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In 2002 the Spanish press appeared agitated regarding a new attribution by Matías Díaz Padrón, specifically a *Portrait of Sir Arthur Hopton* (1588? -1650) *and a secretary* (fig. 1)[[1]](#footnote-1) that at the time was being shown at Madrid’s Prado Museum as an anonymous work. The painting was part of *La Almoneda del Siglo* (*The Sale of the Century*), an exhibition devoted to the sale of Charles I of England’s collection as a consequence of his execution in 1649[[2]](#footnote-2). Hopton’s portrait was included because of his significant role whilst English ambassador in Madrid, in providing works of art for the English monarch and other noblemen[[3]](#footnote-3). Belonging to the Meadows Museum in Dallas, the portrait had been in Madrid and Barcelona shortly before that, together with a selection of works from the North American museum, whose collection focuses entirely on Spanish art, reflecting Algur Hurtle Meadows’ (1899-1978)[[4]](#footnote-4) personal fascination.

Both exhibitions were Díaz Padrón’s opportunity to see and study the portrait more closely, as he would later remark “one of the most controversial paintings in an American museum”, the authorship of which had yet to be resolved. Indeed, the portrait had a long history of attributions to painters from the Spanish school: Bartolomé Esteban Murillo (1617-1682), Fray Juan Ricci (1600-1681), Juan Bautista Maíno (1581-1649) and Alonso Cano (1601-1667), among others. None of whom proved convincing enough, and as a consequence the painting remained anonymous. The vacuum proved compelling for Díaz Padrón, who saw how “the execution and treatment of the materials show the approach of a personality outside of the Spanish sphere”[[5]](#footnote-5). His recognising Bruges’ leading painter Jacob van Oost the Elder (1603-1671) as the painting’s most likely author; and his considering the work being Flemish rather than Spanish, stirred the press and scholars alike.

With the exhibition open, the national daily newspaper *ABC* went on to publish as its headline: “Díaz Padrón discovers the authorship of an anonymous canvas from 'La Almoneda del Siglo’”[[6]](#footnote-6). The following day, the exhibition’s two curators, Jonathan Brown and John Elliot were invited to give their opinion, saying: “Nothing proves that the painting is by Van Oost”[[7]](#footnote-7). Describing Díaz Padrón's argument as “interesting”, and without going as far as to commit themselves to any painter of the age, the curators raised their own concerns of the naming of Van Oost as the author of the work: “Where could Van Oost and Hopton have met? Because it seems that the latter was never in Flanders” –argued Elliot. For his part, Brown stated that “the painting is dated 1641 and at that moment Sir Arthur Hopton was in Madrid where he was ambassador from 1638 to 1645”[[8]](#footnote-8).

Díaz Padrón's published a comprehensive article on the portrait in *Archivo Español de Arte*, to which the reader is able to refer to a complete account of the critical history and literature of the painting*[[9]](#footnote-9)*. Since then, except for Ismael Gutiérrez Pastor who rejects the attribution to Maíno and considers Van Oost as “probable”[[10]](#footnote-10), no other scholar makes a case for or against. William B. Jordan reiterates his attribution to Alonso Cano in 2015[[11]](#footnote-11). More recently Todd Longstaffe-Gowan in his detailed study of the image of Sir Arthur, is aware of Díaz Padrón's publication but notably continues to preserve the anonymity of the painting[[12]](#footnote-12); as is the case with the recent *Handbook* from the Meadows collection[[13]](#footnote-13). Interestingly, in an unpublished document by Marcus Burke (1989), he attempts to connect the portrait with Northern painters active in Madrid between 1638 and 1644, without finding any talented enough for such a painting[[14]](#footnote-14).

There is nothing to add to Díaz Padrón’s stylistic and comparative observations. He demonstrates very effectively the authorship of Van Oost, giving his reasons to discard Ricci, Maíno and others. Indeed, to think of the Flemish school it is enough to sense “the impact of the chromatic beauty of the objects and details, clearly designed. Everything is captured with individual precision: the tablecloth, the rivets and trimmings on the chair, books and ornaments… the realism and material treatment of the book…” etc. Díaz Padrón points out that "the confusion lies in paying more attention to the design than to the plastic substance and the brushwork"; and he speaks of an obvious "thingness" (*cosidad*), of the individual presence of the objects and their tactile qualities which is typically Flemish[[15]](#footnote-15). “No one like the Flemish indulges as much in painting the objects, they treat a thing with the same care that the face of a sitter”[[16]](#footnote-16). Cautioning against the Spanish furniture in the painting being misleading, when it was decorating the houses in Bruges[[17]](#footnote-17); Díaz Padrón sees a portrait that “assumes a stylistic approach close to Caravaggio and the Bolognese, without forgetting Rubens and Van Dyck”, which is what “forges the style of Jacob van Oost”[[18]](#footnote-18).

