In his famous identification and dating of the Morgan Golden Gospels published in the Festschrift for Belle da Costa Greene, E. A. Lowe was quite explicit in his categorizing of Carolingian uncial as the ‘invention of a display artist’. He went on to define it as an artificial script beginning to be found in manuscripts of the ninth century and even of the late eighth century. These uncials were reserved for special display purposes, for headings, titles, colophons, opening lines and, exceptionally, as in the case of the Morgan Gospels Lowe was discussing, for an entire codex. Lowe acknowledged that uncial had been used in these ways before the end of the eighth century, but then it was ‘natural’ not ‘artificial’ uncial.

One of the problems I wish to address is the degree to which Frankish uncial in the late eighth and the ninth centuries is indeed ‘artificial’ rather than ‘natural’. Can it be regarded as a deliberate recreation of a script type, or is it a refinement and elevation in status of an existing book script? Secondly, to what degree is a particular script type used for a particular text type in the early Middle Ages? The third problem, related at least to the first, if not to the second, is whether Frankish uncial, be it natural or artificial, is sufficiently distinctive when used by a particular scriptorium to enable us to locate a manuscript or fragment to one atelier rather than another. This problem needs, of course, to be set within the context of later Carolingian book production, the notions of ‘house’ style as opposed to ‘regional’ style and the criteria for locating manuscript production to particular scriptoria in the Frankish kingdoms under the Carolingians that I have discussed elsewhere. It is also of particular importance when considering the Hofschule ateliers of the mid-ninth century associated with the Emperor Lothar and with King Charles the Bald. Did they develop ‘house styles’ of either minuscule or uncial, and can manuscripts written in high-grade scripts of the Carolingian period be linked palaeographically without the aid of minuscule? The discussion is particularly pertinent in relation to a fragment of a hitherto unlocated Gospel Book of the mid-ninth century, written in an uncial script of great elegance and beauty, of which I shall have more to say at the end of this paper.

To tackle the question of natural versus artificial uncial one needs to consider the history of uncial script in early mediaeval Europe and its differentiation into ‘national’ types. Uncial was a book hand which became increasingly common in the course of the
Fig. 1. Sixth-century uncial. BL, Harl. MS. 1775, f. 51
fourth century and which, according to Lowe, reached perfection in the fifth. An early example is the fourth-century Livy; other typical perfected uncial scripts are those of the Victor Codex in Fulda, written in South Italy in A.D. 546, or the Burchard Gospels, now in Würzburg, also written, according to Lowe, 'doubtless in Italy'. What gives it its 'peculiar grace and beauty' is the emphasis on curved strokes, particularly to be noted in the forms of the 'a', 'd', 'e', 'h', 'm' and 'u' (fig. 1). Distinctive 'national types' of uncial developed in the course of the early Middle Ages throughout Western Europe. Quite apart from 'English uncial' which has been fully documented, there is also a type of 'Frankish uncial'. Indeed, far from there being a hiatus in the evolution of uncial script in the Frankish kingdoms, still less a period of decadence, there was an essential continuity in the development of uncial script in the Frankish kingdoms which culminated in Carolingian uncial.

Jouarre and Chelles in the first half of the eighth century were the most productive and influential centres; the uncial script they produced was refined and given the forms in which it can be recognized as the ancestor of the elegant Carolingian uncial of the next century. Yet theirs are also forms clearly related to the distinctive Frankish uncial types that one can observe in the manuscripts from Merovingian Gaul in the seventh and eighth centuries. In other words there is a direct continuity traceable in the letter forms of Frankish uncial from the fifth century through to the ninth. From the point of view of the development of script, Frankish uncial in the Carolingian period cannot be labelled an artificial development. It is a natural one. The definition Lowe offered of Carolingian uncial as an 'artificial script', therefore, on the basis of analysis of the development of the letter forms, cannot be sustained.

