ripensis\textsuperscript{37}, covered also the inland areas of Moesia\textsuperscript{38}, the areas between the Danube Delta and the coastal Pontic area in Scythia\textsuperscript{39}, reaching the middle course of the Danube, as attested at Sirmium (Brukner 1981, 125, cat. # 85, pl. 64) and Ravna (Bjelajac 1996, 79, Sl. XXVII, # 151). The wide-spread diffusion of these amphorae was also evident in the territories north of the Danube, as demonstrate the Sucidava and Hinova finds (Ardeţ 2006, 150-151, fig. 84, where the form is considered as imported from Egypt; Stingă 2005, 94, pl. L/1-2) (fig. 6).

CONCLUSION

Studies of the distribution of ceramics provide invaluable information for the reconstruction of trade patterns. With distribution maps it is important always to bear in mind that they simply represent the state of our knowledge and not true values. Another difficulty is related to the impossibility to distinguish imitations of Sinopean productions, especially when analysing published materials. However, the aim of this paper is to look for general distribution trends and to characterise different types of trade routes and why they developed. The analysis of regional context distribution of Pontic amphorae first of all highlights the clear supremacy of the containers manufactured along the southern coast of the Black Sea, as compared to those of northern and eastern Pontic origin. This massive dominance can be explained by the setting of a preferential route with the production centres of Alaplı nearby Heraclea Pontica and those in the vicinity of Sinope, active still in the second half of the 1\textsuperscript{st} century BC. Exchange with the southern Black Sea coast continued developing in an intensive way up to the end of

\textsuperscript{316} DIAnA DOBREVA

\textsuperscript{37} At Romula, Drobeta and Tibiscum, see Popilian 1974, 142-143, pl. 2, # 2-4; Benea 2000, 435-437, fig. 1, # 2-4.

\textsuperscript{38} It concerns the imports of LRA 4, see Dobrev 2017.

\textsuperscript{39} At Novae, Iatrus, Ratiaria, Castra Martis, Nicopolis ad Istrum and Dichin, see Majewski 1981(1984), 124, 12, ryc. 55, 6; Böttger 1978, 429, Pl. 1/6; Böttger 1982, 44-45, 96, 105-106, cat. # 14-16, 130-134. pl. 21; Böttger 1991, 163, cat. # 683, pl. 47; Kuzmanov 1985, 17, A 64, табл. 7; von Bülow 2000, 212, fig. 1; Conrad 2007, Abb. 1-3; Kuzmanov 1987, 115, tabl. XXX, 37; Kuzmanov 2005, 148, кат. # 182; Falkner 1999, 257, cat. # 1099, fig. 9. 54; Kuzmanov 2009, 175, # 208, табл. XXI; Swan 2007, 841, fig. # 19.

\textsuperscript{316} In the territory of the villa near Odârchi, see Дончева-Петкова 1989, 45, табл. III/1, 3-5.

the 6th century AD, when the latest productions of Demirci40 are dated. The presence of Sinopean wine in Thrace is by no means a result of the development of a global exchange phenomenon that involved not only the Black Sea area, but also in the Eastern Mediterranean in general (as evidenced in Crete, Athens, Ephesus, Limyra and Berytus), and from the 3rd century AD – part of the Western Mediterranean coast. The analysed deposits indicate the significant role that the Thracian market played for the Sinopean wine trade. Thrace seems to be part of a broader mechanism that included also the territories along the Lower Danube. But what was the impact of Sinopean wine on the local Thracian economy? The data based on amphora finds shows clearly the important presence of this product still during Early Imperial times. As a matter of fact, about 35% of the imported wine amphorae in the studied contexts come from Sinope (calculations made on 31 vessels)41. On the contrary, the pit sanctuary at Sexaginta Prista on the Danube limes, dated between the late 2nd BC and the third quarter of 1st century AD, shows that only 17% of the imported wine originated from Sinope (for this research, a total amount of 49 vessels have been considered). Further on, the contribution of Sinopean containers to the Thracian deposits began to be more relevant, and during 2nd and 3rd century AD their number slightly increased, thus reaching 39% of all imported wine amphorae (based on 31 vessels). Compared to the low number of Sinopean amphorae that are attested along the Lower Danube River, a possible explanation can be that many of the wine amphorae imported there come from the Aegean or have been supplied locally. In fact, in the 2nd and 3rd century levels at Novaе only 10% of the total amount of amphorae are Sinopean and about 14% of the wine originated from the Aegean (perhaps Samos), contained in Kapitän II (from 50 vessels estimated). During Late Antiquity the wine from Sinope that reached the western Black Sea coast still remains better documented, registered up to 35% of the total amount of imported wine containers (54 estimated vessels). Similar proportion can be observed also for the sites of the northern coast of the Black Sea. The Bosporus contexts from the first half of the 5th century AD reveal that about 20-30% of the total amount of amphorae are of Sinopean origin (Smokotina 2016, 715). On the other hand, between

40 At Deultum Sinopean amphorae C Snp I are very common in some domestic contexts dated from the second half to the end of 5th century AD, while some C Snp II are attested in late 6th century deposits, see Dobreva 2017.

41 To count the number of vessels estimated, I have used the number of minimal individuals method (NMI), see further Dobreva 2017.
the middle of the 4th and the end of the 6th century AD only one tenth of the amphorae that reached the Lower Danube limes and the territories around came from Sinope. At Trimmamium, Nicopolis ad Istrum and Dichin, to the much smaller number of Sinopean containers corresponded the quite high percentage of Late Roman 1 wine amphorae, mostly of Cypriot and Cilician production (Falkner 1999; Swan 2004 and 2007). The wine supply along the Danube border in the 5th and mainly in the 6th century AD is strongly conditioned by quaestura exercitus, established by the Emperor Justinian (Torbatov 1997). With the inclusion of Caria, Cyprus and the Cycladic Islands, it provided food supply to Moesia Secunda and Scythia. The western coast of the Black Sea received considerably bigger quantity of Sinopean amphorae than the Lower Danube region. Here the proportion of the containers that arrived from Sinope remained relatively stable, as compared over the centuries. So it seems that the Sinopean wine was a constant factor in the local consumption behaviours and eating practices in Roman and Late Antique Thrace. It played a considerable role, including about one third of the whole wine trade reaching the Thracian market. How can we explain this fixed trend? The possible explanation has to evaluate several key factors, one of which is most likely related to the quality/price ratio that made Sinopean wine competitive to Aegean and other Pontic wines. On the other hand, its success could also be related to the fact that it suited the local taste. This peculiarity can justify the 'global' market establishment of the Sinopean wine. Taking into consideration the distribution maps, another question stands out: was Sinopean wine equally distributed in Thrace? The topography of the finds shows the wide-spread diffusion of Sinopean imports, limited mainly to ports and coastal regions and to those sites located near rivers. It concerns maritime routes that involve ports and coastal cities receiving many of the Sinopean amphorae from where, via navigable rivers and ship canals (as Hebros, Tonzos, Strymon, Nestos etc.), the production could penetrate inland to well-connected locations. Distribution maps regarding the Lower Danube territories demonstrate that most of the military camps received Sinopean imports, thus pointing out the importance of the Danube River not only as a commercial route, but also as an access point to the Pontic trade network.

In closing, the case of Sinopean wine in the context of tracing networks in the Black Sea has been already observed for the Classical and Hellenistic period, and now we can emphasize its significant role also for the Roman and Late Antique times. Further research in this area, including the production site information at the Turkish coast and more analysis of assemblages around the Black Sea, is necessary in order to clarify this point.
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