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The goal of the dissertation

My undergraduate degree thesis entitled The terminology of reindeer husbandry in Northern Sámi - based on the UEW and a collection of joiks (1997) focused on the role of reindeer in the lives of the Sámi people and the reflection thereof in their folklore, based on the lyrics of joiks, deprived of their tunes, forming the core of Sámi folk poetry. My sources at the time of writing were the Uralisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch (ed. in chief Károly Rédei, Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó, 1986), as well as a collection of joiks by György Szomjas-Schiffert published under the title Singing Tradition of Lapp Shamans (Lapp sámánok énekes hagyománya. Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó, 1996). It was not my goal at the time to either give a full-scale presentation of the specialized language of reindeer breeding that had developed through centuries or make a comprehensive collection of the elements of the nomenclature concerned.

The goals of the current dissertation are to present, by giving a comprehensive picture, the essence of reindeer husbandry as traditionally cultivated by the Sámi, forming a central role in their everyday lives as well as in the economy, in their past and their present (reviewing the history of reindeer husbandry and its reflection in Sámi culture, everyday life and spiritual tradition) and examine the terminology related to reindeer keeping and the nomadic lifestyle involved (presenting a potential semantic grouping of Northern Sámi elements related to the topic and striving for their morphological and etymological analysis). Accordingly, this work comprises two main parts.

I.

Rangifer tarandus

The Latin scientific name of the reindeer is Rangifer tarandus. The subspecies of the polar deer species, the wild reindeer (Fi. peura, Lp. goddi) included in the Red List of the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) of endangered animal and plant species, are known as “tarand deer” in Eurasia (and “caribou” in North America). In this paper, I shall review the past and present incidence of the species, with reference to its former presence in Hungary and the archaeological proof thereof, its characteristic features and subspecies.

In this work, the name “reindeer” refers to the tamed (domesticated) “tarand deer” (Fi. poro, Lp. boazu). The former and current Hungarian names of reindeer shall be enlarged upon in detail under the chapter The names of reindeer in the Hungarian language.

The history of reindeer husbandry

The history of reindeer husbandry can be divided into two periods: the early small herd (or small-scale) and the later large herd (large-scale) reindeer husbandry.

The development of small-scale reindeer husbandry was primarily motivated by the meat, fur and leather demand of the population of the Arctic zone as well as their need for a beast of burden making transportation easier. The fact that the reindeer had become a trade valuable, moreover, a means of exchange, as well as the effect and example of sheep husbandry, widely present in Scandinavia, must also have played a role in the development of reindeer husbandry. The first written document of Scandinavian, and at the same time of Sámi reindeer
husbandry dates back to the time of Harald Fairhair, the first king of Norway, in 892: In a letter addressed to King Alfred of England, Ohthere of Halogaland, Norway, made mention of the king’s 600 reindeer and 6 valuable bait reindeer. Compared to the ancient fishing/hunting culture, specialized large-scale reindeer husbandry providing a means of living has been a young phenomenon in the history of the Sámi people. They are likely to have mastered the skills of this lifestyle already after their settlement in the area of Fennoscandinavia, independent of other reindeer keeping peoples.

The reindeer is a breed of domesticated wild reindeer, which, however, does not compare to either other domesticated animal species or the wild livestock. There are two theories as regards the method of domestication, both rather shaky.

According to one theory, it was some reindeer captured by hunters to use as bait animals that became the first tame animals suitable both as yoke animals and as beast of burden and their first generation formed the first tame reindeer herds. Naturally, the significance of the reindeer grew simultaneously and its role changed: instead of a supplementary activity, reindeer husbandry gradually became a direct source of living.

According to the other theory, reindeer husbandry was established through the gradual development of the hunting of wild reindeer and the increasingly professional and fruitful management of wild reindeer herds: recognizing the continuous shrinking of the wild livestock, hunters formed groups, jointly protecting what had thus become their common property from exploitation by outsiders and devastation by predators. Regulating hunting was an initial stage of shepherding already, from which, in parallel with the slow development of social order, the phenomenon of private property gradually unfolded (later on there arose the need to express property rights more efficiently: they began to earmark calves). The latter theory seems to be supported by the fact that similar techniques are used in wild reindeer hunting and reindeer husbandry (e.g. fences).

In this paper, the arguments against the two above theories shall also be presented.