If there is no abrupt change, but rather a gradual transformation, in uncial letter forms, it is perhaps in the use of uncial that a break or change is to be observed. It is important to note that in the early stages of its history uncial appears to have been associated with Christian texts. Choices of types of script for particular purposes, indeed, had been made throughout the Roman period. Surviving evidence suggests a preference for capitals, whether square or rustic, for non-Christian texts, and uncial for Christian writings in the fourth century, just as the codex appears to have been the Christians' preferred format for the book. Lawyers and notaries on the other hand, as well as private letter-writers, preferred the cursive forms, and the former in particular developed their own distinctive shorthand – tironian notes – as part of the technical writing of their professions. Different letter forms, therefore, were recognized as suitable or appropriate for different purposes in the late Roman world.

As far as uncial is concerned, moreover, it was joined as a book hand at a very early stage by half uncial (and do not let us forget the still lower ranking 'quarter uncial'!). There seems little doubt that this was a differentiation according to formality and rank of script. Use of uncial to provide headings in half-uncial codices of the sixth and seventh centuries seems to me to reinforce an understanding of uncial as a high-grade script from the very beginning of its existence and one that in principle at least would be reserved for special books. Of the 138 Gospel Books recorded in McGurk’s handlist, for example,
apart from those written in insular half-uncial, itself a high-ranking script, only sixteen are not written in uncial script. Half of these were written at the end of the eighth century or in the early ninth and may represent deliberate choices for one reason or another (including delight in experimenting with the new minuscule, for two – Trier 22 and Cotton Claudius B. V – come from the court school of Charlemagne). The remainder seem to represent departures from a norm. The two earliest, the Aberdeen fragment written in rustic capitals and the St Gall Vulgate in half-uncials, may have been written at a time when the hierarchy of appropriate scripts was being worked out. The others constitute interesting exceptions to uncial being a standard script for Gospel Books on the Continent. Two sixth-century Gospel Books, Karlsruhe Landesbibliothek Aug. fragm. 14 and the Split Chapter Library Gospels, were written in half-uncial. An eighth-century example of a half-uncial Gospel Book is Leningrad O.v.1.2, from Corbie. The other three eighth-century Gospels are written in minuscule. Berne 199 is a fragment of St John’s Gospel written in eastern France in pre-Caroline minuscule. Leningrad O.v.1.3, possibly from Corbie, is written in Merovingian cursive. Montpellier 3 was written in b-minuscule in the second half of the eighth century and is among those from the Jouarre–Chelles constellation I mentioned earlier. N-uncial is used for the headings in Montpellier 3. These examples of the use of scripts other than uncial towards the end of the eighth century are indications that uncial was beginning to go out of use as the exclusive book hand for this kind of text. In view of the number of ninth-century Gospel Books of a grand format preserving uncial for the text from the early ninth century, however, (such as the Lorsch Gospels), and its continued appearance in the grander Gospel Books of the later ninth century (such as the Gospels written for Lothar or Charles the Bald), it by no means went totally out of use.

With regard to Sacramentaries the evidence is less conclusive. Of the forty-four Sacramentaries recorded by Delisle dating to before the tenth century, only eleven date to before the ninth, but these, with the exception of the anomalous Bobbio Missal, were written in uncial. Thereafter it appears only to be the very grandest of Sacramentaries that would use uncial for portions of the text other than headings and titles, such as the Drogo Sacramentary, BN lat. 9428, some of the group of Sacramentaries produced at St Amand for export and on commission in the second half of the ninth century such as Stockholm MS. fr. 1, Pierpont Morgan G 57 and BN lat. 2290, and the Metz Sacramentary produced by the court school of Charles the Bald. Again, however, there is at least an indication of the high status of uncial in that it appears in prefaces and in the central canon of the Mass when it is used as a text hand, and there is no reason to posit a major hiatus in the use of the script in Mass Books.

What of the other books produced in Frankish Gaul in the pre-Carolingian period? Is there a clear differentiation in script type in relation to text type? The answer would appear to be not at all. There is an enormous variety of texts written in uncial extant from the period before the middle of the eighth century. There are Roman and canon law, the works of Gregory the Great, Augustine, Jerome, Isidore, Julianus Pomerius, Ambrose, Lactantius, Cyprian, Origen, Paterius, Eucherius, Iuvenecus and Hilary, as well as Ovid,
Livy, Pliny, Probus, grammatical texts, poetry, medical texts, Eusebius and Fredegar. These range in date from the fifth to the mid-eighth century, but there are far more manuscripts produced in the eighth century generally than in the two preceding centuries, and this may not just be an unfortunate pattern of survival. The books produced in the eighth century, moreover, appear to be exactly the same kind of text as in those produced in half-uncial, though in books of a larger and somewhat more sumptuous format. They raise the question of whether the use of a particular type of script outside the special category of Gospels might depend as much on the wealth of the commissioner or producer of the book as on the type of text it contained. Uncial could have been not only a higher-grade script but also a more highly paid one, requiring greater skill and special training. Conversely, the mass of books written in the standard grade, minuscule, may represent a widening of the market for cheaper books.