The comparison with a painting by Van Oost representing a *Theologian with a secretary* (fig. 2)[[19]](#footnote-19) proves compelling and decisive for the proposed attribution, both from a plastic and compositional point of view; as is the *Calling of St. Matthew*, dated 1641 (fig. 3)[[20]](#footnote-20) and the *Philosopher meditating* (fig. 4) [[21]](#footnote-21), which is dated “1647” on the open letter falling from the desk (fig. 5). Díaz Padrón notes other parallels with a *Portrait of an Unknown Man* signed by Van Oost in 1638[[22]](#footnote-22), and with the gentlemen of the *Musical Company* at the Royal Museums of Fine Arts, Brussels[[23]](#footnote-23).

Offering convincing visual evidence to support his belief of Van Oost as the author of the *Portrait of Sir Arthur Hopton and a Secretary*, Diaz Padrón’s proposal is by far the most plausible among those that have been considered, and since discarded. However, it is true that in order to convince doubters it is necessary to find evidence of possible contact between the painter and the sitter. A complicated task, considering how little is known about Van Oost’s life and the gaps in Sir Arthur’s.

It cannot be assumed that Hopton was never in Flanders as Elliot argues[[24]](#footnote-24). In the search for evidence of this, there are reasons to think that he could have visited the Spanish Netherlands on more than one occasion. In fact, when planning his trip from Madrid to England in 1636, he asked the king for funds to guarantee his passage through Flanders[[25]](#footnote-25); and even if he finally decided to take the sea route[[26]](#footnote-26), that detail indicates that he could well have set foot on Flemish lands on any of his other journeys, not only whilst he was between London and Madrid, but also during his stays in Paris and Rouen.

Bruges was, along with Ostend and Dunkirk, one of the routes to travel between England and the Continent. A boat with passengers (paquebouc=packet boat) was in service to cross to Dover from Nieuport-Oostende, near Bruges[[27]](#footnote-27). Since 1640 a Treaty was signed between the kings of Great Britain and Spain “to keep commerce and navigation open and free between the ports of England and those of Flanders”[[28]](#footnote-28). Against a backdrop of Royalists and Revolution, Bruges, that the king himself would later choose as a place of exile in 1656, had been a favoured destination for British fleeing England since 1640[[29]](#footnote-29).

But above all, Sir Arthur's most compelling motivation for going to Bruges was his much-loved nephew, Sir Ralph (fig. 6)[[30]](#footnote-30), 1st Baron Hopton of Stratton (1596-1652), who was exiled from 1647 until his death in 1652[[31]](#footnote-31). Sir Ralph was a very revered military officer and politician, a great defender of the royalist cause. He had been in Flanders as a soldier[[32]](#footnote-32), decorated a Knight during the coronation of Charles I, and later titled Baron Hopton in 1643. Winner of battles, he was considered a great hero deserving of poems[[33]](#footnote-33). Given Sir Ralph's exile in Bruges, an encounter between Sir Arthur and Van Oost through him would make incredible sense; but the dates do not match 1641, as the supposed year of the portrait, when Sir Arthur, as far as is known, was in Madrid.

Regarding that, when attempting to verify the veracity of the date of the portrait (with the use of high-resolution photographs, that are available today), it is striking how difficult it is to read[[34]](#footnote-34). Until now the argument of the painting being created in Spain hinges on the date, 1641, supposedly printed in Roman numerals at the top of the spine of the red book that stands vertically on the table, where the coat of arms of the sitter also appears. But crucially what if the date was not 1641 as has always been believed? To our knowledge, José López Rey was the first to mention the presence of these Roman numerals. He tells us verbatim that “though partly abraded, [they] are easily readable: [M] DCXLI”[[35]](#footnote-35); that is, 1641; the same information having been reiterated since then. Only recently, Longstaffe-Gowan notes “[M]DCXL”, that is, 1640[[36]](#footnote-36), which is indicative of a discrepancy, and of the lack of clarity of a date that has been transmitted for decades without being questioned.

