Abstract

This study is concerned with the strategies for reporting speech in contemporary Russian. It analyses the salient features of direct and indirect speech report constructions and examines the shifts that accompany the transformation of a direct speech report construction into its corresponding indirect construction. It demonstrates that while most speech report constructions in Russian are multicausal, monocausal constructions using evidentials are also possible and that a speech report continuum exists where some constructions display features of both direct and indirect speech reports.

1. Typological profile

Russian is an Indo-European language that belongs to the Eastern branch of Slavic (along with Belorussian and Ukrainian). All three languages use the Cyrillic alphabet with variations for each language. Much of the abstract vocabulary of Russian and some grammatical forms are derived from Church Slavonic, a South Slavic language that was first codified in the ninth century. Russian has a highly developed system of inflectional morphology. There are six cases in the nominal morphology, with vestiges of a seventh (the vocative), and two aspects (imperfective and perfective) and three tenses in the verbal morphology. There are no definite or indefinite determiners. Word-formation makes use of a complex array of affixes, especially suffixes. In terms of the typology of the Slavic languages Russian may be considered to be peripheral, like Bulgarian and Czech, showing significant features not shared by any other Slavic language (for example, absence of a high-frequency lexeme corresponding to ‘to have’ in English). Syntactic constructions in Russian generally show dependency marking. It has AVO/SV constituent order, though in direct speech
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report constructions, where the complement comes before the reporting verb, partially or fully, the order in the clause containing the reporting verb is VS. (See (5) and (6) below.) Order is relatively free in comparison to English. Compare the following sentences:¹

(1) (a) Анна любит Бориса.  
   Anna-nom love-3sg.pres Boris-acc  
   ‘Anna loves Boris.’

(b) Бориса любит Анна.  
   Boris-acc love-3sg.pres Anna-nom  
   ‘It’s Boris Anna loves.’

Russian has complement clauses of different types: some contain a complementiser and finite verb form, others just an infinitive as predicate. In some cases both types are possible. See (13a–b) below. By comparison with English, Russian has a diverse set of complementisers. In Russian different complementisers can serve to draw semantic distinctions that in English are conveyed by using different verbs or different constructions. Compare the two following sentences: only the complementisers are distinct (как versus что).

(2) (a) Мать не заметила как сын ушел.  
   (Švedova 1970, 704)  
   mat’a ne-neg zameti-la TRANS PRES kak syns  
   mother-sg.nom.fem not notice-sg.fem.past how son-sg.nom.masc  
   use-la INTR  
   leave-sg.masc.past  
   ‘The mother didn’t notice her son leave.’

(b) Мать не заметила, что сын ушел.  
   mat’a ne-neg zameti-la TRANS cto syns  
   mother-sg.nom.fem not notice-sg.fem.past that son-sg.nom.masc  
   use-la INTR  
   leave-sg.masc.past  
   ‘The mother didn’t notice that her son had left.’

¹ Abbreviations:  A: transitive subject; acc: accusative; ADV: adverb; CC: copula complement; comp: comparative; COP: copula; CS: copula subject; dat: dative; fem: feminine; fut: future; gen: genitive; imp: imperative; inf: infinitive; instr: instrumental; INTR: intransitive; loc: locative; masc: masculine; NEG: negative; neut: neuter; nom: nominative; O: transitive object; OBJ: object; PARENTH: parenthetic; PERI: peripheral; PRED: predicate; pres: present; s: intransitive subject; subj: subjunctive; TRANS: transitive; V: verb.
2. Speech report constructions

2.1. Introduction

Like English and many other languages, Russian draws a formal distinction between direct and indirect speech reports. Direct speech is termed прямая речь 'indirect speech косвенная речь'. (The adjective прямой also translates as ‘straight’, ‘right’: прямой угол 'right angle', прямая линия 'straight line'; косвенный translates as ‘oblique’: косвенный падеж ‘oblique case’.) The typical indirect speech report construction that corresponds to a simple declarative sentence in the direct speech complement is multiclausal consisting of a reporting verb and a complement clause introduced by the complementiser что ('that'). Unlike English, Russian makes use of other complementisers to express supposition and doubt. At the same time Russian provides evidence of a speech report continuum with some speech report constructions showing features of both direct and indirect speech. Note that in a direct speech report construction in Russian the direct speech complement is usually indicated in the written language by an initial dash, not by quotation marks. (Quotation marks indicate a direct speech report within direct speech.)