If one surveys the Frankish manuscripts produced in the first half-century of Carolingian rule, that is, between the mid-eighth century and the beginning of the ninth there is a quite remarkable change in emphasis in script types. Uncial as a text hand is hardly in evidence at all as the main text hand in books. Apart from the Gospel books, uncial is only to be seen in the Anthologia Latina in BN lat. 10318, the North French Psalter in BN lat. 13159 (795–800) and the fragment of a homiliary possibly from Bavaria and now in Bamberg (Stadtsarchiv fragm. 43), some canon law (BN lat. 281+lat. 298) and some medical texts (BN lat. n.a.lat. 203) from southern France or perhaps northern Italy and one or two others. What we are witnessing is a major script revolution, in which a conscious choice of script type appears to have been made for a variety of reasons, not all of which are as yet understood. Uncial was elevated in status, and minuscule took the place of both uncial and half uncial as the normal text hand. Uncial is preserved for titles, prefaces, headings, opening pages and the like, but we now only find it as a text hand in the most glorious of books destined for the wealthiest of patrons.

To say that uncial is replaced as the main or as one of the two main scripts for books, however, is not to agree that its subsequent use is artificial as far as its letter forms are concerned, nor that its eighth-century manifestations are the decadent survivors of a once glorious script. In the preference accorded Caroline minuscule in the course of the eighth century, evident from the fact that the bulk of the surviving manuscripts from the late eighth century are in minuscule of one type or another, we are witnessing something much more interesting and complicated. The Franks appear to have reserved a script, hitherto used quite widely in copying both ecclesiastical and secular texts, for the Gospels and the most sacred texts of the Christian religion, and for royal, high-ranking ecclesiastical or noble patrons who could afford to commission them. But uncial itself simply continued to develop as a script. Its use was limited but it did not die out in order to be revived. Uncial was not an artificially revived script. It was a script that had always been used for the text of a specific type of book, the Gospels, and in this category it had a continued existence. Although it had been used for other types of book, it was replaced by the new minuscule. That Carolingian uncial should show distinctive calligraphy and artistic
elegance and embellishment is a manifestation of scribal skill rather than an artificial development after a period of decadence. If it was increasingly reserved for special books there may also have been a limited number of accomplished scribes who could do it well, and it may have constituted a scribe’s ‘higher education’ to learn how to write it properly. It is perfectly possible, moreover, to find examples of uncial script in the books of the Carolingian world, such as the later ninth-century Cassiodorus from Auxerre, whose letter forms are a direct reflection of the Frankish uncial types of the eighth century.\(^{30}\)

Thus Carolingian uncial is a natural continuation, both in letter forms and in function, from the Frankish uncial types of the seventh and eighth centuries. There is nothing artificial about it at all. If even its use in Gospel Books and other liturgical codices gradually dies out in the course of the tenth century, it is thereafter that we might be entitled to use the term ‘artificial’ uncial when we find the script in use for headings, titles, incipits, explicit and colophons. There again, however, a hierarchy of scripts for titles, headings, colophons, incipits, explicit, and prefaces was well established by the eighth century and the elaboration and deployment of different grades of script according to rank or degrees of formality in order to set out and punctuate a text is a constant feature of ninth-century books.