These numerals that López Rey can “easily” read, are not as visible in the high-resolution photograph of the painting. Only "CX" appear clearly, before that, the remains of another letter that could well be a "D" (since its rounded shape can be seen). Behind “CX”, there is little else visible. Given this situation, it proved necessary to contact the conservation team at the Meadows Museum, seeking their assistance. Anne Lenhart, Director of Collections and Exhibitions, was able to send a number of photographs of details from the painting[[37]](#footnote-37). Only then did it become possible to confirm the presence of "DCXL", behind which an "I" can hardly be perceived. But the inscription does not end there, with enough space, until the end of the book for something else to be added. Indeed, another numeral appears whilst modifying the settings of the different photographs: it is shaped with diagonal lines, which could well be an “X” (fig. 7); beyond that nothing is visible. It seems that something was missing from the Roman numeral pointed out by López Rey: “[M]DCXLI” (1641); the date of the portrait could more likely be “[M]DCXLIX” (1649).

This brings us back to Sir Ralph Hopton, a connection that has been unnoticed until now, and that could well explain certain aspects of the genesis and authorship of the portrait. During his exile (1647-1652), Ralph having Bruges as his residence it is more than likely that he knew of Jacob van Oost, the most celebrated painter in the city at the time. It's also likely that Ralph received more than one visit from his uncle Arthur.

The relationship between Sir Arthur and his nephew Sir Ralph was not any kind of family relationship[[38]](#footnote-38). Related on the fathers’ side, barely eight years apart, more than uncle and nephew they were like brothers under the skin. They were so close that whilst Ralph is in Jersey defending the royalist cause, Arthur –who had already left Madrid– goes to Normandy to try to see him, and there they meet in Coutainville for three days. It is known that it was the only time Ralph was absent from Jersey in the eleven months he served there[[39]](#footnote-39). Arthur tries to convince him to join him in France, which Ralph decides to do after receiving the news of the death of his wife, Lady Elizabeth Hopton (born Capel, 1596-1646). In February 26, 1647 Ralph moves with his uncle to Rouen[[40]](#footnote-40), who lives there from the beginning of the year[[41]](#footnote-41). Since neither of them had issue both had named each other heir[[42]](#footnote-42).

The bond between uncle and nephew was such that Arthur does not hesitate to sell a large part of his valuable belongings[[43]](#footnote-43) whilst living in Rouen, in order to assist Ralph. Indeed he comments that he is “raking all his corners for money” to cover his nephew's expenses and debts[[44]](#footnote-44). With this intention, Arthur decides to entrust some of his paintings to a certain “Mr. Crosse” for him to sell in Paris[[45]](#footnote-45). From what we know, pieces as significant as his own oval portrait by Anthony van Dyck (fig. 8)[[46]](#footnote-46) reappear in the collection of the painter Sir Peter Lely (1618-1680), catalogued in his 1682 sale[[47]](#footnote-47), preceding a “Portrait of Lady Hopton”[[48]](#footnote-48) who is very likely Ralph's deceased wife. Sir Arthur also renounces ownership of another portrait with sentimental value, in which he himself appears, together with his deceased brother Sir Thomas Hopton (c.1585-1638) (fig. 9) [[49]](#footnote-49). This double portrait was added to the collection of the Count of Molina, Don Antonio Mesía de Tovar (c.1620-1674), as it is described in the inventory drawn up after his death in 1674[[50]](#footnote-50). Quite astonishing that Sir Arthur let such personal pieces go. Perhaps, as Longstaffe-Gowan argues, it is an indicator that these portraits were an investment that went beyond the importance of the sitter[[51]](#footnote-51). However, it could be seen that he is still giving everything of himself away. Arthur intended to return to England in the autumn, "earlier than expected", as he comments in a letter to Sir Richard Browne, from Rouen, on March 27, 1647[[52]](#footnote-52). On his way to England, Sir Arthur could easily have passed through Bruges; and until his death near Bapton, Oxfordshire, in March 1650; he likely sought for other opportunities to see Ralph. During which time Ralph lives in Bruges and makes pilgrimages to The Hague and Utrecht[[53]](#footnote-53).

