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The collection of essays under consideration has its origin in the recent critical production which – at last – has brought to attention the multifaceted Anglo-Dutch Richard Verstegan, a personage who, as the editors observe in the “Introduction”, has remained on the margins of critical interests for too long. The volume succeeds in approaching Verstegan’s multifarious aspects by showing and discussing the several activities in which he was engaged, from being a creative writer, a philologist, a translator, a polemicist, to acting as a Catholic spy. The book, which is divided into three parts of three chapters each, focuses on Verstegan’s major interests, i.e. philology (Part One), society and contemporary politics (Part Two), and poetry and storytelling (Part Three).

The three contributions in Part One concentrate on Verstegan’s most representative and best known work: A Restitution of decayed intelligence: In antiquities: Concerning the most noble and renowned English nation (Antwerp, 1605). They approach this work from three different angles, highlighting the various aspects it deals with. Massimiliano Morini’s article, “Teutonic and Unmixed: Verstegan’s English” (pp. 3-18), offers an in-depth analysis of Verstegan’s work as a product of the late sixteenth-century struggle between purists and neologizers for the definition of the identity of the English language. Morini presents the Anglo-Dutch author’s position in all its force, which militated for the defence of the language from foreign intrusions (the word ‘language’, Morini observes, was practically never used in the treatise, a term of German origin – ‘tongue’ – being preferred). The author discusses
the philological correctness, and questions the coherence, of Verstegan’s point of view that, after Babel, the language of all German peoples was Teutonic (of which English was merely a branch that had to undergo changes because of its insularity). He also examines Verstegan’s ultimate ‘defence’ of necessary English borrowings from French (because of the Norman Conquest) on the basis that the Normans themselves were originally a Teutonic people who had migrated westward in times past. Morini treats Verstegan’s Teutonic tenets on a highly knowledgeable backdrop of coeval rhetorical and linguistic theories, so that the reader is led to understand the author’s positions in the complex scenario of the history of English at a time when – to Verstegan’s dismay – the nostalgic and purist party had already lost the battle, in favour of a language which progressively asserted itself on the one hand as autonomous from old and new Continental influences, but, on the other, as a ‘tongue’ ready to accept its being the positive result of a long-going process of admixture.

Alessandro Zironi’s contribution deals with another facet of A Restitution, i.e. the intriguing connections resulting from its time of writing and publishing, and from English national events (“Searching for the Origins: Teutonic Past and Contemporary England in Verstegan’s Thought”, pp. 19-39). In 1605 Verstegan, as a Catholic, was an exile in the Low Countries, but he probably saw in the Stuart monarch James I somebody who might favour a readjustment of religious controversies in England (for Verstegan this might have meant a return to that country). A series of questions is at the basis of Zironi’s study: why does the tract open with a dedication to James? Is A Restitution simply “an antiquarian essay on the Teutonic past” (p. 20)? Couldn’t it rather be read as a political pamphlet? Apart from stressing the Teutonic origins of English, Verstegan’s tract also deals with the origins of the nation, an issue highly debated in the sixteenth century, especially after Polydore Vergil (from Urbino) had dismantled the medieval legends connected to Enea’s son Brutus and to King Arthur in his Anglica historia (1534), the first modern history of Great Britain, commissioned to Polydore by the first Tudor King, Henry VII. But by 1534 the break with Rome was already effective and the Historia anglica was interpreted by Anglican intellectuals “as a sort of Catholic pamphlet” (p. 25), thus transforming the matter of the origins into a religious and political issue. The historical and political background is well researched and presented in this essay along about ten centuries, so as to transmit to the reader the interconnected political meaning embedded in Verstegan’s tract. Verstegan’s insistence on the Teutonic-Saxon origins of the English race seemed to offer a new reading which was acceptable for Protestants, though coming from a Roman Catholic. The adherence of the English to Christianity was also seen by Anglican theologians as due to independent local action. Zironi shows well how all these threads interweave
as to make of *A Restitution* a possible basis for mutual understanding between Catholics and Protestants. But the publishing time of *A Restitution* was just a few months before the Gunpowder Plot in November 1605 and the Catholic conspiracy against the king and the Parliament neutralized Verstegan’s efforts: Catholics were violently prosecuted and *A Restitution* lost its possible appeal on topical issues, being as a consequence relegated to almost complete oblivion. And Verstegan, of course, remained in exile.

