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Empirical observation

Person features show an asymmetry in their diachronic development:

- in personal pronouns and possessives forms, person features tend to be stable, i.e. pronominal and possessive paradigms show diachronically comparable partitions;
- in demonstrative forms, person features can undergo a reorganisation which leads to diachronically different partitions.
Pronouns & possessives vs demonstratives I

Personal pronouns (1) & possessives (2): no featural reorganisation → in Romance: stably ternary = they contrastively encode three persons.

(1) a. Personal pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Latin > Galician (Dubert & Galves 2016, 420)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>ego</th>
<th>tu</th>
<th>(ille)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Galician</td>
<td>eu</td>
<td>ti</td>
<td>el</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) a. Possessives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before</th>
<th>1.POSS</th>
<th>2.POSS</th>
<th>3.POSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>1.POSS</td>
<td>2.POSS</td>
<td>3.POSS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Latin > Italian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>meus</th>
<th>tuus</th>
<th>suus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>mio</td>
<td>tuo</td>
<td>suo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galician</td>
<td>eu</td>
<td>ti</td>
<td>el</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demonstrative systems: featural reorganisation → in Romance: original ternary systems frequently evolve into participant-based (3) or into speaker-based binary systems (4):

3) a. Demonstratives (participant-based)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before</th>
<th>near 1</th>
<th>near 2</th>
<th>far from 1/2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>near 1/2</td>
<td>far from 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Catalan (Ledgeway & Smith 2016, 886, 892)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat/1</th>
<th>aquest</th>
<th>aqueix</th>
<th>aquell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cat/2</td>
<td>aquest</td>
<td>aquell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) a. Demonstratives (speaker-based)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before</th>
<th>near 1</th>
<th>near 2</th>
<th>far from 1/2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>near 1</td>
<td>far from 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Rioplatense Spanish (A. Saab, p.c.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RS/1</th>
<th>este</th>
<th>ese</th>
<th>aquel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RS/2</td>
<td>este</td>
<td>ese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposal

The diachronic asymmetry can be derived *structurally*, via the architecture of person features in indexical forms.

**Main ingredients:**

- Harbour (2016)’s person system;
- derivations for the different person indexicals;
- Polinsky (2018)’s intuition that stability is linked to structural salience.

→ Person features are only structurally salient in personal pronouns and in the indexical part of possessives (stable), but not in the indexical part of demonstratives (unstable).
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Disclaimers

- **Semantics of person**, not its morphological exponents: person paradigms do show morphological change (e.g. loss of number and gender features, lexical variation).

- Main focus: forms in which **person features are interpretable and valued**, i.e. excluding all agreement forms.

- Empirical domain:
  - **diachrony** = Romance data (Jungbluth & Da Milano 2015 and Ledgeway & Maiden 2016; cf. there for full overviews);
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Personal pronouns: Diachrony and contact I

Personal pronouns in Romance languages retained the ternary partition of deictic space from Latin → no featural reorganisation:

\[(5) \text{ Personal pronouns in diachrony (32/32)}\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>After</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Personal pronouns: Diachrony and contact I

Personal pronouns in Romance languages retained the ternary partition of deictic space from Latin → no featural reorganisation:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Before} & 1 & 2 & 3 \\
\text{After} & 1 & 2 & 3
\end{array}
\]

Personal pronouns in pidgins/creoles mostly retain their major lexifiers’ partitions [\textit{APiCS} 15, revised] → no reorganisation, but for:

- **6/74 varieties**: different values for clusivity (5 lost, 1 acquired).
- (3/74: compositional clusivity; 8/74: person syncretism [\textit{APiCS} 16]).

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Before} & 1 & 2 & 3 \\
\text{After} & 1 & 2 & 3
\end{array}
\]
Wider typological investigation: Nichols 1992:

- the inclusive/exclusive opposition is very **stable genetically** (and slightly less so areally);
- only attested examples of **instability** = linked to **contact** (cf. also Siewierska 2004, 7.3 & references therein):
  - tripartition > quadripartition: Central Khoisan < Southern Khoisan; Numic & Washo < Penutian; Kwaza < Tupi-Guarani; Gujarati, Marathi & Sindhi < Dravidian Ls; Aneêm < Austronesian Ls; Gimira, Amaaro & Dasenech (Ethiopian Omotic-Cushitic) < Nilo-Saharan Ls;
  - quadripartition > tripartition: Warlpiri (younger speakers).
Personal pronouns: Generalisations

The indexical value of personal pronouns:

- is stable in diachrony and
- tends to be remarkably stable in contact situations (limited examples of switches between tri- and quadripartitions, but no reduction is attested).
Cf. Harbour 2016, with minor revisions.