2.2. Direct speech report constructions

The typical direct speech report construction in Russian attempts a verbatim report and consists of a direct speech complement and reporting verb. The position of the complement in relation to the reporting verb can vary with implications for constituent order. Consider the following two typical examples of a direct speech report construction.

(3) Иногда она спрашивала меня: — Что вы читаете? (Gor’kij, Pul’kina et al. 1968, 592)

\[
\text{иногда спрашивала меня: — Что вы читаете?}
\]

\[
\text{иногда спрашивала меня: — Что вы читаете?}
\]

Sometimes she would ask me, “What are you reading?”

(4) Студент сказал: — Завтра будет экзамен. (Acta Linguistica Hungarica 52, 2005)

\[
\text{студент сказала: — Завтра будет экзамен.}
\]

\[
\text{студент сказала: — Завтра будет экзамен.}
\]

The student said: “There’ll be an exam tomorrow.”
In both these examples the direct speech complement follows the reporting verb. If the complement precedes the reporting verb, either in full or in part, then the reporting verb must come before the subject, as in the following examples. This constituent order is characteristic of direct speech reports introduced by the complement.

(5) — Завтра будет экзамен, — сказал студент.

(6) — Хочу я спросить тебя, — тихонько сказала она, — что ты всё читаешь?

Note that in example (6) an adverb (тихонько) is interposed between the direct speech report and the reporting verb (not possible in English).

The direct speech report construction can often be discontinuous, as in (6). In this case the clause containing the reporting verb functions syntactically as a parenthesis. Note that in the direct speech report construction the constituent order in the clause with the reporting verb varies according to its position in relation to the complement. Only if the reporting verb comes before the complement can the reporting verb follow its subject. This contrasts with English. Compare (4) and (5).

A direct speech complement can sometimes be introduced by a non-reporting verb, as in the following example. (Such a sentence cannot be transformed into an indirect speech report construction according to the normal transformation. Another verb must be added.)

(7) Он покачал головой: — Будет еще хуже.

Note that in example (6) an adverb (тихонько) is interposed between the direct speech report and the reporting verb (not possible in English).
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2.3. Indirect speech report constructions

The typical indirect speech report construction is multiclausal. A simple declarative statement in a direct speech report corresponds to a complement clause using the complementiser что in the indirect speech report. (The complementiser cannot be omitted except possibly in colloquial Russian.) There is a shift in person deixis, but no shift in tense (in contrast to English). Note that Russian has only three tenses, but the verbal system has a well-defined set of aspects. Compare the following direct and indirect speech report constructions.

(8) Он сказал: — Я скоро уезжаю.

3sg.nom.masc say-sg.masc.past 1sg.nom soon leave-1sg.pres
"He said: "I’m leaving soon.""

(9) Он сказал, что он скоро уезжает.

3sg.nom.masc say-sg.masc.past that 3sg.nom.masc soon leave-3sg.pres
"He said that he was leaving soon."

In both (8) and (9) the verb in the complement clause is in the present tense.

(10) Девушка сказала: — Мы придем в шесть часов.

1pl.nom arrive-1pl.fut
"The girl said: “We’ll arrive at six.”"

(11) Девушка сказала, что они придут в шесть часов.

3pl.nom arrive-3pl.fut
"The girl said they’d arrive at six."

There may be a change in modality. An imperative can occur only in a direct speech report construction: in the corresponding indirect speech report construction the complementiser чтобы is used or simply an infinitive. Compare the following examples.
(12) Он попросил меня: — Помоги мне решить задачу. (Švedova 1980, 486)

\[
\begin{align*}
on_A & \text{ poprosi-l}_{\text{PRED.TRANS}} menj\bar{a} o \text{ pomog-imp} \text{ mne-obj rešit'}_{\text{INF}} \\
& \text{ 3sg.masc.nom ask-sg.masc.past 1sg.acc help-sg.imp 1sg.dat solve-inf} \\
& \text{ zadač-uo} \\
& \text{ problem-sg.acc.fem} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘He asked me: “Help me solve the problem.”’