With the third essay in this volume we move to Verstegan’s Dutch works. Although Queen Elizabeth’s repression of recusants was much sharpened during the last decade of her reign, Verstegan had an early foretaste of what it meant be a Roman Catholic in England when, in 1577, he was imprisoned for two days “for religion”. The situation became rapidly more dangerous for those professing to be Roman Catholics. In 1581 the Jesuit priest Edmund Campion was captured and, after four months of torture, he was hanged, drawn and quartered. It was Campion’s execution (about which Verstegan published a pamphlet) that made him decide that the moment had come to leave the country, a wise decision which very likely saved his life. He wandered to Paris and Rome, and, after the fall of Antwerp to the Spanish in 1585, he finally settled in this city as a printer. Verstegan’s grandfather had immigrated to London at the beginning of the sixteenth century, and as a consequence Richard Rowlands was born and raised in England. He had little knowledge of the Dutch language, and his early published works in Antwerp therefore included mainly pamphlets and didactic works for English readers. It was not until the second decade of the seventeenth century, after his marriage to the Flemish Catharina de Sauchy, that Verstegan started publishing in the language of his newly-adopted country.

Giulio Garuti Simone’s article “Nederlantsche Antiquiteytten: Between Language and Religion” (pp. 41-9) analyzes Verstegan’s first major Dutch work (1613), a rewritten account of passages from his previous publication on English antiquities: *A Restitution of Decayed Intelligence* (1605). Garuti Simone gives a detailed synopsis of the Dutch work, and finds that it is characterized by an insistence on the common origin of Anglo-Saxons and Netherlands, a concept which Verstegan reiterates “with almost obsessive insistence” (p. 47). Comparing it to *A Restitution*, Garuti Simone cannot but conclude that, with the exception of the explanation of the flatness of the Netherlands and the account of Willibrord’s evangelical mission in the Low Countries, this work is ultimately disappointing in its almost complete lack of documentary materials. If for *A Restitution* Verstegan had studied Old English sources in depth, his knowledge of Old Netherlandic, Middle Dutch and Old Frisian in *Nederlantsche Antiquiteytten* can at best be called poor. This does not mean, Garuti Simone argues, that the latter work is totally devoid of interest. Read-
ing Nederlantsche Antiquiteiteten in the wider context of European religion is rewarding as “a common Germanic (‘Teutonic’) origin subsumes a deeper and more important kind of connection – the Catholic faith” (p. 47). Thus Garuti Simone reinforces Zironi’s conclusions in the preceding essay in this volume.

Romana Zacchi’s analysis of Verstegan’s Theatrum Crudelitatum Hæreticorum Nostri Temporis (Antwerp, 1587) opens the second part of the volume, introducing the topic of “Vestegan as a Social and Political Observer” (“Words and Images: Verstegan’s ‘Theatre of Cruelties’”, pp. 53-75). The object of Zacchi’s article is studied in order to identify its possible visual sources (since, as Zacchi declares, it is “a multi-coded text” rich with images juxtaposed to the written parts, p. 62), the history of its publication, and its material structure. The cultural strata of the Theatrum are skillfully researched and managed, resulting in an effectively colourful portrait not only of the book itself, but of the whole historical layers of which it is a product. This work, therefore, is placed inside the “post-Tridentine Counter-Reformation” (p. 54) in the context of sixteenth-century religious wars, not oblivious of John Foxe’s Book of Martyrs (1563) and the latter’s emphasis on visual representations of martyrdom. But besides the interest of the book for its religious and propaganda values, Zacchi’s essay also takes other issues into consideration, in particular the connections of the engravings with series of analogous Jesuit paintings, and the genesis of the Theatrum as a publisher’s commodity. The paratextual features of Verstegan’s text are deftly examined, Zacchi being well aware that the impact of such a work played mostly on its visual appeal for the illiterate, to which the literate could add the surplus ‘pleasure’ of reading. The ‘cruelties’ of the title are actually rather in the images than in the words (especially if one thinks that, apart from the French who from 1588 could rely on a French translation, readers were given a text in Latin, which was illegible not only for the illiterate but also for common people who had no Latin). Text and images, Zacchi underlines, are interdependent, that “[Verstegan wrote] his micro-stories of martyrdom as captions rather than independent narrative” (p. 68). His images are therefore not simply part of a decorative paratext, but are at the very basis of the author’s religious and polemical intent. It is a real pity that the volume contains only the reproduction of Verstegan’s frontispiece (which Zacchi analyses in depth). Possibly for editorial reasons none of the 29 engravings, realistically and terribly illustrating martyrdoms (and discussed by Zacchi), are reproduced. But the interested reader can google “Richard Verstegan” and find a copy of the 1604 edition of the Theatrum at this address: http://books.google.it/books?id=xgk_AAAAcAAJ&pg=PA49&rdir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false (accessed 22/08/2013). The violent visual impact is still guaranteed in 2013.