That Sir Ralph's stays in Bruges is further confirmed by the testimony of the Dutch historian and diplomat Lieuwe van Aitzema (1600-1669), who sees him there and claims to have previously met him in The Hague[[54]](#footnote-54). Indeed, Ralph sends and receives letters from the Dutch city from January to July 1649[[55]](#footnote-55). As an advisor he is part of the entourage that accompanies Charles II of England[[56]](#footnote-56), in refuge with his sister the Princess of Orange in The Hague, where in February news was received of the execution of their father[[57]](#footnote-57). Whilst in The Hague in June, Ralph receives a package from Jonas Porrée (1619-1685), a Rouen physician. It contains a book translated by him into French; he asks Ralph to give it to Charles II[[58]](#footnote-58). It is undoubtedly the *Eikôn basilike*, the famous compendium of meditations published after the death of Charles I[[59]](#footnote-59), supposedly written by the monarch himself before his execution, a matter that is still speculated to this day[[60]](#footnote-60). The work, of which more than thirty editions were published, builds the image of Charles I as a martyr[[61]](#footnote-61), and provokes a response from the English Parliament, with John Milton's (1608-1684) *Eikonoklastes* published in October, who attacks the beheaded monarch, presenting him as a tyrant and hypocrite[[62]](#footnote-62). Sir Ralph had since February expressed his condemnation of the murder of Charles I, publishing an eight-page *Declaration* in which he asserts his fidelity to Charles II, and requests help to recover the crown and sovereignty[[63]](#footnote-63).

We can confirm Ralph Hopton’s presence at the conference with the Dutch Commission headed by the secretary of the Princes of Orange, Constantijn Huygens (1596-1687), on March 1, 1649[[64]](#footnote-64). Huygens had actively participated in the festivities when Charles II arrived to The Hague with his entourage and composed a verse to the king’s image[[65]](#footnote-65). Huygens and Ralph certainly know of each other from before, as Huygens mentions Ralph in his correspondence [[66]](#footnote-66); but the evidence that they actually meet in The Hague for this occasion is very significant, as it could explain the obvious parallels with the *Portrait of Constantijn Huygens and his Clerk* (1627) by Thomas de Keyser (1596-1667) (fig. 10) [[67]](#footnote-67), to which the *Portrait of Sir Arthur Hopton and a Secretary* (fig. 1) has been associated with good reason[[68]](#footnote-68) without plausible explanation. The resemblance between the two portraits is compelling. Although it cannot be excluded that Sir Arthur was in The Hague and saw Huygens’ portrait[[69]](#footnote-69), in Sir Ralph's case it is very likely, given the proof of his meeting there with Huygens. One can assume that Ralph will have felt a resounding impression of the portrait as well as of the personality of Huygens; an exceptional scholar, diplomat, patron and collector, not to dissimilar to his uncle Arthur. Ralph would have seen an image worthy of a model, a prototype for his uncle's portrait. Such circumstances could explain the influence of Huygens portrait and open the possibility of Van Oost’s commissioned by Ralph, who could have had his uncle sit for the painter in Bruges.

Sir Arthur’s trail in 1649 is difficult to follow. We can only confirm his presence in England on June 7, the day he receives the visit of Sir John Evelyn (1620-1706), who notes it in his *Diary*[[70]](#footnote-70). By this time Charles II is leaving The Hague for Paris, to meet his mother Henrietta Maria. On his journey the king is received with great honours in Antwerp and Brussels, where he spends some time in July 1649. Ralph avoided Paris[[71]](#footnote-71); he remained in the Low Countries and would only meet the King In March 1650 in Beauvais[[72]](#footnote-72). This provides a possible space for Ralph to have received his uncle, and for the portrait to have been executed under his initiative in Bruges. We can only surmise if Ralph felt obliged, compelled even to do something and intended the work as gratitude for Sir Arthur’s consideration of his circumstances a short time before; as a way of compensating Arthur for the valuable paintings with his own image, that he had parted with for him; a sensitive gesture from Ralph, who was sincerely religious and extremely loyal; a man who was described as having “great honour, integrity and piety” [[73]](#footnote-73).