The rules and state regulations of reindeer husbandry. The natural limits of reindeer husbandry

In the summer, reindeer migrate to the Barents Sea, the shore richer in pasture and “poorer” in mosquitoes, while they spend the winters in forests, in the mountains or at the lakes. In earlier times, country borders meant no problem during the annual migration of the Sámi living in Sweden, Finland, Norway or Russia, but their routes have changed by today. In this dissertation, I shall give a short review of the most important events in state and natural regulations (agreements, contracts, changes of state borders, the sealing of borders) as well as the means thereof (e.g. organized forest management, the fight against reindeer diseases).

The reindeer husbandry of other (Uralian and Non-Uralian) peoples

From among Uralian peoples – in addition to the Sámi – it is the Northern Samoyeds, Ob-Ugors and Zyryans who keep reindeer. It is a disputed issue whether or not the reindeer husbandry of these peoples is of common origin. Peoples living in different areas but under the same climatic conditions may have undergone the stages of development of reindeer husbandry outlined above, irrespective of one another and at different times. There is no reason to claim that the Sámi took over the habit of reindeer taming from the reindeer keeping population in Siberia.

As regards Non-Uralian peoples, the reindeer husbandry of some Siberian groups – including the Evenki, who speak the Manju-Tunguz language, the Mongolian speaking Buryat, the Turkish speaking Tofas and Dolgans, the Chukchi and Ket who speak Paleo-Siberian
languages and the once Tunguz-speaking but now mongolized Tsatsan-shal shall be reviewed in brief.

Reindeer husbandry as reflected in Sámi folk poetry and beliefs

The reindeer are a favorite topic of Sámi folk songs called joiks: the general and individual features of reindeer, their annual schedule, their significance as the favorite companions of humans and as the guarantee of wealth, welfare and food are facts sung about in dozens of joiks.

In his work of 1673, entitled Lapponia and reporting on Lapland in the Latin language, Johannes Schefferus published, among others, a joik collected from a certain Olaus Matheus Sirma (Čerbmá Ovllá). The poem entitled Guldnsaž njirrosam is one of the earliest pieces of Sámi written poetry.

The reindeer keeping Sámi people sing the simplest type of joiks, which are also the shortest and hide the most secrets in that, beyond the words and sometimes contradicting them, the tune and rhythm, too, convey a basic meaning. The joik lyrics of the reindeer keeping Sámi are often not more than the name of a person, mountain or place, or a simple sentence.

While the performance of joiks could not be eradicated even by the order of 1687 banning pagan rituals, there was a forced change in its function: the once ritual goals were replaced by the characterization of human companions and the attitude towards them as well as to nature. (In older times, shamans had performed reindeer sacrifices to their gods and ghosts, accompanied by the signing of joiks, so as to prevent illnesses or stop the decay of livestock.) In this paper, mention shall also be made of the mythological joiks often featuring wild reindeer. These are extensive epic poems telling of discords between noitas (magicians, shamans) primarily. Noitas were able to turn into wild reindeer or hide in the necks or backs thereof. The reason triggering discords between them was usually the ownership right of a herd of wild deer.

Joiks are certainly inseparable from the beliefs of the Sámi, while this paper shall also reveal that the reindeer have played an important role in other elements of Sámi beliefs, too (e.g. at funeral feasts, in addition to the sacrifice rituals mentioned above), as well as in other forms of expression of Sámi mythology, like tales and myths.

The annual schedule of reindeer and their shepherds

The pace of life of reindeer and their shepherds is determined by the animals’ instincts, their centuries-old habits as well as some natural circumstances. The annual “scheduled” migration of the reindeer adjusted to the seasons and the conditions characterizing these – in the case of mountain reindeer keepers – can primarily be put down to their conditions of food acquisition. Points of certainty in the lives of all reindeer shepherds and reindeer are the hunt for mushrooms in autumn, the herding and earmarking of the animals, the tradition of castration, the mating of the animals, the migration of caravans, the calving season in spring, the milking of cows, the summer grazing as well as several reindeer habits (like the 3-4 rest breaks a day, migration against the wind, etc.). The feeding of reindeer, their agony caused by mosquitoes and their larvae as well as the characteristics of the hair, fur and horn are also discussed in the chapter on the annual schedule of the nomadic Sámi.
The necessity of linguistic analysis