Paul Arblaster in “That Kynde of Man That is Wombed” (pp. 77-96)
looks at issues of femininity in Verstegan’s *Odes* and *A Restitution*, issues which can be discerned in his use of gendered language, in his discussion of Anglo-Saxon female names, and in his descriptions of Anglo-Saxon social and religious customs. Arblaster points out that Verstegan considered the Old English word ‘mensca’ as the gender-neutral word for human being where the female is not included in the male, while ‘woman’ derived from ‘womb-man’. This implies that, in Verstegan’s view, the female should not be seen as simply different from man, but rather as “that kynde of man that is wombed, or hath the wombe of conception, which the man of the male kynde hath not” (*A Restitution*, p.194). This, Arblaster argues, “enables Verstegan to legitimize tradition-ally masculine action by women when such behaviour is seen to serve a higher good, or answer a desperate need” (p. 80). In a later passage of *A Restitution*, by looking at the use of Old English social practices as well as usage of names, titles of honour and terms of contempt, Verstegan paints an Anglo-Saxon ideal of womanhood based on determination, grace, chastity, fertility and charity. Verstegan also puts some emphasis of martial valour in women, showing that gender roles were not fixed. As in so much of Verstegan’s writings, his ideal of womanhood reflected, and was determined by, the late sixteenth-century and early seventeenth-century religious scene; or, as Arblaster has it: “As a Catholic refugee who acted as lay agent in Antwerp for the English Jesuits in Spain and for the English College in Rome, Verstegan also knew first-hand that the safety of the missionaries relied in large part on women” (p. 91). It becomes apparent once more that Verstegan’s philological studies only thinly disguised a religious agenda which he made the fulcrum of his life-long work.

Religious controversy in the Netherlands is the subject of Herman van der Heide’s essay in this volume “ ‘The Seven-Headed Beast’: Myth and Allegory in Richard Verstegan’s Polemic against the Northern Netherlands” (pp. 97-114). Verstegan’s grandfather had emigrated from Gelderland, which, by the time the printer settled in Roman Catholic Antwerp, formed part of the Protestant Northern Netherlands. The fact that Verstegan nurtured a vivid interest in the land of his ancestors emerges from his *Spiegel der Nederlandsche elenden* (1621), written in Dutch after having visited the Northern Netherlands, and from the English work *Observations concerning the present affayres of Holland and the united Province*, published in 1622, though it may well have been written some time before *De Spiegel*. Verstegan’s point of view in these works, of course, is clearly that of the righteous Catholic South – the subtitle of *De Spiegel* specifies it is the product of a “lover of the truth” – and Protestantism is made the butt of fierce and zealous satire, which is well-illustrated by an opening remark in *Observations* that people living in the North “by reason of the lowness of their dwelling, […] are the nearest neighbours to the Divell” (*Observations*, p. 3). Describing the seven provinces of the Northern Netherlands as a seven-
headed beast is another felicitous ploy, while the Tower of Babel is frequently evoked to describe the religious opinion in the North where “every Cobbler is a Dutch-Doctor of Divinity” (Observations, p.4). In this fine essay Van der Heide shows that Verstegan consistently makes use of such allegory and myth in order to “to explain, to popularize, and to protect” (p. 111). Building on a common stock of Biblical knowledge, Verstegan made sure that his illustrations were intelligible to both a Protestant and Roman Catholic reading public. At the same time such material lent his arguments the necessary authority in a scenario where for many the search for religious truth was far from easy. For Verstegan, of course, religious truth only lay with the Roman Catholics.