Uncial has one of the longest continuous histories of any script type. Its high rank is a recognition of the symbolic, religious and historical associations of the script with the Word of God and the evangelists in the early Gospel Books of the Christian Church. Attitudes towards a particular text were expressed in the rank of script used. Choice of a particular script for a particular text made a statement about the power and associations of the written word itself. Uncial retained a function as a high-ranking script long after even Gospel books themselves ceased to be written in uncial script. It would be useful to know about the fate of uncial in the codices of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, but this is beyond the scope of the present study.\(^{31}\)

Let us turn now to Carolingian uncial. I have no quarrel with Lowe’s description of late uncial. He characterized it as lapidary in style, with broad letters standing firmly on the line and avoiding as much as possible long ascenders and descendents. There is a marked use of serifs, curls and finials which Lowe thought gave the script a ‘holiday’ look.\(^{32}\) He noted too that Carolingian uncial occasionally introduced capital letters. It was the ‘Q’ of the Morgan Golden Gospels in fact, a capital ‘Q’ in an otherwise uncial script, which was one of the features that enabled him to identify the group of books to which it belonged. The Lorsch Gospels are a fine example of the sort of uncial Lowe had in mind, with smooth, rounded letter forms, the characteristic high ‘L’ with the foot carrying a hair line serif, the elegant thin stroke completing the ‘G’, the thin pointed tongue of the ‘A’ and the deep curves of the ‘M’. Thin and thick strokes are clearly differentiated in a flowing rather than rigid manner, and the only letters to disturb the even positioning of the script on the line are the tall ‘L’ and the slight descendents of ‘P’, ‘Q’ and ‘F’.\(^{33}\) We can see classic Carolingian uncial in other examples from the great Carolingian scriptoria, such as the heading in the Utrecht Psalter from Hautvillers near
Rheims, the Vivian Bible from Tours where uncial is used only sparingly and the glorious Moutier Grandval Bible in the British Library, Add. MS. 10546, also from Tours, where Tours uncial is seen to better effect. Metz appears to have developed a very fine form. In the Drogo Sacramentary its elegance is mature and well-balanced and the substitution of capital for uncial ‘T’ gives it a more monumental character. In the uncial from the Franco-Saxon scriptoria, such as St Amand and St Bertin, there is a control and regularity, as well as fineness of the downward strokes, which make this uncial distinguishable from those written further south and east (fig. 2). The ‘A’ is a particularly characteristic letter, with a very sharp and pointed bow, but note too the formation of the ‘G’, whose tail falls straight down with only the suggestion of a curve at the end (unlike the curly flourish on Metz uncial ‘G’). Other distinctive traits are delicate hair lines added to the final strokes of letters such as ‘U’ and ‘N’, the virtual elimination of descenders on ‘Q’ and ‘P’ by means of elevation of the bowl of the letter and the relatively generous spacing between letters. In the Second Bible of Charles the Bald from St Amand (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 2) the strong restraint of the letter forms between two imaginary lines is made explicit, for in many instances (for example, f. 8or) the constraining ruling is clearly visible. In the Porrentruy Gospels from St Bertin there is a strikingly similar elegance and grace.

If one were worried that particular examples of uncial may be in fact the hallmark simply of individual scribes rather than a distinctive house style of high-grade script, it is the consistency in the shapes of the letters in a number of the finest products of the Franco-Saxon school that convinces one that it is possible to differentiate Carolingian uncial according to particular scriptoria and regions. The Franco-Saxon type is expert uncial and the effect is graceful, elegant and distinctive. There is such consistency indeed in the Franco-Saxon uncial script that it looks like a regional style of Carolingian uncial. It appears to have been a type prevailing in the north and north-east of France and in Lotharingia. The earlier Metz examples evidenced in the Drogo Sacramentary are not unrelated, but the uncial produced by the group of scribes working in the Lothar court school, together with the style of initial ornament and the disposition of the text on the page as in Rome Urbinus lat. 3, suggests that the artists and scribes were themselves from the north-east and Lotharingian region and had benefited from its scribal traditions.

