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1 The Puzzle

- While TAM (tense-aspect-mood) morphology in Zapotec languages has been broadly
described, both synchronically and diachronically, the semantics of the TAM categories
is less robustly analyzed.
- For example, cognates of the Tlacochahuaya Zapotec verbal prefix $r$- are typically
called “habitual”, although it is generally acknowledged that this prefix serves other
functions.
- Munro & Lopez (1999) say of San Lucas Quiaviní Zapotec -$r$: “Speakers also use this
form to relate a single, non-habitual event or (especially) state.” Smith (2019) describes
a wide variety of uses of the cognate in Mitla Zapotec.
- In Tlacochahuaya Zapotec, it is clear from even early elicitation that this prefix appears
outside of habitual contexts.

(1) $r$- marking the single, closed speaking event
$	extit{chi'ì} \ r$-\textit{als=a=nì} “nan-e’e \ lia \ Seby”
then $R$-\textit{tell=1SG=3SG} woman-$\text{DIM}$ title.$\text{FEM}$ Eusebia

‘then I told him, “[that was] the little lady Eusebia’’ (txt;susto)

(2) $r$- marking an ongoing bodily state
$\textit{Jwany} \ r$-\textit{biz+la’z}
Juan \ $R$-\text{be.thirsty(dry.out+heart)}

‘Juan is thirsty.’ (elic)

- Broadwell (2015) argues that the Proto-Zapotec antecedent of R marked a general
imperfective category, which became more restricted after Central Zapotec innovated
a separate progressive category marked by $ka$. (See Deo 2015 on diachronic pathways
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for the progressive.) Given this analysis, it is particularly interesting to consider how the imperfective space is carved up between $r$- and $ka$- in modern Central Zapotec languages.

- In this presentation, I outline the distribution of the $r$ TAM category in Tlacochahuaya Zapotec and draw comparisons with a description of this category in Mitla Zapotec.
- Based on my findings, I suggest calling Tlacochahuaya Zapotec $r$- the Imperfect, as it has a broad usage that is not adequately described by the term “Habitual”.
- Ultimately, this research calls for further research into cognates of $r$- in related languages, in order to analyze the diachronic development of this morpheme in Central Zapotec.

Figure 1: Map of Oaxacan districts

Source: User:El_bart089 / Wikimedia Commons / GFDL 1.2

2 Language background

- Tlacochahuaya Zapotec is a variety of Tlacolula Valley Zapotec (ISO 639-3 [zab]), a cluster of languages originating in the Tlacolula Valley in the Central Valleys region of Oaxaca, Mexico (Figure 1).
- Each town in the Valley has a distinct variety of Zapotec. Tlacochahuaya Zapotec seems most closely related to San Francisco Lachigoló and San Juan Guelavía (Rendón 1970).
- Tlacochahuaya Zapotec is within the Central Zapotec group (Figure 2). In this presentation will also reference data from San Lucas Quiaviní Zapotec and San Pablo Mitla Zapotec.
- San Jerónimo Tlacochahuaya is a town of about 2,300 residents (2010 census; García García n.d.). The town economy is historically based primarily around agriculture.
Like other indigenous languages of the Americas, Zapotec languages are severely marginalized. As a result of linguistic racism and the resulting socioeconomic pressure, fewer parents teach Zapotec languages to their children.

Language vitality varies significantly from town to town across the Tlacolula Valley. The youngest fluent speaker of Tlacochahuaya Zapotec is in his early 40s. The language is primarily restricted to domestic contexts.

The only modern descriptive work on Tlacochahuaya Zapotec grammar is Rendón's (1970) phonological sketch and my own recent research.²

Language activist Moisés García Guzmán has led some documentation and revitalization projects, including a set of pedagogical YouTube videos (BuZunni 2014) and more recently a series of language classes for both children and adults García Guzmán also tweets in Tlacochahuaya Zapotec (under the handle @BuZunni) and in collaboration with linguists has developed an online Talking Dictionary of the language (Lillehaugen et al. 2019).