- **Ontology** (i.e. discourse-related atoms): speaker = $i$, hearer = $u$, other = $o$.
- Accessed by the grammar *via* two binary features, $[\pm A]$ and $[\pm P]$, that can (successively) apply to the categorial head $\pi$:
  - **categorial head**: $[[\pi]] = \{i_o, iu_o, u_o, o_o\}$
  - **two features**:
    a. $[[\text{Author}]] = \{i\} \rightarrow [A]$
    b. $[[\text{Participant}]] = \{i, iu, u\} \rightarrow [P]$
  - each feature must have either of **two values**:
    a. $+$ (action: disjoint addition)
    b. $-$ (action: joint subtraction)
Personal pronouns: Derivation

The two features can (successively) compose with $\pi$, to partition it:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
(+\text{Participant}(\pi)) \\
(+\text{Author}(\pi)) \\
(+\text{Part}(+\text{Auth}(\pi))) \\
(+\text{A}(+\text{P}(\pi))) \\
(+\text{A}(-\text{P}(\pi)))
\end{array}
\quad\quad\quad
\begin{array}{c}
\pi \\
(-\text{Participant}(\pi)) \\
(-\text{Author}(\pi)) \\
(-\text{Part}(\text{Auth}(\pi))) \\
(-\text{Part}(\pm\text{Auth}(\pi))) \\
(-\text{Auth}(\text{Part}(\pi))) \\
(-\text{Auth}(-\text{Part}(\pi)))
\end{array}
\]

(Unary)
(Binary/P)
(Binary/A)
(Ternary)
(Quatern.)
Personal pronouns: Derivation

The two features can (successively) compose with $\pi$, to partition it:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
(+\text{Participant}(\pi)) & \pi & (-\text{Participant}(\pi)) \\
(+\text{Author}(\pi)) & (-\text{Author}(\pi)) \\
(+\text{Part}(+\text{Auth}(\pi))) & (+\text{Part}(-\text{Auth}(\pi))) & (-\text{Part}(\pm\text{Auth}(\pi))) \\
(+A(-P(\pi))) & (+A(+P(\pi))) & (-\text{Auth}(+\text{Part}(\pi))) & (-\text{Auth}(-\text{Part}(\pi))) \\
\end{array}
\]

(Unary) (Binary/P) (Binary/A) (Ternary) (Quatern.)

Pronouns: Generalisations:

- ✓ no reductions to bi-/monopartitions $\rightarrow$ personal pronouns derived directly by the successive composition of both person features with $\pi$;

- ✓ tri- $\rightarrow$ quadripartitions, or quadri- $\rightarrow$ tripartitions $\rightarrow$ changes in the composition ordering.
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Possessives: Diachrony and contact

Possessive forms in Romance languages retained the ternary partition of deictic space from Latin → no featural reorganisation:

(7) Possessive forms in diachrony (23/23)

|--------|--------|--------|--------|

- **Analytic possessives** = P+pronoun (PPs): available, but restricted.
Possessives: Diachrony and contact

Possessive forms in Romance languages retained the ternary partition of deictic space from Latin → no featural reorganisation:

(7) Possessive forms in diachrony (23/23)

|--------|--------|--------|--------|

- **Analytic possessives** = P+pronoun (PPs): available, but restricted.