(13) (a) Он попросил меня, чтобы я помог ему решить задачу. (Idem.)

\[
\begin{align*}
on_A & \text{ poprosi-l}_{\text{PRED.TRANS}} menj\bar{a} o \text{ čtoby ja} \\
& \text{ 3sg.masc.nom ask-sg.masc.past 1sg.acc so that 1sg.nom} \\
& \text{ pomog-pred._intr emu-obj rešit'}_{\text{INF}} \text{ zadač-uo} \\
& \text{ help-sg.masc.past 3sg.dat solve-inf problem-sg.acc.fem} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘He asked me to help him solve the problem.’

(Literally: ‘He asked me that I should help him solve the problem.’)

An indirect speech report construction that is an alternative to (13a), without čtoby but using an infinitive, would be as follows.

(13) (b) Он попросил меня помочь ему решить задачу.

\[
\begin{align*}
on_A & \text{ poprosi-l}_{\text{PRED.TRANS}} menj\bar{a} o \text{ pomoc'}_{\text{INF}} \text{ emu-obj} \\
& \text{ 3sg.masc.nom ask-sg.masc.past 1sg.acc help-inf 3sg.dat} \\
& \text{ rešit'}_{\text{INF}} \text{ zadač-uo} \\
& \text{ solve-inf problem-sg.acc.fem} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘He asked me to help him solve the problem.’

When the direct speech report expresses advice, the corresponding indirect speech report uses the same complementiser čtoby, as in the following examples.

(14) Мать посоветовала сыну: — Ты бы отдохнул. (Idem.)

\[
\begin{align*}
mat'\bar{s} & \text{ posovetova-la}_{\text{PRED.INTR}} syn-obj ty, s \\
& \text{ mother-sg.nom.fem advise-sg.fem.past son-sg.dat.masc 2sg.nom} \\
& \text{ by PARTICLE otdoxnu-l}_{\text{PRED.INTR}} \\
& \text{ subj rest-sg.masc.past} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘The mother advised her son: “You should have a rest.”’

(15) Мать посоветовала сыну, чтобы он отдохнул. (Idem.)

\[
\begin{align*}
mat'\bar{s} & \text{ posovetova-la}_{\text{PRED.INTR}} syn-obj čtoby \\
& \text{ mother-sg.nom.fem advise-sg.fem.past son-sg.dat.masc so that} \\
& \text{ on} \\
& \text{ otdoxnu-l}_{\text{PRED.INTR}} \\
& \text{ 3sg.masc.nom rest-sg.masc.past} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘The mother advised her son that he should have a rest.’
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When the direct speech report expresses a possibility or wish (using the subjunctive/conditional particle \textit{by}), there is no shift in modality and the complementiser \textit{čto} is used in the indirect speech report construction. Note the syntactic similarity between the direct speech report in (14) and (16). Both make use of the particle \textit{by}.

(16) Он сказал: — Я бы помог тебе. (Švedova 1980, 486)

\begin{verbatim}
3sg.masc.nom say-sg.masc.past 1sg.nom subj help-sg.masc.past 2sg.dat
\end{verbatim}

‘He said: “I could help you.”’

(17) Он сказал, что помог бы мне. (\textit{Idem.})

\begin{verbatim}
3sg.masc.nom say-sg.masc.past that help-sg.masc.past subj 1sg.dat
\end{verbatim}

‘He said that he could help me.’

(18) Больной сказал: — Я бы выпил чая. (\textit{Idem.})

\begin{verbatim}
1sg.nom subj drink-sg.masc.past tea-sg.gen.masc
\end{verbatim}

‘The patient said: “I’d like to drink some tea.”’

(19) Больной сказал, что выпил чая. (\textit{Idem.})

\begin{verbatim}
1sg.dat subj tea-sg.gen.masc
\end{verbatim}

‘The patient said that he’d like to drink some tea.’