In “Richard Verstegan’s Penitential Ódes” Valentina Poggi assesses the Anglo-Dutch writer’s literary qualities (pp. 118-31). Comparing his Odes in imitation of the seaven penitential psalmes (1601) to the corresponding liturgical texts in The Primer or office of the blessed Virgin Marie, a book Verstegan was licensed to print in 1599, Poggi suggests that most of the odes are the result of a process of expansion in which the author tries to foster in the reader “a truer sense of contrition and a deeper longing for divine mercy” (p.121). Verstegan interprets rather than paraphrases his sources, and the overall effect is a more personal approach in which consciousness of sin, rather than Divine wrath, is foregrounded. Poggi also finds that although the author makes the rhythm of his lines more animated than in the texts in The Primer and makes more frequent use of alliteration, the urge to stress and underline his didactic purpose “leads him into flatness” (p.129). In establishing to what extent the Odes were works of Verstegan’s inspiration or products of mere imitation, Poggi rightly concludes that although he intermittently rises to the occasion, one should not go to Verstegan looking for high aesthetic pleasure.

Tina Montone in “‘What after nature liues, liues subject unto mee’: Richard Verstegan and Otto van Veen’s Emblems of Love (1608)” (pp. 133-78) examines Verstegan’s putative contribution to the English text of Amorum emblemata (1608), a popular emblem book by the Antwerp artist Vaenius (Otto van Veen). This popular polyglot edition of Vaenius’s emblem book featured accompanying texts in Latin, French, Italian, Dutch and English. The literary reasons for using different languages in such books was not limited alone to reaching readers in different nations, but the variations in the subscripts also worked internally in what should be read as one polyglot text: “The subscriptio”, Montone reminds us, “is not just a comment on the emblematic illustration or a simple translation of a given model, but becomes the instrument of variatio, that is to say that the collaborators now play an active role in the construction of the emblematic message” (p.171). This implies that Vaenius would have chosen his collaborators with care, and, seeing that by the beginning of the sixteenth century Verstegan had become part of
the intellectual milieu of Antwerp, it is not unlikely his choice would have fallen on him for the English texts, especially as there is little doubt that the English tribute at the beginning of the book, which is signed R.V., must be attributed to Verstegan. Moreover, from a careful analysis of the mottoes and subscripts to the emblems in the various languages Montone presents convincing evidence that the author of the English texts clearly used the Dutch texts as his model. All this makes Verstegan’s collaboration to Vaenius’s Amorum emblemata more than probable.

“Richard Rowlands Verstegan’s Pyed Piper: Of Fantastical Cotes and Unkept Premises” by Silvia Notini ends the volume (pp. 179-98). With this article the book comes full circle and Verstegan’s activities are rounded off: this because the story of the Pyed Piper is contained inside that Restitution with which the panorama of Verstegan’s various ‘enterprises’ begins. Notini first tackles the concepts of legend and myth to which such a story as the “Pyed Piper of Hammelin” may be connected, stressing that even wondrous events preserved by legends may have a basis in historical facts and, as a consequence, possible explanations have to be searched for this narrative. Therefore the article covers the numerous hypotheses which in time have tried to identify a specific historical truth under the legendary Piper, and also analyses the literary and cultural products which were originated by the story (from Robert Burton in his Anatomy of Melancholy in 1621 to the Led Zeppelin song “Stairway to Heaven” in 1971, passing through Walter Scott and Robert Browning). As for Verstegan’s historical explanation underneath the legend, it is tied to the work in which the author founded his ‘pan-Germanic’ linguistic and racial principles. For him – the first to produce the legend in English –, the children who disappeared from Hammelin went to Transylvania to colonise that country, and the proof is – Verstegan suggests – that there are many German family names there. An interesting feature of Verstegan’s version of the story investigated by Notini is the absence of any moral at its conclusion: Verstegan left to his readers the task of understanding the educational value of the narration. They “had to make the connection” (p. 195). Of particular relevance is also the brief stylistic analysis of the text, where Notini observes that the onomatopoeia produced at the beginning of the story by the repeated use of “‘pyed’, ‘pyper’, and ‘pyping’ allows the reader to hear the music as it is played; but once the piper (and Verstegan) realizes the true nature of the townspeople, the privilege of hearing his music is taken away” (p. 195).

