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Abstract

The Khotanese and Sogdian genitive plural endings cannot be satisfactorily explained from the traditionally posited ending *-nām. Instead, Khotanese -nu and Sogdian -nw point to *-nam. Instead of assuming a special rule that shortens the expected *-nām to *-nam, it is argued that the evidence from East Iranian is to be taken at face value. A short ending *-om can be reconstructed for Proto-Indo-European as well and the East Iranian reflexes of a short ending are probably an archaism.

Keywords

Indo-Iranian reconstruction – historical morphology – genitive plural – East Iranian – Proto-Indo-European

Introduction

In Old Iranian, the genitive plural ends in *-ām or *-nām. In Old Persian, it is written ⟨-n-a-m⟩, and found, for instance, as ⟨-a-n-a-m⟩ /-ānām/ in the a- and ā-stems and as ⟨-u-n-a-m⟩ /-ūnām/ in the u-stems (Kent 1950: 59, 60, 62). In Avestan, we find -ąm in consonant stems and -nąm in vowel stems (Hoffmann and Forssman 2004: 116). The element -n- has spread from the n-stems. Since
-(n)ąm is metrically disyllabic in Old Avestan, the ending must in origin have been *-aam or *-aHam (possibly pronounced as *-aʔam). Apart from the disyllabic reading in Old Avestan metre, these endings are parallel to the acc.sg. -ām of the feminine ā-stems, as expected, and not with the acc.sg. -am of the masculine a-stems or the nom.acc.sg. of the neuter a-stems. Thus, the acc.sg.f. of the ā-stems is ⟨-a-m⟩ /-ām/ in Old Persian and -qm in Avestan, while the acc.sg.m and the nom.acc.sg.n. of the a-stems is ⟨-m⟩ /-am/ in Old Persian and -əm or -ə̄m1 in Avestan (Kent 1950: 59–60; Hoffmann and Forssman 2004: 118, 121).

In Khotanese, the situation is different. In the oldest attested phase of this language, the genitive plural in -nu is parallel to the acc.sg.m. -u rather than the acc.sg.f. -o. The explanation for this state of affairs is usually a shortening in the genitive plural ending of original *-nām to *-nam, but since there are no parallels for such a shortening this explanation is ad hoc. Instead, we should seriously consider the possibility that the original genitive plural ending was not *-ām but *-am. This original ending is suggested already by the pure fact that the long ending *-ām goes back to *-aam or *-aHam: apparently this ending is a conglomerate of two elements, obviously *-a- and *-am.2

In the following, I will discuss the genitive plural endings of a number of languages that are relevant to this point: Khotanese, Tumšuqese, Sogdian, Bactrian and Indian “Śaka”.3 I will then argue that the short genitive plural has parallels in other Indo-European languages so that it is most probably an archaism of East Iranian within the Indo-Iranian branch.

1 This is the basic ending. There are several variants, especially after w and y.
2 On the basis of Vedic metrics, Kümmel (2013: 202–205) investigates the possibility that the second of the two a-vowels is long. He concludes that the most likely reconstruction is indeed *-aHam, not *-aHām.
3 I do not include Ossetic, because the evidence is inconclusive. Cheung argues that *-am has become *-u, and that the suffix -on reflects *-ānu < *-ānam, with shortening from *-ānām (2002: 127). This is possible, but not certain, since as a general rule *ā becomes o before a following nasal (o.c. 14) and the conditions for u-umlaut are not met, so that the presence of the intermediate *-u cannot be proved. It is true, however, that an intermediate *-ānā can be excluded, since *-ā becomes Digoron -ae; cf. Dig. fide ‘father’ < *pHtā. The outcome of *-ām is unknown.
Khotanese

The evidence from Khotanese is straightforward. The problem with Khotanese is that, already from Old Khotanese onwards, the comparatively rich inflexional system gradually erodes towards the much simplified one of Late Khotanese, which is typologically markedly different from the oldest stage of the language. Nevertheless, the original form of the relevant endings in Old Khotanese is clear. The nom.sg. of the masculine a-stems ends in -ä, and the corresponding accusative in -u (Emmerick 1968: 252, 255). The nom.sg. of the feminine ā-stems ends in -a, and the accusative in -o (Emmerick 1968: 271, 273). Traces of a neuter with nom.sg. -u and pl. -e are also preserved (Emmerick 1968: 253, 265). The genitive-dative plural of the a-stems ends in -änu or -ānū, that of the ā-stems in -ānu, that of the i-stems -inu or -ānu, etc. (Emmerick 1968: 266–267, 278, 293–294). In all stem classes, the original genitive-dative plural ends in -nu. Obviously, the comparison with the accusative singular endings points to *-nam for the genitive-dative plural, so that Emmerick (1968: 266) is forced to assume a special shortening of *-ānām to *-ānam in order to explain -ānū. By themselves, these endings point to *-ānam and *-anam, respectively.