From the examples of indirect speech report constructions given above it will be observed that Russian, unlike English, can use various complementsers in the indirect speech report. As well as \textit{čto} and \textit{čtoby}, the complementiser \textit{budto} may be used to express doubt or absence of full confidence in the trustworthiness of the reported statement. In English such doubt is expressed by a particular reporting verb, in Russian by a complementiser. Compare the following sentences.
(20) Она утверждает, что слышала этот шум. (Шведова 1980, 485)

\[
\text{она} \quad \text{утверждает, что} \quad \text{слышала этот шум.}
\]

\[
\text{она} \quad \text{утверждает, что} \quad \text{слышала этот шум.}
\]

She insists that she heard this noise.'

(21) Она утверждает, будто слышала этот шум. (Idem.)

\[
\text{она} \quad \text{утверждает, будто слышала этот шум.}
\]

\[
\text{она} \quad \text{утверждает, будто слышала этот шум.}
\]

She claims that she heard this noise.'

(22) Приехал с фронта фотокорреспондент Ромов, он утверждал, будто видел в апреле Васю. (Еренбург, Евген’ева 1981–1984, I: 121)

\[
\text{приехал} \quad \text{фотокорреспондент} \quad \text{Ромов, он утверждал, будто видел в апреле Васю.}
\]

\[
\text{приехал} \quad \text{фотокорреспондент} \quad \text{Ромов, он утверждал, будто видел в апреле Васю.}
\]

The photojournalist Romov arrived from the front. He gave an assurance that he had apparently seen Vasja in April.'

Related to \textit{бутдо} both in form and meaning are the compound complementisers \textit{бутто by, \textit{что бутто by, \textit{kак бутто}}, as in the following example.

(23) Нам сказали, как будто все уехали. (Шведова 1970, 703)

\[
\text{нам} \quad \text{сказали, как будто все уехали.}
\]

\[
\text{нам} \quad \text{сказали, как будто все уехали.}
\]

'We were told that everyone had apparently left.'

The complementiser \textit{jakoby} functions in a similar way to \textit{бутдо} to express absence of certainty, as in the following sentence. Note the semantic change in the reporting verb.

(24) Говорят, якобы он уехал. (Ожегов 1970, 899)

\[
\text{говорят, якобы он уехал.}
\]

\[
\text{говорят, якобы он уехал.}
\]

'They claim he has left.'
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If the direct speech report contains a question without an interrogative, then the corresponding indirect speech report will use the interrogative particle *li* after the verb (which stands in initial position in the complement clause). Compare English *whether, if*. The rules governing shifts remain the same.

(25) Ученик спросил: — Завтра будет экзамен?
    učenik, sprosi-lRED.TRANS zavtra bud-etPRED.INTR
    pupil-sg.nom.masc ask-sg.masc.past tomorrow be-3sg.fut
    ekzamen
    exam-sg.nom.masc
    ‘The pupil asked: “Will there be an exam tomorrow?”’

(26) Ученик спросил, будет ли завтра экзамен.
    učenik, sprosi-lRED.TRANS bud-etPRED.INTR li zavtra
    pupil-sg.nom.masc ask-sg.masc.past be-3sg.fut whether tomorrow
    ekzamen
    exam-sg.nom.masc
    ‘The pupil asked whether there would be an exam tomorrow.’

In contrast to English, in Russian the indirect speech report construction must contain a complementiser. On the other hand, the complement clause may omit the subject, if it coincides with the subject of the reporting verb. This cannot occur in English. Consider the following sentences.

(27) Она сказала, что она поговорит с профессором.
    on-a, skaza-laPRED.TRANS čto on-a pogovor-itPRED.INTR
    3sg.fem.nom say-sg.fem.past that 3sg.fem.nom speak-3sg.fut
    [s professor-om]PERI
    with professor-sg.instr.masc
    ‘She said she’d have a chat with the professor.’

(28) Отец обещал детям, что подарит им эту книгу. (Švedova 1980, 486)
    otec, obešča-lPRED.TRANS det-jamOBJ čto
    father-sg.nom.masc promise-sg.masc.past children-pl.dat that
    podar-itPRED.TRANIMOBJ [et-u kni-g-u]O
    give-3sg.fut 3pl.dat this-sg.acc.fem book-sg.acc.fem
    ‘The father promised his children that he’d give them this book.’