²There is description of related Tlacolula Valley languages, most notably San Lucas Quiaviní Zapotec (Chávez Peón 2010; Lillehaugen 2006; Munro & Lopez 1999) and Teotitlán del Valle Zapotec (Gutiérrez Lorenzo 2014; Lowes & Lopez Cruz 2007; Uchihara & Gutiérrez Lorenzo 2016).
Figure 3: Map of the Tlacolula Valley, with Oaxaca de Juárez, San Jerónimo Tlacochahuaya, and Tlacolula de Matamoros marked (García García n.d.)

Figure 4: Areal image of San Jerónimo Tlacochahuaya by Alejandro Osorio
3 Brief grammar sketch

- Unless otherwise noted, Tlacochahuaya Zapotec data in this talk comes from my own fieldwork, and the glosses reflect my current personal understanding of Tlacochahuaya Zapotec grammar.\(^3\)
- My proposed consonant inventory is shown in Figure 5, using the practical orthography which I will use in this paper. Plosives, nasals, and fricatives have a fortis-lenis distinction. Word-final glides surface as highly reduced, voiceless segments.
- The Tlacochahuaya Zapotec vowel inventory is shown in Figure 6. Tlacochahuaya Zapotec has four contrasting phonation types: modal (\(a\)), breathy (\(ah\)), creaky (\(a’\)), and interrupted (\(a’a\)).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plosive</th>
<th>Bilabial</th>
<th>Lab. dent.</th>
<th>Alveolar</th>
<th>P-alveo.</th>
<th>Retroflex</th>
<th>Palatal</th>
<th>Velar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasal</td>
<td>[mm]</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>[mn]</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>[ng]</td>
<td>ng</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fricative</td>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>sh</td>
<td>zh</td>
<td>zh:</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affricate</td>
<td></td>
<td>ts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ch</td>
<td>dh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tap</td>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approx.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>y</td>
<td>w</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lat. appr.</td>
<td>[ll]</td>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5: Tlacochahuaya Zapotec consonant inventory (segments in square brackets are more tentatively phonemic; segments in parentheses are found only in loan words)

![Figure 6: Tlacochahuaya Zapotec vowel inventory](image)

- I choose to not represent tone here, although four tones (high, low, rising, falling) are contrastive in the language.

\(^3\)Sentences are marked as either: elicited (“elic”); constructed by the researcher (“const”); spontaneously produced by a Zapotec speaker during an elicitation session (“spon”); or produced as part of a naturalistic text (“txt”). In the case of constructed data, sentences judged ungrammatical are marked with a star (*). The pound sign (#) marks data judged to be syntactically sound but semantically or pragmatically unusual. Sentences which are of dubious grammaticality are marked with two question marks (??); most of these sentences are cases where my Zapotec teacher told me that the construction was “understandable, but not common”.

Gloss abbreviations: ?? = unknown, 1 = first person, 3 = third person, AGN = agentive, COMP = completive, CTFL = counterfactual, FUT = fut, HAB = habitual, INFORM = informal, PL = plural, POT = potential, PROG = progressive, PROX = proximal, R = SJTZ ‘habitual’ prefix, SG = singular, ST = stative.
• Where I cite data from other sources, the original orthography is maintained.
• Tlacochahuaya Zapotec, like other languages, has canonical VSO word order (with argument fronting in some pragmatic contexts) and is predominantly head-marking. Subject and object pronouns appear as enclitics on the verb.