That the basic reflexes of Old Iranian *-ām and *-am are -o and -u, respectively, in Khotanese, is generally accepted. Nevertheless, it should be noted that already within Old Khotanese, final -u changes to -o so that the difference between the two finals is blurred (Emmerick 1987: 40–41; Emmerick and Maggi 1991; Maggi 1992: 58–60). However, for the genitive plural no variant in -o is attested so that this ending really points to *-am. Moreover, remarkably the acc.sg. ending of the masculine a-stems and the nom.acc.sg. of the neuter are not affected by this sound change, according to Maggi for semantic reasons (1992: 60).

Tumšuqese

Tumšuqese is important because it is on the whole more archaic than Khotanese. However, the poor attestation of this language is a serious obstacle to its interpretation, both synchronically and diachronically. For example, not all letters of the script have been deciphered with certainty. Nevertheless, some points are clear. The nom.sg. of the masculine a-stems ends in -i and the corresponding accusative in -u. Genitive plurals in -änu, -īnu, -ānu, and -ānu are found (Konow 1935: 792; 1947: 177). These facts suggest that the genitive plural goes together with the acc.sg.m., as in the closely related Khotanese. However, the acc.sg. ending of the feminine ā-stems unfortunately has not so far...
been identified with certainty. Konow (1935: 792) gives roro as the acc.sg. of rorā- ‘fortress’, which fits the gen.sg. rorye, but this analysis is not repeated in Konow (1947: 187), where the word is listed instead as rora-. Skjærvø (1987: 81) equates the 1sg. acc. pronoun mvo with Khotanese muho (also Schmidt 1988: 312), mainly used for the plural, but also for the singular (Emmerick 1989: 220), and derives both from *mu̯ām, itself analogical for expected *mām after the 2sg. *θου̯ām (Av. θβαμ). This is a good possibility, and the combined evidence of roro and mvo suggests indeed that the gen.pl. in -nu cannot reflect *-nām, but clearly the evidence is not as strong as one would wish.

**Sogdian**

In Sogdian, the plural inflexion of nouns has been replaced by productive formations based on originally collective nouns. In the light stems, the nom.acc. ends in -tʾ/-ta/ and the gen.-loc.-abl. in -tyʾ/-tya/. In the heavy stems, we find direct -t and oblique -ty/-tī/ (Sims-Williams 1989: 184).

A trace of the original Iranian plural inflexion is preserved in the form of an archaic genitive plural that is still “fairly common” in Buddhist and Manichaean Sogdian (Sims-Williams 1979: 337). This ending is normally -ʾn/-ān/. In the Ancient Letters, an older variant -ʾnw is found. From the opening formula Sims-Williams (1991: 178–179, 182; see also Henning 1936: 197) gives AL II r2 ZKyHM(w) βγʾn(w), AL III r2 ZKušn(w) βγʾnw, AL IV r2 ZKuHMβγʾn, AL V r4 wyšnw βγʾnw, AL VI r1 ZKyHMβγʾn, which all stand for wešanu βaγānu or wešanu βaγān, ‘to the gods’. To this may be added e.g. AL I r9 ZKuHMswyšykʾnw ‘the Sogdians’ and AL II r14 [xw](n)ʾnw ‘Huns’ or [cy]nʾnw ‘Chinese’ (Sims-Williams 2001: 268).

A similarly formed pronominal genitive plural in -nw, without the preceding -ʾ-, is more frequent, being found, for instance, quite a number of times in Buddhist texts. Some examples from the “Sūtra of the causes and effects of actions” are 7, 259 wyšnw ‘those’; 538 wyspyšnw ‘all’; 520 cywyšnw (cy + wysnw) ‘from those’; 103, 115 myšnw ‘these’ (MacKenzie 1970).