Possessive forms in pidgins/creoles tend to retain the major lexifiers’ deictic structure (cf. personal pronouns) [APiCS 37, revisited]:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possessive adjectives (APiCS: 76 varieties)</th>
<th>Only</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Tot.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Unmarked personal pron. [type: <em>mi</em> ‘my’, Beliz. C.]</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. P+pronoun (analytic) [type: <em>fu mi</em> ‘my’, Beliz. C.]</td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Possessives: Generalisations

- The indexical value of possessive forms does not typically undergo diachronic or contact-induced change (cf. personal pronouns)
  \[\to\text{ derive it like personal pronouns = via composition of } [\pm A] \text{ and } [\pm P] \text{ with } \pi.\]
- Morphological variation (\(\neq\) personal pronouns): pronominal possessors can be expressed as:
  - PPs (P+personal pronoun), type: fu mi;
  - synthetic (genitive) forms, type: ma;
  - unmarked personal pronoun, type: mi.
Possessives: Derivation

The indexical base of possessives is an inherently Case-marked personal pronoun (reversing Caha (2009)’s rationale).

- Indexical base derived as personal pronouns → diachronic symmetry.
- Inherent Case: underlyingly construed as a PP (Řezáč 2008).

→ Indexical base of possessives = PP (P+pronoun):
  - spelled out as such: P+pronoun (analytic), type: fu *mi*;
  - spelled out synthetically: genitive possessive forms (synthetic; & possibly DP-internal agreement slot), type: *ma*;
  - spelled out synthetically + syncretism: unmarked personal pronouns, type: *mi*.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
PP \ P (+Part(+Auth(\pi))) & PP \ P (+Part(-Auth(\pi))) & PP \ P (-Part(\pm Auth(\pi))) \\
PP \ P (+A(-P(\pi))) & PP \ P (+A(+P(\pi))) & PP \ P (-Auth(+Part(\pi))) & PP \ P (-Auth(-Part(\pi)))
\end{array}
\]
Roadmap

- Person indexicals
  Personal pronouns
  Possessives
  Demonstratives

- (In)stability: A structural account
Demonstratives

Exophoric demonstratives → locate objects/areas in the external world w.r.t. deictic centre.

According to the deictic centre(s) involved:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Hearer</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>speaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speaker</td>
<td>hearer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speaker</td>
<td>hearer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

→ Binary system, speaker-oriented
→ Binary system, participant-oriented
→ Ternary system

Assumptions:
- discourse participants as deictic centres: demonstratives systems are primarily defined by person features;
- demonstratives express a spatial relation to person, rather than person.
Demonstratives: Diachrony

Some Romance ternary demonstrative systems evolved into participant-based (8) or speaker-based binary systems (9):

(8) Participant-based binary dems (53/239) [45/153 nom.; 8/86 adv.]
e.g. Tarantino (demonstrative adj., Ledgeway & Smith 2016, 886)

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|}
\text{Tar/1} & \text{sto [near 1]} & \text{SSO [near 2]} & \text{quid [far from 1/2]} \\
\text{Tar/2} & \text{sto [near 1/2]} & \text{quid [far from 1/2]} \\
\end{array}
\]

(9) Speaker-based binary dems (72/239) [37/153 nom.; 35/86 adv.]
e.g. Occitan (demonstrative adv., Ledgeway & Smith 2016, 895)

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|}
\text{Occ/1} & \text{aicí [near 1]} & \text{aquí [near 2]} & \text{alai [far from 1/2]} \\
\text{Occ/2} & \text{aicí [near 1]} & \text{aquí [far from 1]} \\
\end{array}
\]

Instability of the hearer-related domain:

- binary/P same exponent as the speaker-related one;
- binary/A no longer consistently referred to by only one form.
Demonstratives: Contact

The demonstrative systems of pidgins’/creoles’ major lexifiers show different patterns of evolution [APiCS 33, revisited]:

**Nominal demonstratives**, 73 contact varieties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major lexifier type</th>
<th>Same contrasts</th>
<th>More contrasts</th>
<th>Fewer contrasts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(one per contact variety)</td>
<td>(n=46)</td>
<td>(n=3)</td>
<td>(n=24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-way contrast (n=26)</td>
<td>5 [19.23%]</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>21 [80.77%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-way contrast (n=38)</td>
<td>32 [84.21%]</td>
<td>3 [7.89%]</td>
<td>3 [7.89%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No contrast (n=9)</td>
<td>9 [100%]</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Adverbial demonstratives**, 61 contact varieties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major lexifier type</th>
<th>Same contrasts</th>
<th>More contrasts</th>
<th>Fewer contrasts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(one per contact variety)</td>
<td>(n=39)</td>
<td>(n=2)</td>
<td>(n=20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-way contrast (n=24)</td>
<td>4 [16.67%]</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>20 [83.33%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-way contrast (n=37)</td>
<td>34 [91.89%]</td>
<td>2 [5.41%]</td>
<td>1 [2.70%]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