In (28) the subject of the complement clause is omitted. See also (21) and (22).

In the indirect speech report construction the complement clause functions similarly to other complement clauses.
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2.4. Monoclausal speech report constructions

While the typical speech report construction in Russian is multiclausal, Russian also has monoclausal speech report constructions using the evidentials -de, deskat’, mol. The items -de and mol are usually described as particles (časticy), deskat’ as a parenthetical word (evvodnoe slovo). They cannot be easily identified, except in terms of etymology, with any other word class (the verb, for example). (Compare English ‘they say’.) They have no function except as evidentials. -de and mol carry no stress, while deskat’ is often unstressed. They are confined to the vernacular register. These particles emphasize that the statement is reported. (Compare Czech, Estonian, Latvian, Ukrainian. In Czech the evidential is the uninflected form prý, while in Ukrainian there are four evidentials, all cognate with Russian mol: mov, movby, movbyto, movljav. Of these mov, movby, movbyto can also serve as complementisers, similar to budto in Russian.)

(29) Тарас Петрович Середа часто притворялся, что его не волнует мнение старших начальников: он, дескать, солдат и вояк не ради похвал.


These evidentials can also be used within multiclausal indirect speech report constructions as a way of stressing the reported statement.

(30) Раз—под самый под Троицький день—к ней пришли и сказали, что князь, мол, убит на дуэли.
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Evidentials may be used to indicate a direct speech report, as in the following passage. Note the use of different evidentials in successive sentences.

(31) — Позвонил по телефону из бюро пропусков. Так, мол, и так, с вами говорит Кротов. Мне, дескать, необходимо с вами срочно поговорить об Елизавете Ивановне.

The particle -de functions as an enclitic (and is usually marked in the written language with a hyphen). It is often attached to the first constituent of the main clause in the speech report. It can be repeated several times in the one speech report, if the report consists of several clauses.

(32) [Ногтев] продолжал говорить: если бы ему дали все необходимое, он-де наладил бы питание.

"He called on the phone from the office of permits. Like this, he says, it’s like this, it’s Krotov speaking to you. I need, he says, to have an urgent chat with you about Elizaveta Ivanovna."

"[Nogtev] continued speaking: if he were given everything necessary, he said, he would arrange the food."
3. Reporting verbs and framers

In Russian the set of reporting verbs that can be used with a direct speech complement is extensive and largely coincides with the set that can be used with an indirect speech complement. Reporting verbs of communication taking the complementiser čto include govoriť ‘say’, dokladyvat’ ‘report’, zajavljen ‘announce, declare’, izveščat’ ‘inform, notify’, informirovat’ ‘inform’, molvić ‘say’, opovešćat’ ‘notify, inform’, osevoljat’ ‘inform’, objavljat’ ‘declare, announce, proclaim’, pisati ‘write’, rasskazvat’ ‘tell, narrate, recount’, soobšćat’ ‘communicate, report, inform, announce’, skazat’ ‘say, tell’. But the set of reporting verbs in Russian shows significant semantic differences from the set of reporting verbs in English. For example, skazat’ corresponds to both ‘say’ and ‘tell’, govorić to both ‘say’ and ‘speak’, while sprašivat’ sebi, literally ‘ask oneself’, translates ‘wonder’. At the same time in Russian there are some non-reporting verbs that can frame a direct speech complement that do not readily combine with an indirect speech complement. Consider the following sentences taken from a Russian crime novel of the Soviet period. Each sentence is multiclausal and shows the characteristic inversion of subject and verb after a direct speech complement.

(33) — Vy, značit, peshkom rešilis’? — ulybal’s Tihomirova, dovöl’na/ya čto vstretil-taki ego. 

vy s značit | peškom | rešil-is’ | ulybal-as’
2pl.nom so on foot decide-pl.past smile-sg.fem.past
Tihomirova s dovöl-a-ja | čto vstretil-a-taki | ego
3sg.acc.masc nevertheless meet-sg.fem.past taki | taki | 3sg.acc.masc

“‘So you decided to walk?’ Tixomirova smiled, pleased that she had met him after all.’