The oblique plural ending in -nw is parallel to the acc.sg.m. and the nom.acc.sg.n. of the light stems, but not to the acc.sg.f. of the light stems. In the light stems, the nom.sg.m. ends in -γ and the acc.sg.m. and nom.acc.sg.n. end in -w. In the feminine light stems, the nominative and the accusative both

---

4 Emmerick (1985: 17) analyses rasananda ‘questioner’ and diyāndā ‘presenter’ as ā-stem acc.sg.f., but according to Schmidt (1986: 144–145; see also Skjærvø 1987: 87) these are rather gen.sg.m. in -ā. Schmidt reads diyāndā ‘seeing’, rasananda ‘knowing’ (with rā = rā), and adds rāsandā (differently, Emmerick 1985: 19).
end in *-ʾ. As a result of the so-called “rhythmic law” the corresponding endings of the heavy stems have all been reduced to zero. Accordingly, the oblique plural ending in -nw points to *-nam or *-ānam. In order to reconcile this ending with the expected *-ānām, usually a special shortening is assumed as in the case of Khotanese (Sims-Williams 1990: 280).5 Obviously, the Sogdian ending by itself points to *-nam.

Even though -w is the expected reflex of *-am, it must be pointed out that -ʾnw is most probably not the regular outcome of *-ānam, because according to the rhythmic law the -w should have been lost as in the acc.sg.m. of the heavy stems since the preceding syllable has a long vowel. Although the rhythmic law is in essence formulated on the basis of the length of the root syllable (see in detail Sims-Williams 1984), there is no reason to assume that it did not operate in endings if it was in origin a sound law. I therefore suppose that the final -w after -ʾn is analogical after variants of the same ending with a preceding short vowel. For examples of such variants, cf. the Sogd. pronominal ending -nu in wēšanu etc. and the Khotanese variants cited above. It is possible that the phonologically regular ending -ʾn with loss of *-w was preserved as well, so that -ʾn and -ʾnw were variants. This explains why -ʾnw could be replaced by -ʾn while -w remained in the acc.sg.m. and the nom.acc.sg.n.6

Bactrian

In the Bactrian language of the documents, noun inflexion has been reduced to a simple opposition singular vs. plural without any distinction of case or gender. In the older stage of the language as shown in the inscriptions from the Kushan period, traces of case (three, according to Sims-Williams 2015: 258) and gender are preserved, but on the whole Bactrian noun inflexion is drastically simplified compared to Khotanese, Tumšuqese and Sogdian, and no firm conclusions can be drawn from the few endings that are preserved. However, even the endings of Bactrian are not completely without use.

To begin with, the genitive plural is well attested, serving in inscriptive Bactrian as an oblique and in the documents as the general plural. The end-
ing is consistently -ано, as for instance in the formula бəновано бəо 'king of kings'
(e.g. Rabatak 14). The letter о can stand for w and u, among others, but is at the
end of the word most probably silent. Thus, the final -о of -ано cannot be used
to prove that this ending was originally *-ану. However, evidence from other
endings can narrow down the possibilities for the oblique plural -ано.

Final *-ā becomes -α in Kushan Bactrian, as shown by Rabatak 14 πίδα 'father'
< *πۀtā; in the documents, the later form πίδο /pid/ is found. Some feminines
in -α are preserved as well, such as λίζα 'fortress', later λίζο /liz/. Obviously, as
shown by πίδα, a possible source for the -α of the feminines is the nom.sg.f. *-ā.
No special oblique of the feminine in -α is registered so far. Although many
points of Kushan Bactrian syntax are still unclear (Sims-Williams 2011: 36–37),
direct and oblique were probably identical in the feminine singular. This is
suggested by the direct αμγα, νανα and ομμα in Rabatak 9–10 ια αμγα νανα σδο
ια αμγα ομμα αορομοζδο μοζδοοανο σροφαρδο ‘the above-mentioned Nana and
the above-mentioned Umma, Aurmuzd, Muzhduwan, Sroshard’ (coordinated with
direct αορομοζδο μοζδοοανο σροφαρδο) and the oblique νανα in Rabatak 2 ασο νανα
οδο ασο οισπουανο μι βαγανο ‘from Nana and from all the gods’ (coordinated with
oblique οισπουανο μι βαγανο; Sims-Williams 2008: 55–56). Possibly, the nominative,
accusative and genitive all merged into the feminine -α by sound law,7
but since the nominative may also simply have replaced the accusative, this
remains uncertain.