The nomenclature related to reindeer husbandry is amazingly rich and expedient. The examination of the various names denoting reindeer according to certain aspects exclusively (age, sex, behavioral and bodily characteristics like color, the size and shape of the horn, the build of the body, etc.) already reveals a shockingly precise terminology. There is also an abundance of words known to denote the individual moments and work phases of reindeer husbandry as well as the instruments involved (e.g. fences, earmarks, etc.). This precision of the vocabulary is indispensable in the life of the Sámi and its effort to be able to denote a single concept by a single term points in the direction of ideal linguistic communication. So far, there has been no example for the presentation of the Sámi terminology of reindeer husbandry on the basis of linguistic aspects, even though the synchronous and diachronic examination of the vocabulary could also reveal, among others, the changes that have developed in the relationship of the words and the underlying concepts in the past decades, in parallel with the technical development of reindeer husbandry.

The sources serving as a basis for linguistic analysis

The sources at my disposal were partly of a linguistic-lexicological nature (bilingual dictionaries: Sammallahti (1989, 1993), Nielsen (1932–38), Lagercrantz (1936); etymological dictionaries: SSA, SKES, UEW; etymological glossaries: Lehtiranta (1989), Kortesalmi (1996); computer databases: Álgu), and partly related to other fields of study, primarily to ethnography (Collinder 1984). The sources of the Sámi vocabulary serving as the basis of this paper are two works by Nils Isak Eira (Eira 1984, 1994), thus the linguistic data reflect the Norwegian use of the Northern Sámi dialect. The orthography follows the orthographic principles agreed upon at the 20th Sámi Conference held in Arjeplog, Sweden in the summer of 1978 and considered official in Sweden, Norway, as well as Finland. In some cases, I made a good use of the further development of this simplified orthography by Pekka Sammallahti, which has proven useful in scientific work. (Sammallahti, too, avoids the detailed phonetic sign system that includes several secondary signs, used by his great predecessors Lagercrantz and Nielsen, while he marks strong long geminates, for example.)

The specification of the vocabulary examined

The collection and presentation of certain groups of words, the examination of semantic fields, is a popular field of Finno-Ugric research. Just to mention two examples of Sámi reference: Edit Bogár chose the system of Sámi bird names (Bogár 1991), while József Máté that of Sámi plant names (Máté 2003) as their fields of research. The group of words I have chosen does not only include nouns (like various names of reindeer based on some of their characteristics), but also adjectives (the characteristics of reindeer) and verbs (the activities of reindeer and their shepherds) as well as even adverbs.

It is a difficult task to determine what actually belongs to the terminology of reindeer husbandry, i.e. where the borderline of the vocabulary to be examined should be drawn; it forces the author to make arbitrary decisions. My decision was to shrink the vocabulary found to some extent, which I have done in the following way: in my semantic and morphological study, I have avoided examining the possible illnesses of reindeer, the means of transportation indispensable for the nomadic Sámi or the parts thereof, tools or the parts thereof, or the moments, instruments or products of processing reindeer. Despite my above effort, attentive
readers may find words including which may seem unjustified considering the above aspects. Let me mention the word LpN *avohas* as an example. According to its primary meaning, this word denotes the strap of the harness of a reindeer that runs along the back of the animal (and is often decorated) but is also used to denote a reindeer of grey or lighter color that has a hoop-like dark stripe or band on its back, similar to the above strap. Thus, it was its secondary meaning that justified the inclusion of the word *avohas*. In the chapter discussing the origin of the words, however, all elements related to reindeer husbandry that can be found in the linguistic sources are dealt with. The LpN *sárja* meaning “the slats of a sleigh” is a loan-word from the Finnish language, for example, because of which it has been included despite the above aspect of shrinking the vocabulary.

### Summary of the linguistic (semantic, morphological, etymological) analysis

The informative reindeer names that form the core of the terminology of reindeer husbandry convey relevant information on the animals that they denote to the name-giving community, the nomadic reindeer keepers. These pieces of information, however, do not necessarily allow the representatives of those cultures in which these names are not used to adequately define these terms, in lack of relevant experience, specialized knowledge, or a basis for comparison. The implicit information inherent in these terms, however, makes it possible to list the elements of this terminology into conceptual-semantic groups. Although the lines between these groups cannot always be clearly drawn, they reflect the approach and motivation underlying the name-giving.