Such a suggestion also raises the whole question of the nature of Carolingian patronage and the formation of an atelier. What we know of the organization and members of the Hofschulen of Charles the Bald or Lothar, and the gathering together of craftsmen from different centres and with different training behind them, for example, suggests that we would be foolish even to look for, still less expect, a standardized minuscule, let alone uncial, in terms of the letter forms, even though collectively the scribes and artists responsible may have reached agreement on format and layout of the texts they were copying. Attention so far has been focussed on the painting and decoration of these Hofschule manuscripts. The script of the palace school groups of manuscripts of the mid-ninth century has still not been adequately studied. Nevertheless, it must be said that the
In nomine Domini. In praeceps, cum circulo annium sexagésimo dois, ei modo, et ab ipso tempore in qua est ecclesiae, et duobus diebus festis sancti Dominici, victimae presbyteri et diaconus dicuntur: "Gloria in excelsis deo, et in terra pax hominum. Amen."

products of the Lothar palace school are far less eclectic than those of the palace school of Charles the Bald, and there is a greater similarity in layout and ornamental style in Lothar’s books than is apparent in those belonging to his youngest brother.41

There are five known manuscripts belonging to the Lothar Hofschule group:

- Padua, Biblioteca Capitolare, D 47 Sacramentary
- London, British Library, Add. MS. 37768 (Lothar Psalter)
- Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Urbinus lat. 3
- Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, theol. lat. fol. 3
- Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, theol. lat. fol. 260

In the Berlin Gospels (theol. lat. fol. 260) in particular the uncial is notably refined and elegant. The form of the letter ‘A’ is especially to be remarked (see, for example, f. 122r), where the bow is so pointed as almost to resemble a fine straight line and gives the letter the appearance of a capital ‘A’.42 The fundamental similarity between the uncial of these books is that which one might expect from a group of scribes gathered together working in a small atelier to produce a special group of books for the Emperor, who had diverse scribal training behind them but who already possessed some common links in that all of them appear to have come from the Franco-Saxon and Metz/Lotharingian regions. Where very similar uncial letter forms occur it is more likely to be actually the writing of the same scribe rather than one trained in the same school. One of the scribes of the Urbinus manuscript, for example, is also to be observed in the Berlin Deutsche Staatsbibliothek Gospels. Similarly, one of the scribes in the Berlin Gospels was also responsible for Padua D 47. In other words scribal individuality is retained, but not at the expense of the total harmony of the books.

It is in the context of later ninth-century Carolingian uncial and the work from northeast France and Lotharingia that I wish, finally, to discuss a new Carolingian fragment (figs. 3, 4), for it was only by consideration of the sorts of problems I have outlined so far that I was able to reach any conclusion about its origin. This is a fragment sold by Sotheby’s in 1987 in Monte Carlo, bought by Bernard Quaritch Ltd and now in private possession. It is a parchment leaf of high quality, fairly thin and originally pale, clearly prepared to the highest standards and ruled with great care.43 The text on the verso is in two columns and is spacious in layout with wide margins and no economies to disturb the elegance of the design. The format is unusually small for a Gospel Book (234 x 176 mm.). The ‘L’ is reminiscent of Rheims work of the 820s and 830s, but it more closely resembles Lotharingian work of the next two or three decades.44 The treatment of the finials indeed has its closest parallels in the finials of the initials of the Lothar Psalter, BL, Add. MS. 37768.45 Comparison of this fragment with the court school manuscripts of Lothar suggests that the closest parallels in art historical terms are with the Lothar Psalter. There is also some similarity between the approach to the finials in the Quaritch fragment and that to the finials in Padua D 47. In the Lothar Psalter the approach to the layout of the page, the disposition of the initial, the use of gold in a particular way and the delicate colouring are all reflected in the Quaritch fragment.
Fig. 3. Quaritch fragment, recto; mid-ninth century
Fig. 4. Quaritch fragment, verso; mid-ninth century
But it is the beautiful script of the Quaritch fragment which really establishes its origin. On the recto there are graceful capitals in gold, infilled with luminous green. On the verso, however, are two columns of uncial script of the highest quality and great elegance and beauty, in ink so pale now as to look like gold. It is well-spaced, clear and smooth. The ‘A’ is particularly interesting, in that the bow is so angular and the hair line so straight as to give the letter almost a capital ‘A’ form. ‘D’ is a full tall uncial, and the shafts of ‘F’ and ‘P’ descend a little below the line. ‘H’ has a serif on its shaft and is quite tall. The word *salmon* in the first column, line 22, is rather squashed and in line 2 a later hand has inserted an extra ‘i’. A capital ‘H’ has been inserted in the second column, line 18. Abbreviations are almost absent. Amid the number of individual styles, within the basic elegant type, of the Lothar school group only one seemed to me to be anywhere near that of the Quaritch fragment and that is one of the many scribes responsible for Berlin theol. fol. 260, observable on f. 122r. The Lothar Psalter, BL, Add. MS. 37768, for example, is written throughout in very high quality minuscule in gold, with uncial (and rustic capitals) reserved for the headings. Although this uncial and that of the other members of the group have a certain family likeness, none so closely resembles the uncial of the Quaritch fragment as that of the Berlin Gospels. The script of the Quaritch fragment and that of this Berlin codex seemed to me to be so close as to make it possible to identify the selfsame scribe at work in the two codices. What is more, this scribe’s very distinctive uncial bears a sufficient resemblance to the uncial script type of the Franco-Saxon ateliers to suggest that it was in one of that constellation of scriptoria – St Amand, St Bertin, St Omer, St Vaast – that he was trained.