This may be described as ellipsis: it occurs in Russian where English retains the reporting verb, as in the following example.

(34) — Éto shkol’na nasha, — mahnuza Irina prutikom na krasnoe zdanie.

ét-oš | škol-a | naš-a | maxnu-la
this-sg.neut.nom be-pres school-sg.fem.nom our-sg.fem.nom wave-sg.fem.past
Irina-at prutik-on | na krasnoe | zdani-e
Irina-sg.fem.nom switch-sg.masc instr at red-sg.neut.acc building-sg.neut.acc

‘This is our school,” said Irina, waving a small switch at a red building.’
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As well as reporting verbs, verbs of cognition and thinking can also introduce a complement clause with čto. The same shifts (or absence of shift, in the case of tense) apply.

4. Speech report continuum

While standard Russian formally distinguishes direct and indirect speech report constructions and characterizes each with certain distinctive features, it is also possible to find speech report constructions that show features of both direct and indirect speech reports. This suggests a speech report continuum. Consider the following sentence (difficult to translate into English without distortion). It has a reporting verb and the complementiser čto typical of an indirect speech report, but lacks the usual shifts characteristic of such a report: the complement clause contains imperatives (postupaj, uezžaj) and a 2nd person pronominal (tvoja) that correlates with a 3rd person pronominal (emu) referring to the person addressed by the subject of the reporting verb.

(35) Kogda on přišel domo/ishort, /ya emu skazala, qto ili postupaj/ishort, ili uezžaj/ishort iz dom-u, a qto vs/yaka/ya tvo/ya noqь mne stoit god žizni, . . .

5. Indirect speech reports in colloquial Russian

In colloquial Russian (razgovornaja reč’) one can observe particular features of indirect speech reports not found in the standard literary language. Colloquial Russian shows a higher degree of freedom of constituent order than the standard language and permits discontinuous
indirect speech reports. Take the following sentences, where the subject of the indirect speech complement is placed before the subject of the reporting verb. Note the presence of the complementiser čto after the reporting verb.

(36) Konfety on skazal čto vkusnıy.
(Zemskaja 1973, 398)
konfet-y on skaza-l pred.trans čto ∅ vkusn-y 
sweet-pl.nom 3sg.masc.nom say-sg.masc.past that be-pres tasty-pl.nom
'He said that the sweets were tasty.'
(Standard Russian: On skazal, čto konfety vkusnıy.)

(37) Ego sestra govor-yat čto priehala.
(Idem.)
[ego sestr-a] govor-jat pred.trans čto prieha-la pred.intr
3sg.masc.gen sister-sg.nom.fem say-3pl.pres that arrive-sg.fem.past
'They say that his sister's arrived.'
(Compare: 'His sister they say that she's arrived."
(Standard Russian: Gоворят, ччто приехала его сестра.)

6. Speech report constructions and style

In works of literature direct and indirect speech report constructions often reflect significant stylistic differences and allow for contrasting modes of expression. Generally speaking, direct speech reports, being a more faithful representation of what has been said (though not necessarily an exact representation), can contain lexical elements (slang, expletives, colloquialisms, non-standard grammatical forms) not usually found in the stylistically more neutral indirect speech reports. For this reason some Russian writers (Babel', for example) have deliberately cultivated direct speech in their writing as an immediate way of confronting the reader with the reality of what is being portrayed. (Here one may compare the photograph to the drawing or painting, though all can involve a degree of artifice.) If we consider the short story by Babel', entitled The Death of Dolgusov, we discover that of the 140 lines of text, 77 lines (or 55%) represent direct speech reports.

7. Conclusion

In conclusion it should be noted that Russian distinguishes both direct and indirect speech report constructions which are typically multiclausal.
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Russian also has monoclausal speech report constructions that employ a vernacular evidential (mol, deskat’ or -de.) At the same time it is possible to demonstrate the existence of a speech report continuum in Russian, where some constructions display features of both direct and indirect speech reports, such as the complementiser čto and imperative verb forms. While Russian makes use of a large set of reporting verbs in speech report constructions, it can also deploy non-reporting verbs as framers of direct speech complements.
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