In conclusion, the oblique plural -ано is compatible with a derivation from
*-анам, and since no variant **-ана is attested, a direct preform *-анā is not
probable. It cannot be established whether *-анām can be excluded as well,
since *-胺 need not have developed in the same way as *-ā.

Indian “Śaka”

Lüders has identified the expression daivaputra ṣāhi ṣāhānu ṣāhi ‘the king, the
son of gods, the king of kings’ in the inscription of Samudragupta in Allahabad
of the 4th century CE (1913: 426). ṣāhānu ṣāhi is obviously Iranian, ṣāhānu being
the genitive plural of ‘king’ and ṣāhi probably the nominative. Lüders suggests
that this title goes back to the Kushans, but adapted in form to the grammar
of the Iranian northern Ķṣatrapas, the “Śakas”, whose language was, according
to him, identical to Khotanese. Lüders must be right that the expression is not

7 For the genitive in *-āyāh, cf. perhaps ἱγο ‘shadow’ < *sā̆yākā- (Sims-Williams 2007: 261; Gho-
Bactrian proper, and therefore not a genuine Kushan expression: in Bactrian, the oblique plural of *βαο ‘king’ is *βανανο, not **βανανο. In addition, *βαο does not contain /h/ (which should have been written with υ) but /w/ or /u/, and there is no match of the nominative in -i in Kushan Bactrian, where rather the oblique ends in -ί or -έ (Sims-Williams 2007: 40). However, we should in my view be cautious with identifying this Indian “Śaka” language with Khotanese for historical and geographical reasons. Indeed, a nom.sg.m. -ι and a gen.pl. -άνυ remind of Khotanese, but the same endings are found in Sogdian and the Śaka language may simply have been close to these, but not identical. After all, the word for ‘king’ in Khotanese is *ρρι, which is not related to the etymon here represented by ṣāhi. Clearly, ṣāḥāνυ may derive from *-ānam, but since the acc.sg.m. nor the acc.sg.f. are attested for exactly this dialect, there is no way to be sure.

East Iranian *-nam

It is now clear that the evidence from Khotanese, Tumšuqese and Sogdian points to an original East Iranian plural *-nam instead of the usually posited *-nām. There is no evidence for a sound law that shortens final *-ām to *-am in this position, and the genitive plural endings in these languages are thus parallel to the acc.sg.m. from *-am, not to the acc.sg.f. from *-ām. Nevertheless, it might be countered that a sound change without parallels operated in the genitive plural only, yielding the required *-nam secondarily from an earlier *-nām through a special shortening.

Kümmel mentions the evidence for *-am from Khotanese but claims that “dieses kann aber durch lautgesetzliche Kürzung aus *-ām in nachtoniger Endsilbe erklärt werden” with reference to Emmerick (1968: 266). However, in reality Emmerick writes, “<O.Ir. *-ānām one would expect *-āno, cf. ASf -o < *-ām. But *-āno is not attested even as a spelling variant. *-ānām was probably shortened to *-ānam as a result of the heavy stress on the penult in Kh.” The shortening Emmerick assumes is an ad hoc explanation for the genitive plural ending only, and this cannot of course be called a sound law.

Although in my view the burden of proof rests with the supporters of such a special shortening, I will adduce two main arguments against it below. These

---

8 It may in addition be noted that the original initial *xš- of this word should have given kṣ- in Khotanese. Therefore, as suggested to me by Nicholas Sims-Williams (p.c.), the Khot. title ₦ṣau, sau (Bailey 1979: 412b–413a) is probably borrowed from Bactrian βαο.

9 For “<”, one has to read “from”, “out of”, or “as the reflex of”.
are drawn from Khotanese because this language preserves the Old Iranian endings better than Sogdian. It must be pointed out that if the short genitive plural *-nam results from a secondary shortening, this shortening should have occurred at an early stage since it is found in East Iranian dialects that do not form a special subbranch within East Iranian. The assumption of multiple, independent special shortenings obviously is increasingly implausible. Therefore, the counterevidence to any special shortening that is presented below invalidates any such development for Sogdian as well.