(3) VSO word order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>bel</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b–yene</th>
<th>bèn</th>
<th>de</th>
<th>leyu</th>
<th>pwes</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b–yene</th>
<th>bèn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>if</td>
<td>already</td>
<td>COMP–keep</td>
<td>person</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>field</td>
<td>well</td>
<td>already</td>
<td>COMP–keep</td>
<td>person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>de</th>
<th>leyu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>field</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘If people kept the fields, well, people kept the fields’ (txt;abasolo)

(4) Subject and object enclitics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>r–ats</th>
<th>=ë</th>
<th>=ni</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R–tell</td>
<td>=1SG</td>
<td>=3SG.INFORM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘I told him’ (txt;susto)

• Sentences are constructed based on the verbal template given in (5). The categorial status of the various elements is unresolved; beyond the TAM-verb stem unit, there is little evidence for a well-defined “word” in Tlacolula Valley Zapotec languages (Gutiérrez Lorenzo et al. 2019). For the purposes of this presentation, I mark TAM and causative morphemes as prefixes, while other elements of the verbal template I mark as clitics.

(5) Tlacochahuaya Zapotec verbal template:

\[
(\text{NEG}) \ (TAM)(\text{CAUS}) \ root \ (ADV)(\text{SUBJ PRO})(\text{OBJ PRO})/
\]

stem

4 Tlacochahuaya Zapotec TAM

• Tlacochahuaya Zapotec has six primary TAM categories, shown in Table 1. (Allo- morphy of these prefixes, in particular the forms of the Completive and the Potential, define nine verb classes of the type outlined by Kaufman 1993/2016; see also Smith-Stark 2002.)
• The glosses I give here are impressionistic; a full semantic description of all of these morphemes is still lacking for Tlacochahuaya Zapotec, or any other Tlacolula Valley Zapotec variety.
• As mentioned above, Broadwell (2015) argues the Progressive ka- is an innovation at the level of Central Zapotec, while r- marks an older imperfective category.
In this presentation, I make an initial attempt to describe the distribution of a single TAM prefix: -r. Cognate morphemes in related languages are usually glossed as “habitual”. Here I gloss it simply as r.

In this paper, I argue that -r is better analyzed as a general imperfective, but it’s precise interaction with different verb roots requires further research.

I acknowledge that any attempt to describe a single TAM category within a whole system is somewhat futile. However, I find this to be a useful exercise in determining avenues for future research in Central Zapotec TAM semantics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My Gloss</th>
<th>Surface-level description</th>
<th>Example: ndyeny ‘come up, rise’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>situation occurs habitually</td>
<td>rnyeny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROG</td>
<td>situation is in progress</td>
<td>kandyeny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP</td>
<td>situation has finished/ended</td>
<td>bndyeny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POT</td>
<td>situation has not yet occurred</td>
<td>indyeny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>situations will definitely occur</td>
<td>zenyeny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTFL</td>
<td>situations was supposed to occur but didn’t/won’t</td>
<td>nyenyeny</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Tlacochahuaya Zapotec TAM prefix inventory

5 Distribution of r-

5.1 Habitual/generic

In early elicitation, r appears most often marking habitual/generic situations, like the one shown in (6).

(6) Bn Zaa r-yan Yabni de bëdguidy
people Zapotec r-feed (type.of.fruit) PL chicken

‘Zapotec people feed yabni fruit to chickens’ (txt;twitter)

The default interpretation of a r-marked sentence is present tense (utterance time ⊆ topic interval). r is also attested in past tense sentences (topic interval < utterance time), but here tense is indicated either by additional context or by an adverbial as in (7b).

(7) a. anre’ rënkë ba r–ba’ay=nu zhub
    now differently now R–plant.AGN=1PL corn.kernel

    ‘Nowadays, we plant corn in a different way.’ (txt;tractor)
    [present context reinforced with adverbial]

4This is consistent with the cross-linguistic generalization that unbounded situations are by default located in the present (see Smith 2008: 231).
b. anski r–ba’ay=nu zhub kon gu’un
previously R–plant.AGN=1PL corn.kernel with bull

‘Previously, we planted corn with bulls.’ (txt;tractor)
[past context indicated with adverbial]

- In my current dataset, R is not attested in future contexts, and in fact is ungrammatical with Potential-marked inceptives like in (8a) (cf. (8b)), while it is acceptable with Completive-marked inceptives, as in (9).