This volume of essays is a welcome addition to existing scholarship on Richard Verstegan and offers a critical panorama of the various writings of this multitalented Anglo-Dutch Renaissance writer. Although the authors analyze different specific aspects of Verstegan’s work, there is a satisfying continuity in the sequence of essays. While previous scholars have mainly concentrated on
Verstegan’s more famous works, these essays also give ample space to his journalistic writings, translations, and religious poetry. The overall picture that emerges does full justice to the sub-title of this book: a versatile man in an age of turmoil.

Jan Marten Ivo Klaver and Roberta Mullini

Come sta la lingua italiana: spunti di riflessione


Andrea Camilleri è scrittore, sceneggiatore, regista di indiscutibili fama e prestigio a livello internazionale, uno dei personaggi più significativi della cultura italiana del XXI secolo. Insignito della Laurea ad honorem presso l’Università di Urbino il 15 novembre 2012, per l’occasione tiene un’interessantissima e stimolante Lectio magistralis “Sullo stato di salute della lingua italiana”. Essa si inserisce a pieno titolo nell’attuale e controverso dibattito delle interferenze linguistiche gravitando intorno alla spinosa questione dell’utilizzo o meno dell’inglese quando si comunica in italiano.

Si intravedono nella Lectio due distinte parti argomentative che si intersecano e si sovrappongono l’una all’altra. Alla base di entrambe, un fertile humus che alimenta l’albero del patriottismo più incontrollato.

Nella prima parte, Camilleri pone l’accento sulla sua preoccupazione per la vitalità della lingua italiana, ormai provata, secondo l’autore, dalla quotidiana prevaricazione linguistica e culturale del mondo anglosassone. Il suo riferimento alla politica di Mario Monti ne è un esempio indicativo. Pur volendo conservare l’identità nazionale rispetto alla politica europea, Monti viene dipinto come pessimo paradigma di italianità per via del suo costante ricorso a termini inglesi tipici della finanza come nel caso dei ben noti spending review o spread, il cui significato è ancora oggi oscuro a buona parte degli italiani. Il monito camilleriano si rivolge in particolar modo a coloro che

1 Quanto segue in realtà non è una recensione nel senso tradizionale del termine, tuttavia lo si presenta eccezionalmente in questa sezione della rivista (non essendovi – per ora almeno – una ‘zona’ riservata a questo tipo di comunicazione), in quanto segno di un dialogo attivo con il pubblico dei nostri lettori. [N.d.D.]
prediligono l’uso di espressioni di chiara identità o derivazione anglosassone, soprattutto laddove lo scopo preciso diventi mostrarsi non “provinciali” privilegiando ciò che non è italiano. A nostro avviso, la corretta questione da affrontare qui è quando sia opportuno utilizzare l’inglese e quando invece non lo sia, non allarmandosi né tentando di bandire una lingua straniera dal parlato quotidiano alla maniera della Legge Toubon del 1994 in Francia, o della legge contro i forestierismi del 2010 in Cina. In tal modo si favorirebbe un uso degli inglesi maggioremente consapevole.

Nella seconda parte della *Lectio*, la preoccupazione iniziale di Camilleri si delinea progressivamente come slancio nazionalista verso la lingua italiana. Egli intende sottolineare con i vari rimandi ad articoli stampati, citazioni e digressioni l’inizio di una timida presa di coscienza comune relativa alla necessità di coltivare l’amore per la lingua italiana, che prima ancora “della volontà politica e della necessità storica ci ha dato il senso dell’appartenenza e del comun sentire”.