→ Ternary > speaker-based binary systems.
Demonstratives: Generalisations

Contrary to personal pronouns and possessives, demonstrative forms can show a reduction of person features:

- reduction of ternary systems to (mostly) binary ones, \textit{vs} stability of binary and unary systems;
- instability of the hearer-related domain.
Indexical part of demonstratives: **two-step** functional application of person features to $\pi$:

1. a space function, $\chi$, applies to $\pi$: define the discourse space;
2. $[\pm A]/[\pm P]$ can apply to the result of $\chi(\pi)$: yield a subregion.

→ Cf. Svenonius 2006 *seqq.* for **spatial Ps** with AxPartP and Zwarts 1997 *seqq.* for vectors.
Demonstratives: Derivation II

‘This/here’ = (x)/PLACE near i in the space of \( \pi \).

\[
\pi P
\]

\( \pi = \{i, iu, u, o\}: \) ground

\( \pi P \)
Demonstratives: Derivation II

‘This/her’ = (x)/PLACE near i in the space of π.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\chi_P \\
\pi_P
\end{array}
\]

\[
f: \pi P \text{ denotation} \mapsto \text{region} = \pi \chi
\]

\[
\pi = \{i, iu, u, o\}: \text{ground}
\]
Demonstratives: Derivation II

‘This/here’ = (x)/PLACE near i in the space of π.

\[
f: \text{region} \mapsto \text{subregion} = \pi_{\chi_F^+} \\
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\chiP & \\
\piP & = \{i, iu, u, o\}: \text{ground}
\end{align*}
\]

Full featural schema:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Near 1</th>
<th>Far from 1</th>
<th>Near 1/2</th>
<th>Far from 1/2</th>
<th>Near 1</th>
<th>Far from 1/2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(+A(\chi(\pi)))</td>
<td>(P(\chi(\pi)))</td>
<td>(+P(+A(\chi(\pi))))</td>
<td>(+P(-A(\chi(\pi))))</td>
<td>(+P(\pm A(\chi(\pi))))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demonstratives: Derivation II

‘This/her’ = (x)/PLACE near \( i \) in the space of \( \pi \).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{f: (sub)region } & \mapsto \text{vector} \\
\text{f: region } & \mapsto \text{subregion } = \pi_{\chi \pm F} \\
\text{f: } \pi P \text{ denotation } & \mapsto \text{region } = \pi_{\chi}
\end{align*}
\]

Full featural schema:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{near 1} & \quad \text{far from 1} & = & \quad (+A(\chi(\pi))) & \quad (-A(\chi(\pi))) \\
\text{near 1/2} & \quad \text{far from 1/2} & = & \quad (+P(\chi(\pi))) & \quad (-P(\chi(\pi))) \\
\text{near 1} & \quad \text{near 2} & \quad \text{far from 1/2} & = & \quad (+P (+A(\chi(\pi)))) & \quad (+P (-A(\chi(\pi)))) & \quad (+P (\pm A(\chi(\pi))))
\end{align*}
\]
Roadmap

- **Person indexicals**
  - Personal pronouns
  - Possessives
  - Demonstratives

- **(In)stability: A structural account**
Proposal

Recap:

- Personal pronouns = \((\pm F(\pi))\) (cf. Harbour 2016);
- indexical base of possessive forms = \([_{PP} P (\pm F(\pi))]\);
- indexical base of demonstrative forms = \((\pm F(\chi(\pi)))\).

→ Evidence: agreement facts (no agreement with person (number, gender) features in the indexical base of possessives & demonstratives).

Diachronic asymmetry: person features = stable in personal pronouns & possessives vs unstable in demonstrative forms.

- Proposal: (in)stability ↔ structural salience.
  
  The most salient (→ stable) feature is the first to compose with the root of its functional sequence.
Stability and structural salience

Link inspired by Polinsky (2018, 63-65): heritage speakers:

✓ retain elements at the top of the relevant domains (‘salient’)
✗ lose elements that occupy lower projections (‘non-salient’) in the same domains.