(8) a. *Jwany sulo r–u’uld
Juan POT\start R–sing

(constr)

b. Jwany sulo g–u’uld en tsē minut
Juan POT\start POT–sing in ten minute

‘Juan will start singing in ten minutes’ (constr)

(9) kos lo sinkwent chi b–zulo r–gin sa’a bēny kon bēny
about in 50 when COMP–start R–kill each other person with person

la’ats
Abasolo

‘It was about in the [19]50s when [Tlacochahuaya] people and Abasolo people started killing each other.’ (txt;abasolo)

- This is compatible with previous descriptions of R only marking non-future, realis events in San Pablo Güilá Zapotec (Lopez Cruz 1997) and Isthmus Zapotec (Bueno Holle 2019).

5.2 Narration of in progress events

- R appears with some frequency in narratives marking in progress events, as in (10).\(^5\)

(10) G–U’T I TUBi, SHI TUBi INGULBEZ R–E’–TOO GUIT’UEZ, NEZ
COMP–?? one day one opossum R–go–eat chilacayota road/in?

LOO’NIA
field?

‘There was a day, an opossum was going to eat chilacayota in the fields’ (txt;tlacuache)
Original translation: ‘Hubo un dia, un tlacuache iba a comer chilacayota, por el campo,’

\(^5\)The “tlacuache” text was presented to me (in written form) by one of my teachers in 2018. It was reportedly transcribed a few decades previously by a maestro who I believe was Juan José Rendón. The original orthography is preserved here, but glosses and English translations are my own.
Two tweets from @BnZunni, shown in (11), indicate that R alternates with the Progressive ka- in these narratives context.\(^6\)

\[(11)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
a. & \quad \text{Ba } r\text{-zulo } r\text{-du’nilo } be’ \quad \text{nagats la’n } \text{Danyadoo} \\
& \quad \text{now } R\text{-begin } R\text{-emerge mushroom yellow in mountain}
\end{align*}
\]
\[\text{‘Yellow mushrooms are beginning to sprout in the mountains.’ (tweet)}\]

\[
b. & \quad \text{ba } c\text{-zulo } c\text{-dop } beld \quad Be’ \quad xnia \quad la’n \quad Gëch \\
& \quad \text{now } \text{PROG-begin } \text{PROG-be.gathered? } ? \quad \text{mushroom red in town}
\]
\[\text{Dani mountain} \]
\[\text{‘[It hasn’t rained well this year, but] some Red Mushroom are now being gathered in The Northern Sierra.’ (tweet)}\]

5.3 Verbs introducing direct quotes

• In my text corpus, the verb ats ‘tell’ always occurs with R when relating direct quotations, as shown in (12) and (13).

\[(12)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{chi’i } \quad & \quad r\text{-ats=a=ni} \quad “\text{nan-e’e lia Seby }” \\
& \quad \text{then } R\text{-tell=1SG=3SG woman-DIM title.FEM Eusebia}
\end{align*}
\]
\[\text{‘then I told him, “[that was] the little lady Eusebia”’ (txt; susto)}\]

\[(13)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
tub=z\text{i} \quad & \quad \text{geht } \text{xtily } b\text{-zene } baly \quad \text{chiru } \quad r\text{-ats=ni} \\
& \quad \text{one=only tortilla Castilian COMP-bring? compadre then } R\text{-tell=3SG}
\end{align*}
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
& \quad \text{mbali “per nare wania tuby kanazh geht xtily ”} \\
& \quad \text{compadre but 1SG COMP-give?=1SG one basket tortilla Castilian}
\end{align*}
\]
\[\text{‘The compadre brought only one loaf of bread. Then she told the compadre “but I took [you] a basket of bread!”’ (txt;40pesos)}\]