Non di rado capita di ritrovarsi a dover ricorrere in certi contesti ad espressioni inglese per agevolare la comunicazione interpersonale e intra-settoriale. Neoformazioni derivate come *fax-are*, *fit-tare*, *follow-are*, *match-are*, *split-tare*, si rivelano alquanto immediate ed “economiche”, per menzionare Martinet, rispetto a certe ridondanti perifrasi dell’italiano. Meramente esemplificativa può essere un’espressione tipica (ed estrema) del settore del *packaging* come “il *call off* di un *print run*” capace di sintetizzare notevolmente una faticosa perifrasi come “richiesta del cliente di una parte della tiratura di stampa di un suo ordine”. Con ciò non ci sentiamo tuttavia di condividere l’opinione di chi sostiene una certa passività dell’italiano nei confronti dell’inglese né di chi come Camilleri ritiene che “da noi la nostra lingua viene quotidianamente sempre più vilipesa e indebolita da una sorta di servitù volontaria e di assoggettamento inerte alla progressiva colonizzazione alla quale ci sottoponiamo privilegiano l’uso di parole inglesi”. In linea con De Mauro, dovremmo parlare piuttosto di “eclettismo linguistico” in base a cui, ricorrendo, quando necessario, a dei rimedi linguistici correttivi, si favorisce l’intercomprensione – ad esempio: *autostop* anziché *hitchhiking*; *camping* anziché *campsites*; *flipper* anziché *pinball* *machine*; *footing* anziché *jogging*. Anche Serianni nella Prefazione al *Dizionario degli anglicismi nell’italiano post-unitario* (1987) di Gaetano Rando ritiene che in realtà l’inglese non costituisca una minaccia per l’italiano in quanto esso tende ad essere riadattato secondo processi di normalizzazione fonetica e morfologico- lessicale peculiari dell’italiano stesso: il *call-off* e i *call-offs*, il *file* e i *files*, lo *show* e gli *shows*.

Al contrario di quanto rilevato da Camilleri, in Italia è la consapevolezza metalinguistica della lingua ad essere debole e non la lingua stessa. Ad ogni modo, tale consapevolezza pare stia progressivamente irrobustendosi negli ultimi tempi. Secondo una sentenza della Corte di Giustizia europea del no-
vembre 2012 viene accolta la denuncia effettuata dall’Italia alla Commissione europea circa la discriminazione creatasi per il costume di pubblicare i bandi per le svariate opportunità professionali nelle istituzioni europee solo in inglese, francese e tedesco, una prassi che ha dato vita a una disparità di trattamento vietata dalla Carta dei Diritti fondamentali: chi avesse voluto partecipare ai concorsi, infatti, risultava svantaggiato rispetto ad un candidato parlante le lingue indicate (La Repubblica, 12/09/2013). D’ora in poi tali bandi dovranno essere in tutte le lingue ufficiali dell’UE.

Richiamando il più rigoroso Castellani ai tempi del suo trattato Morbus Anglicus (1987), Camilleri, pur non volendo essere identificato come “un sostenitore dell’autarchia di fascistica memoria”, disdegna l’uso dell’inglese poiché da lui identificato come causa di un lento ma inesorabile assopimento dell’italiano. Non si dovrebbe mai porre la questione nei termini di un simile purismo linguistico, in quanto una lingua nasce e si evolve sulla base di continue e graduali contaminazioni sia interne, con l’arricchimento conferito dagli influssi dialettali, che esterne, con il ricorso a forestierismi. Affrontare l’argomento in tali termini potrebbe condurre ad estremismi irrazionali dove la lingua stessa rischerebbe di restare isolata e di perdere un importante elemento della linfa vitale che la alimenta, ossia il confronto. Ritornando al riferimento a Monti, risulterebbe ostico a tanti capire o spiegare tutt’oggi ad almeno tre anni dal suo effettivo ingresso nel vocabolario quotidiano cosa sia lo spread, ma tutti concorderanno nell’attribuirvi un’accezione negativa. È il “corso delle cose”, il cambiamento o (ri)adattamento linguistico è inevitabile, sia che lo si consideri sregolato e caotico e a rischio Babele come nella visione dei descrittivisti, sia che lo si consideri frenato e disciplinato come nelle teorie dei protezionisti, ma in ogni caso sempre inevitabile.

I termini inglesi devono essere adoperati consapevolmente negli appropriati contesti comunicativi e conoscendone il significato, poiché è indiscutibile che la loro connaturata produttività agevoli la comunicazione e l’intercomprensione. Le ultime statistiche relative al World English rivelano che l’inglese viene parlato da circa 400 milioni di madrelingua a cui si aggiungono 1,5 miliardi di persone che lo impiegano come L2 o LS. Il numero totale di parlanti si attesterebbe pertanto intorno ai 2 miliardi. È palese che in un simile processo di internazionalizzazione, anche linguistico-culturale, limitare o impedire l’utilizzo dell’inglese sarebbe profondamente anacronistico.

Antonio Taglialatela (Università di Napoli “Parthenope”)
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