In other words, this fragment is the precious remnant of a sixth, hitherto unrecorded, member of the Lothar palace school group produced at Aachen in association with the Emperor Lothar between 842 and 855, and can be added to the evidence provided by the British Library’s Lothar Psalter and its fellows in Padua, Rome and Berlin for the quality of the work done for the Emperor Lothar and his family. That such an identification is possible rests on the cumulative effect of the uncial scripts of Carolingian books, of which I have only been able to provide the merest sketch here. Palaeographers cannot afford to neglect the scripts used for display, grand liturgical books, headings and titles. Their historical origins and development need to be investigated as much as the standard book hands. A study of Carolingian uncial suggests that the use and form of the script has more to tell us about attitudes to texts and grades of scripts, and the associations, connections and career patterns of particular scribes than perhaps we have realized hitherto.


11 E. A. Lowe, 'A hand-list of half-uncial manuscripts', in *Miscellanea Francesco Ehrle*, 6 vols. Studi e testi, xxxvii-xlii (Rome, 1924), vol. iv, pp. 34-61. The term 'quarter uncial' was originally meant as a joke on Traube's part in referring to highly cursive forms of half-uncial script such as are to be found in Naples lat. 2 (Vindobon 16), *CLA*, iii, 397a, and was adopted in all seriousness by E. A. Lowe.
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The best discussion of the problem of the emergence and rapid spread of Caroline minuscule so far is David Ganz, op. cit., with full bibliography of earlier discussions, though his criterion of greater ‘legibility’ as a prime reason for the promotion of Caroline minuscule is questionable.


31 A very useful discussion of display scripts in the twelfth-century manuscripts from Zwiefalten demonstrates how a particular scriptorium’s practice may be characterized and how display scripts can reveal distinctive traits enabling them to be located to a particular centre: see Herrad Spilling, ‘Auszeichnungsschriften’, in Sigrid von Borries-Schulten, Die Romanischen Handschriften der Württembergischen Landesbibliothek Stuttgart: 1. Provenienz Zwiefalten, Katalog der Illuminierten Handschriften der Württembergischen Landesbibliothek Stuttgart 2 (Stuttgart, 1987), pp. 35-6. For the most part, however, the higher grades of script in later manuscripts tend to be subsumed into the decoration in the minds of art historians and palaeographers and rarely receive the attention they deserve.


36 For further examples of Tours Carolingian uncial see the plates in E. K. Rand, A Survey of the Manuscripts of Tours, Studies in the Script of Tours 1, The Mediaeval Academy of America Publications No. 3 (Cambridge, Mass., 1929).
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41 On these Hofschule manuscripts, see Wilhelm Koehler and Florentine Mütherich, Karolingische Miniaturen: IV. Die Hofschule Lothars. Einzelhandschriften aus Lothringen and V. Die Hofschule Karls des Kahlens (Berlin, 1982), with an abundance of illustrations.
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44 See, for example, the Ebbo Gospels, Épernay, Bibliothèque Municipale MS. 1, f. 19r, illustrated in Florentine Mütherich and Joachim E. Gaehde, Carolingian Painting (London, 1977), pl. 15, p. 61. Compare also the Franco-Saxon work of the Psalter of King Louis, Berlin, Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Staatsbibliothek theol. lat. fol. 58, ibid., pl. 17, p. 67.
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