• This is consistent with Munro & Lopez’s (1999) analysis of the San Lucas Quiaviní Zapotec verb re’ihpy ‘tells (someone); asks (someone)’, which they note has no Perfective (COMP) form. As shown in (14), Quiaviní Zapotec R is used in a past tense, perfective scenario.\(^7\)

\[\text{6I preserve the original orthography @BnZunni used in his tweets, but make minor modifications to the translation where necessary for clarity. The glosses are my own.}\]
\[\text{7Orthography and translation in (14) are from Munro & Lopez (1999); glosses are my own, based on my understanding of San Lucas Quiaviní Zapotec grammar.}\]
5.4 **Continuative of certain statives**

- In general, during elicitation, in progress/continuative situations are translated with either *ka-* (for events) or *na-* (for a small subset of stative verbs).
- Some stative situations, however, are consistently translated with *r*. (These examples differ from those in 5.2, where marking the verb with *r* is presented as optional.)
- This subset of verbs includes a variety of stative meanings, including cognitive/attitudinal states (15), bodily states/sensations (16), and some situations I categorize as “non-agentive activities” (17).

(15) Cognitive/attitudinal states

a. \[ r-\text{ilu}=a \quad \text{Jwany} \quad i-\text{nda’a} \quad \text{gehll} \quad \text{zhi} \]
   \[ \text{R-think}=1\text{SG} \quad \text{Juan} \quad \text{POT-harvest tomorrow} \]
   ‘I think Juan will harvest corn tomorrow’ (elic)

b. \[ nare’ \quad r-\text{ka’z}=a \quad \text{Jwany} \quad i-\text{nda’a} \quad \text{gehll} \quad xten=a \]
   \[1\text{SG} \quad \text{R-want}=1\text{SG} \quad \text{Juan} \quad \text{POT-harvest corn of}=1\text{SG} \]
   ‘I want Juan to harvest my corn.’ (elic)

(16) Bodily states/sensations

a. \[ r-\text{ndyen}y \quad \text{be’ekw} \]
   \[ \text{R-be.hungry dog} \]
   ‘The dog is hungry.’ (elic)

b. \[ \text{Jwany} \quad r-\text{biz+la’z} \]
   \[ \text{Juan} \quad \text{R-be.thirsty(dry.out+heart)} \]
   ‘Juan is thirsty.’ (elic)

c. \[ \text{Jwany} \quad r-\text{ak} \quad x:u \]
   \[ \text{Juan} \quad \text{R-be sick} \]
   ‘Juan is sick.’ (elic)

(17) Non-agentive activities
a. \textbf{r–a'asy} \textit{bdo}  \\
\textit{r–sleep} \textit{baby}  \\
‘The baby is sleeping’ (elic)

b. \textbf{r–u+bi+kia} \textit{bëny}  \\
\textit{r–snore(do+sound+head)} \textit{person}  \\
‘The man is snoring’ (elic)

(18) *\textbf{kay-a'asy} \textit{bdo}  \\
\textit{PROG–sleep} \textit{baby}

- However, while all cognitive/attitudinal verbs seem to take \textbf{r} for a continuative, some bodily states (19–20) and some non-agentive activities (21) take \textbf{ka-} to mark the continuative instead.

(19) Bodily states/sensations with \textbf{ka}-marked continuative

a. \textit{Jwany} \textbf{ka–dzhag}  \\
Juan \textit{PROG–be.tired}  \\
‘Juan is tired [right now].’ (spon)

b. \textit{Jwany} \textbf{r–dzhag}  \\
Juan \textit{R–be.tired}  \\
‘Juan is [always] tired.’ (elic)  \\
cf. \textit{ndyen} ‘be hungry’ in (16a)