Something more could be revealed by a detail that has gone unnoticed until now: in the *Portrait of Sir Arthur Hopton* is a sheet of paper seen in a central position in the background, falling from the bookshelf upside-down. With it turned over and magnified, one can speculate at an inscription (fig. 11). It is a long line that is difficult to read, beginning with an “I” or “J” (Jacomo?); further on, a “B” is discernable, followed by something unreadable where we can deduce “…opt…” at the end of the line, below which, an “F” (fecit?) is distinguishable. This is best appreciated by changing the image parameters and comparing the various detail photographs available. Although there are few legible letters, they feed the suspicion that a signature or dedication could be hidden (“I[acomo van oost?] B[aron?] sic [H]opt[on] / F.”?). Whatever the case may be, that points out the presence of an inscription hitherto undetected that deserves further examination to determine its content.

Of interest, in the *Portrait of Sir Arthur Hopton and his Brother Thomas Hopton* (fig. 9), another piece of paper is seen in in Sir Arthur’s hand. It contains an inscription in Spanish (fig. 12): “Al.Ex: mo Don/Arthur Hopton/Embax:dor del R/De La gran. Breta/Madrid” (To His Excellency Don/Arthur Hopton/Ambassador of the K[ing] of Great Brita[in]). The use of ‘Al’ (=To the) could indicate a letter he received but also a dedication or a present. This could imply that Sir Arthur did not order the work, therefore, was it of Ralph’s doing? Concerning the authorship, Michael Cross –as Longstaffe-Gowan recently suggested– makes sense: Cross was in the service of Sir Arthur for many years and he departed with him to England in 1636[[74]](#footnote-74). The same type of double portrait was since used by the Hoptons on two other occasions: the *Portrait of Sir Ralph Hopton and his wife Elizabeth*, dated 1637[[75]](#footnote-75) and the *Portrait of Sir Ralph Hopton and his father Robert Hopton* (fig. 13)[[76]](#footnote-76). The relationship between these three works deserves further study. Emulating Van Dyck’s style, one can only wonder if they are not all by the same Cross, who was known as a copyist, whilst in England, before Sir Arthur’s departure for Madrid in April 1638.

Another factor that supports Ralph’s involvement in the commissioning of the portrait of his uncle to Van Oost, could be the influence of a work by Van Dyck: the Portrait of *Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford* (1593-1641) *together with Philip Mainwaring* (1589-1661) (fig. 14) [[77]](#footnote-77). Like Van Dyck, Van Oost responds to a depiction with a long tradition dating back to the Renaissance, with well-known examples where parallels can be drawn. But in these two works there is a very similar interaction between the two main characters that occurs, a nobleman and a clerk, in a moment of their working routine. The affiliation to this work has us wondering; again the connection is possibly Sir Ralph. Sir Arthur could not have seen Strafford’s portrait being painted in London: even if he posed for Van Dyck at a similar moment (fig. 8), with his being in England between 1636 and 1638 he left London before Strafford's portrait was likely painted (during his stay in London, between September 1639 and March 1640). It is still possible that Sir Arthur knew of Strafford’s portrait at a later date, directly or through its numerous copies[[78]](#footnote-78). More likely Sir Ralph saw the original, for he and Strafford knew each other, being Members of Parliament. That Ralph could have kept in mind the portrait of Strafford is surprising from a modern perspective when learning that he voted against him during his trial for high treason in 1640[[79]](#footnote-79), with Strafford being convicted and beheaded in 1641. In any case, somehow the memory of Van Dyck’s work must have been present during the genesis of Van Oost’s portrait of Sir Arthur. Of note, in his *Theologian with a Secretary*, dated 1668 (fig. 2), Van Oost uses Van Dyck’s formula again, literally borrowing the figure of the secretary, whose attitude is the same in both works.