• Elements at the top are typically indexical (idea: indexicality contributes to the salience of linguistic elements).
• Structural formalisation: “sensitivity to the topmost projection of a domain” (Polinsky 2018, 63).
Stability and structural salience

Link inspired by Polinsky (2018, 63-65): heritage speakers:

✓ retain elements at the top of the relevant domains (‘salient’)
× lose elements that occupy lower projections (‘non-salient’) in the same domains.

- Elements at the top are typically **indexical** (idea: indexicality contributes to the salience of linguistic elements).
- Structural formalisation: “sensitivity to the topmost projection of a domain” (Polinsky 2018, 63).

→ Claim revisited here: **a feature is salient if it is the first to apply to the root of its functional sequence.**
Personal pronouns and possessives

Personal pronouns and the indexical base of possessive forms are **straightforwardly** derived by the composition of the person features with $\pi$.

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
(+Part(+Auth(\pi))) & (+Part(-Auth(\pi))) & (-Part(\pm Auth(\pi))) \\
(+A(-P(\pi))) & (+A(+P(\pi))) & (-Auth(+Part(\pi))) & (-Auth(-Part(\pi))) \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
[pp \ P (+Part(+Auth(\pi)))] & [pp \ P (+Part(-Auth(\pi)))] & [pp \ P (-Part(\pm Auth(\pi)))] \\
[pp \ P (+A(-P(\pi)))] & [pp \ P (+A(+P(\pi)))] & [pp \ P (-Auth(+Part(\pi)))] & [pp \ P (-Auth(-Part(\pi)))] \\
\end{array}
\]

(10) $(\pm F(\pi))$

→ **Salient:** $\pi$’s featural content is **stable**/less prone to change.
Demonstratives

The indexical base of demonstrative forms is derived by a two-step functional application:

- person features (can) apply to $\pi$ only after $\chi$ has applied to it (region $\rightarrow$ sub-region).

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
(+A(\chi(\pi))) & (-A(\chi(\pi))) \\
(+P(\chi(\pi))) & (-P(\chi(\pi))) \\
(+P(+A(\chi(\pi)))) & (+P(-A(\chi(\pi)))) & (+P(\pm A(\chi(\pi))))
\end{array}
\]

(11) $(\pm F (\chi (\pi)))$

$\rightarrow$ Person features in demonstrative forms are not the first to compose with $\pi$, i.e. not structurally salient $\rightarrow$ $\pi$’s person featural content is unstable/more prone to change.
Implementation

Due to the increase in complexity (recursion of compositions), one (or more) **non-salient feature(s)** can be **delinked** from their functional sequence.

- In **ternary** demonstrative systems, one (or more) person features can be delinked from the \((\chi(\pi))\) sequence.
- However, those features are still available in the person pronominal and possessive systems of the same language, where they directly compose with \(\pi\).
  - Principled explanation for the asymmetry.
  - Delinked features are still available: they can be re-linked.
Where and how

✓ Structural considerations define where change can happen → demonstratives, rather than personal pronouns and possessives.

But how? Formal markedness can partially predict the reorganisation patterns.

• Recall the generalisations on change:
  – ternary systems are the most unstable ones ↔ how many active features?
  – the hearer-related domain is the most unstable one ↔ uniform or non-uniform feature values?
Conclusions

- Diachronic asymmetry: person features in personal pronouns and possessives vs demonstratives:
  - diachronic and contact data;
  - derivation of person indexicals:
    i. personal pronouns = (±F(π)) (cf. Harbour 2016);
    ii. indexical base of possessive forms = [PP P (±F(π))];
    iii. indexical base of demonstrative forms = (±F(χ(π))).
Conclusions

• Diachronic asymmetry: person features in personal pronouns and possessives vs demonstratives:
  – diachronic and contact data;
  – derivation of person indexicals:
    i. personal pronouns = (±F(π)) (cf. Harbour 2016);
    ii. indexical base of possessive forms = [PP P (±F(π))];
    iii. indexical base of demonstrative forms = (±F(χ(π))).

• Structure and salience (first merge) & salience and stability (cf. Polinsky 2018) → person features in personal pronouns and possessives are structurally salient = stable; vs in demonstratives are not structurally salient = unstable (possibly delinked from the (χ(π)) functional sequence).
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