(20) Bodily states/sensations with \textbf{ka}-marked continuative

a. \textit{Jwany} \textbf{ka–zu} \textit{zhu}  \\
Juan \textit{PROG–suffer} \textit{sickness}  \\
‘Juan is sick [right now].’ (spon)

b. \textit{dubte’} \textbf{r–zu} \textit{zhu} \textit{Maria}  \\
always \textit{R–suffer} \textit{sickness} \textit{Maria}  \\
‘Maria is always sick.’ (spon)  \\
cf. \textit{ak x:u} ‘be sick’ in (16c)

(21) Non-agentive activities with \textbf{ka}-marked continuative

a. \textbf{ka–ga} \textit{pxit} \textit{gëdzh}  \\
\textit{PROG–expand} \textit{tangled} \textit{maguey.fiber}  \\
‘The maguey spongue is expanding.’ (elic)
b. \textit{ka-yo} lay bdo
\hspace{1cm} PROG–shiver tooth baby

‘The child’s teeth are chattering.’ (elic)

- It’s unclear to me at this point whether these verbs which take a \textit{r}-progressive form a synchronic semantic class, or whether they are a remnant of some historical distinction.

\section{Comparison with Mitla Zapotec}

- The most thorough semantic treatment of \textit{r} in a Central Zapotec language, to my knowledge is \cite{Smith2019}, which looks specifically at uses of \textit{r} in narrative.
- As shown in (22), the Mitla Zapotec Habitual may be used in narratives: (a) as a general continuative; (b) to introduce direct speech; and (c) to denote a single (non-habitual) action.
- Smith concludes that Mitla Zapotec \textit{r} retains the more general imperfective semantics from the Proto-Zapotec, despite the existence of a separate Continuative \textit{ka-}.

\begin{verbatim}(22) Semantic range of the Mitla Zapotec Habitual (Smith 2019; emphasis added)
a. \textit{r-ol-k-a} kuyo t n-aga \textit{r-bihš=ni} \textit{r-tehB=ni} aga =ni
\hspace{1cm} HAB–scream–also coyote ST–lie HAB–turn=3SG HAB–fall=3SG lie=3SG
\hspace{1cm} ‘Screaming, that coyote was lying, turning, throwing (himself) down, lying’
b. \textit{a–bikes=ä} gid \textit{r–ähp=ni}
\hspace{1cm} already–sick=1SG chicken HAB–say=3SG
\hspace{1cm} ‘I’m tired of chicken” he said’
c. \textit{r–sloh} \textit{re–man} \textit{r–yejhY} sas \textit{r–yačjisak=ni}
\hspace{1cm} HAB–begin PL–animal HAB–make.noise and HAB–be.quiet=3SG
\hspace{1cm} ‘Those animals began to make noise, then it was all quiet again.’
\end{verbatim}

- Uses (a) and (b) fall neatly in line with the uses of Tlacochahuaya Zapotec \textit{r} that I describe in 5.2 and 5.3.
- The use of \textit{r} in (c), to mark a single, perfective event, is not attested in my Tlacochahuaya Zapotec dataset.
- As Mitla Zapotec is quite distant from Tlacochahuaya Zapotec (within the Central branch), the significant overlap the use of \textit{r} indicates that this category might have general imperfective semantics in many other Central Zapotec languages.

\section{Conclusions}

- I propose that the TAM prefix \textit{r-} Tlacochahuaya Zapotec, and possibly other related languages, marks a quite general imperfective category; I tentatively suggest that this prefix should be glossed as “Imperfect” rather than “Habitual” in order prevent misconceptions.
• This study is a first step in my larger research program to describe the semantics of the Tlacochahuaya Zapotec TAM system as a whole. The breadth of the range of this single marker demonstrates the dangers of relying on a surface-level description of TAM categories.
• Finally, I call for further research on cognates of r- in related languages, and in particular a description of how r- and ka- work together to carve up the imperfective space. This would facilitate valuable research on the diachronic development of imperfective TAM categories.
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