One wonders if the *Portrait of Sir Arthur Hopton and a Secretary* reached England with the sitter, or if it remained in Bruges with Sir Ralph. As fate would have it, Sir Arthur dies a few months later in Oxfordshire, on March 6, 1650, at the age of 61, two years before his nephew. Ralph is currently with Charles II in Beauvais. Much of Sir Arthur's possessions were dispersed before his death, and the 1653 inventory of his estate records as unspecified "several paintings"[[80]](#footnote-80). Sir Ralph had the intention to go back to England when he dies in Bruges in 1652[[81]](#footnote-81). Lord Hatton receives news of his demise from the continent in October, a subsequent letter conveying the great sense of loss on the part of everyone, “but none so great as the King” [[82]](#footnote-82). Of Ralph's estates it has been said that his house and lands in Witham were passed on to his nephew Hopton Wyndham in 1672[[83]](#footnote-83), inherited by his brother, William Wyndham (†1683), and hence by descent to another William Wyndham, who inherited in 1695[[84]](#footnote-84). Part of Ralph’s collection reaches by lineage Henry Wyndham, III Lord Leconfield (1872-1952), who owned A *Portrait of Ralph Hopton*, as a young man, in full length, which is at Petworth House today [[85]](#footnote-85).

We do not hear of the *Portrait of Sir Arthur Hopton* until just before it reaches Algur Meadows. It is known that he acquired the painting at the Wildenstein & Co. Gallery in New York[[86]](#footnote-86) and that it came from the “Reitlinger” collection in England[[87]](#footnote-87). It must be the British historian and collector Henry Scipio Reitlinger (1882-1950), specialised in drawings, who sold more than one painting by the mid-20th century[[88]](#footnote-88). A mining engineer, Reitlinger made his fortune in Nigeria, devoting himself since then exclusively to art history, spending most of his life in London, he is the author of several publications, including *Old Master Drawings, a handbook for amateurs and collectors* (London, 1922). After Reitlinger’s death, his vast collection of drawings and fewer paintings was sold in seven parts, at Sotheby's, between 1953 and 1954. Consulting the Reitlinger collection catalogues the portrait in question can be found, in the first part, attributed to the Italian Carlo Maratta (1625-1713), and without identifying the character: “9. C. Maratta. A nobleman and His Secretary, the former seated at a table on which a book rests, the latter addressing him from behind his chair. 72 in. by 43 ½ in.” [[89]](#footnote-89). We do not know if Wildenstein was the purchaser at this auction, or if the painting would pass through other hands in the meantime. It is worth remembering that although the gallery owner had a drawing from Reitlinger, he bought it shortly after[[90]](#footnote-90). It was probably Wildenstein who requested the opinion of the Hispanist José Gudiol, of which a report is known (1959) where the portrait is recorded with the correct identification of the sitter and an attribution to Murillo[[91]](#footnote-91). It was published as such in Wildenstein’s catalogue in 1962.

The location of the *Portrait of Sir Arthur Hopton* in London from the mid-20th century, the identity of its previous owner and its former attribution to Maratta are significant details that we can add to the provenance of the painting. The work had since been placed within the perimeter of the Spanish school, a geography that the supposed chronology seemed to confirm. As Díaz Padrón points out, this portrait has been misplaced because of a persistent confusion between Flemish and Spanish painters. Such was the case of Gaspar de Crayer (1584-1669) and Frans Luyck (1604-1668): whose works were attributed in the past to Spanish painters, Diego Velázquez (1599-1660) among them, “because they absorb a modality of portrait that relates to the etiquette of the House of Habsburg”, which is explained by “the hegemony of Spain in Europe, when Flanders was a core part of the empire” [[92]](#footnote-92). In the attribution of the *Portrait of Sir Arthur Hopton* to the Spanish school, “the ambassador's experiences had greater weight than the stylistic study of the painting”[[93]](#footnote-93).

Today it is possible to draw Sir Arthur’s link to Bruges through his much-loved nephew Ralph, who lived in the city and whose involvement in the genesis of the work is very likely, his having the portrait of Huygens in mind. The reading of the date of Sir Arthur’s portrait continues to be misleading: 1641, a number that has been put forward repeatedly. Questioning what had been assumed, and reconsidering the transcription of the date, 1649 appears more likely the year of the work. Adding to the argument, the presence of another as yet unseen inscription, on the sheet of paper perched on the shelf, which could reveal something more. Both inscriptions need further examination, an incentive for the Meadows Museum to study the portrait in detail, as several elements offer new evidence of Sir Arthur’s Bruges’ connection, and may dispel the aforementioned objections to the authorship of Jacob van Oost: the Flemish painter as originally identified for his style; it being another case of Matías Díaz Padrón’s infallible eye.
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