I see two lines of argument against the assumption of a special secondary shortening of *-nām to *-nam in the genitive plural ending: in other, morphologically independent finals *-ām yields Khotanese -o as well; and, if shortening occurs, it is the vowel of the penultimate syllable rather than the final syllable that is shortened.

Other endings in which original *-ām has yielded -o are (that is, apart from the acc.sg. of the feminine ā-stems):

- 1sg.opt.act. -o < *-yām (Av. -iiqm, Skt. -yām; Emmerick 1968: 206–207)
  The clearest example of this ending is 1sg.opt. hīssā to hīs- ‘come’, because it unambiguously shows the palatalisation. A counterexample seems to be paysāṇu to paysān- ‘recognise’, since it shows the same characteristic palatalisation, but has -u instead. One would have to assume that this ending is influenced by the injunctive 1sg. -u < *-am; in any case, functionally, the optative cannot be distinguished from the injunctive (Emmerick 1968: 201).
- 3sg.ipv.mid. -to < *-tām (Av. -tām, Skt. -tām; Emmerick 1968: 213)
  Of this remarkably archaic ending Emmerick gives only hāmāto of hām- ‘be’ as an example (cf. also Emmerick 1970: 132a).

As pointed out also above, it should be noted that the -o of the endings just listed could theoretically be the effect of weakening of -u as in 3pl.sbj.act.mid. -āru, 3pl.opt.act.mid. -īru > -āro, -īro; these endings must be compared with the Avestan secondary 3pl.mid. ending -ram (Emmerick 1968: 203), so that -ru would be expected, but -ro is found besides. Another case in point is the directional suffix -ālstu, -ālsto, of which -ālstu is probably the earlier variant (Degener 1989: 105b). Although, indeed, the Śūraṅgamāsamādhīśutra, in which also the 3sg.ipv.mid. hāmāto (cited above) is found, has always -ālsto, never -ālstu (Emmerick 1970: xx), the 3pl.opt. ends in -īro, not -īru (e.g. p. 129a

10 Since the Avestan ending is metrically disyllabic, this *-yām derives from earlier *yaH-am (Hoffmann and Forssman 2004: 226).
vamasīro to vamas- ‘believe in’ and p. 118b vīro to ah- ‘be’). Thus, the change of -u to -o and the variation resulting from it weaken the evidence of the isg.opt.act. -'o and the 3sg.ipv.mid. -to. By contrast, the spelling of the gen.pl. in -nu is remarkably consistent in Old Khotanese, and shows no interchange with -no, so that this ending can only derive from *-nam.

My second line of argument is that in Khotanese shortening in originally disyllabic endings is actually found in the penultimate, not in the final syllable. Examples of this shortening are the gen.-dat.sg. and the loc.sg. of the feminine ā-stems, and feminine ā-stems enlarged with a kā- suffix, i.e. *ākā-stems.

In the feminine ā-stems, the oldest gen.-dat. ends in -e, which derives from *-yāh or *-yāh (Emmerick 1968: 274). This *-(i)yāh in turn reflects *-āyāh, ultimately from *-āyāh (Skt. -āyās, OP -āyā). Also the loc.sg. -a goes back to an intermediate form with shortened medial vowel: < *-āyā < *-āyā (Skt. -āyām; Emmerick 1968: 176). In both cases, the shortening is also found in Avestan: gen.sg. -aiād, loc.sg. -aiiai (see also Sims-Williams 1990: 280).

In the case of the *ākā-stems, shortening of the first *ā to *ā has led to the merger of this whole class with the *akā-stems. As noted by Emmerick (1968: 300; see also Sims-Williams 1990: 281), the expected category of Khotanese āā-stems from earlier *ākā-stems does not exist, and the words for which an *ākā-suffix can be reconstructed are found instead among the āā-stems. Obviously, this is due to a shortening of original *-ākā to *-akā.

In both the endings of the feminine ā-stems cited above and the *ākā-stems we see that ā_ā sequences where indeed reduced, but with shortening of the first ā, not of the second. This is a further argument against the ad hoc shortening of the gen.pl. *-ānām to *-ānam assumed by Emmerick. To this can be added more evidence from the gen.pl. ending itself. As in Avestan, where -anām is found for expected *-ānām, Khotanese shows short vowels before the gen.pl. ending -nu, for instance -ānu in the a-stems and i-stems (Emmerick 1968: 267, 293). This shortening in the penultimate syllable of the genitive plural further confirms that weakening did occur, but in the penultimate and not in the final syllable.

The fact that in East Iranian the short-vowel genitive plural ending is preserved is probably linked to the spread of the element -n- from the nasal stems. While in consonant stems such as the nasal stems the short-vowel ending could apparently remain, it became early on difficult to recognise in vowel stems, e.g. *-a-am > *-ām, *-ā-am < *-ām etc. In Avestan, -ām spread from the a- and ā-stems to the consonant stems, and the resulting nasal-stem ending -nām in turn was taken over by the vowel stems. In Khotanese and Sogdian the long-vowel ending did not spread to the nasal-stem genitive plural, but this ending was generalised throughout the nominal system. In other words, the general-
isation of the element \(-n\) solved the difficulties and ambiguities arising from the short-vowel ending \(-am\), so that there was no need to replace it with a long-vowel ending.

**Proto-Indo-European**

As argued above, Khotanese and Sogdian point to a genitive plural \(*-nam\) with a short vowel instead of the traditionally posited long-vowel ending \(*-nām\). Since it is unlikely that \(*-nam\) derives from \(*-nām\) through a special shortening, the evidence of East Iranian for the reconstruction of this ending for Proto-Indo-Iranian should be taken seriously. The relevance of an unbiased look at the East Iranian data is given by the reconstruction of a short genitive plural in \(*-om\) for Proto-Indo-European by Kortlandt (1978). According to Kortlandt, this short ending is required in the reconstruction of a number of different Indo-European branches, and the long ending \(*-ōm\) or \(*-oHom\) (i.e. PIIr. \(*-ām\) or \(*-aHam\)) traditionally reconstructed can easily be explained from the addition of \(*-om\) to the stem vowel of the \(o\)-stems.

Kortlandt’s argumentation cannot be repeated in full here. The most important evidence he adduces is Slav. \(*-ə\) and Lith. \(-u < *-uN < *-om\); Umbrian \(-om\); Av. starə̄m; Old Irish \(fer\) ‘of men’; Old Icelandic \(hana\) ‘of cocks’; Goth. \(-e < *-eiom\). He further connects the short ending \(*-om\) with the ending of the genitive plural pronouns Ved. 1st person \(asmā́kam\), 2nd person \(yuṣmā́kam\). Thus, the ending \(*-om\) was in origin not a genitive plural ending, but a neuter adjectival ending. This is now further confirmed by Kloekhorst (2017), who shows that the Hittite endings \(-ā̆š\) (the “singular” genitive ending) and \(-ā̆n\) (the “plural” genitive ending) were both indifferent to number. According to him, the difference was rather that \(-ā̆š\) had specific and \(-ā̆n\) nonspecific semantics.

Kümmel (2013) argues against Kortlandt’s reconstruction. For Italo-Celtic, he argues that both short \(*-om\) and long \(*-ōm\) would explain the material (p. 197), and for Balto-Slavic he prefers a special shortening in front of \(-m\) (p. 200). About Anatolian he is brief, and he concludes that the evidence is ambiguous, “Gegen \(*-ōm\) spricht aber jedenfalls nichts” (p. 201). He does not address the Germanic evidence. Concerning Indo-Iranian, the main topic of his paper, Kümmel further points out, referring to de Vaan (2003: 464), that Av. starə̄m is actually to be read \(strə̄mca\) which reflects \(*-ām\), not \(*-am\). For Umbrian \(-om\), he refers to Meiser (1986: 121), who shows that \(u\) and \(o\) are not distinctive before nasals, so that this ending is ambiguous, too.

Kümmel is certainly right in dismissing the evidence adduced by Kortlandt from Avestan, and indeed, Umbrian and Anatolian are ambiguous. For the
Celtic and Balto-Slavic evidence, see Kortlandt’s reply (2014) to Kümmel. Also, the evidence from Germanic still stands. From Indo-Iranian the disyllabic reading of -ām as -aam remains strong evidence for an originally short ending *-am, as argued in the introduction above. To this must now be added the East Iranian forms discussed in the preceding.
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