In the semantic chapter of my paper, I have listed the Northern Sámi terminology of reindeer husbandry available in my sources (Eira 1984, 1994) into semantic groups.

I have set up three main groups. In the first one, I have listed the names, features, activities, as well as the names of certain groups of reindeer (collective nouns) given to them according to various criteria (sex, age, antlers, fur, physical condition, earmarks, behavior, function, property relationships). The names of certain parts of the antler are also specified here. The second major group contains the words that refer to humans such as the names given to and the activities performed by the reindeer shepherds. The third large group is aimed to cover the (natural and physical) environment. It is here that I have classified the words that refer to the conditions of reindeer husbandry, the typical or important locations, periods and tools thereof (including the earmarks), as well as those that denote the feeding of the reindeer. (I have summarized the grouping criteria in a table attached in the Appendix.)

The elaboration of the terms brings up a handful of problems. In order to determine a term from a lexicographical point of view, we need to have three parts such as:

a) the sign of the term (one word, or a lexeme of several words),
b) the definition that provides the determining features of the denominated concept,
c) the interpretation necessary for acquiring an accurate knowledge of the concept, which adds extra information to the definition.

In many cases, it is the very sign required by Point a) that is missing from the Hungarian language, as, to explain it in extremely simple terms, its speakers do not keep reindeer. The system of the linguistic denominators of the concepts, i.e. that of the terms, is culturally and linguistically dependent, there are (may be) differences in the conceptual systems that had developed in the various cultures. In the case of culturally specific objects (in which the unique experiences and knowledge of the cultural community under review are expressed, i.e. those which exist in one language and not in the other), we are confronted with what we call linguistic ‘realia’, in other words, untranslatable elements (non-equivalent lexemes). If the target language term is missing in lack of a counterpart in the culture of that language, the
choices of the lexicographer will, even in an ideal case, be limited to what is explained in Points b) and c).

The spontaneous coinage of names by Sámi reindeer farmers proves to be much more precise and illustrative in many cases than a scientific term. Of course, there are first of all practical reasons for this preciseness, while the development of the most expressive names may partially even have emotional motivations. For example, the triple compound varitčoarvedahkki denotes such a one-year old male reindeer which is already growing his antler that is typical for a one-and-a-half-year old reindeer, although this is not justified by his age (varit 'male reindeer in his second year of age', čoarvi 'antler', dahkki 'maker'). In this one single form of a word, their users imply the age and sex of the animal designated by the word, as well as the features of his antler.

One can also trace the expression of emotional ties in that a yet unborn reindeer, i.e. the main property of a reindeer farmer, the key to his livelihood, may be called by a Sámi person who is not a reindeer keeper the “offspring of the reindeer” (bohcco ohki: boazu 'reindeer', ohki 'offspring'), but the reindeer keepers still call it sismiessi, i.e. 'internal calf' (sis- 'internal', miessi 'reindeer calf'). The womb of the reindeer cow (álddu heagga: áldu 'reindeer cow', heagga 'womb') is, in turn, called miesegoahti, i.e. 'calf tent, tent of the calf' (goahti 'Sámi tent').

In many cases, it is the similarity that motivates name-giving. The name snuggoaivi, for example, denotes such an antler whose branches are leaning extremely forward, so the anterior constituent of the compound snuggat is the verb 'sniff; steal, nick', while its posterior is the noun oaivi 'head'; the similarly metaphorical noun skierreoaivi denotes a low antler with a short branch, or the reindeer that wears such an antler: the shape and size of the antler remind the name-giving reindeer keepers of one of the characteristics of the flora in Lapland, which is the dwarf birch (skierri, Lat. Betula nana).

While the reasons for the accuracy of the terminology are explained by the outcome of the semantic analysis, the consequences thereof are reflected by the morphological characteristics. In the morphology chapter of my paper, I shall describe the morphological features of the names and attributes of reindeer (according to age, sex, antlers, fur, bodily characteristics, earmarks, behavior, function, property relationships).

Among the compound words, I have grouped the two-, three- and four-member compounds according to their basic members (nouns, adjectives), and the principle for breaking these down to further sub-groups was the part of speech that the anterior constituent of the compound belongs to.

The wider category into which the specimen denoted by the compound can be listed may be determined by the substantival basic member; it may denote some part of the reindeer’s body, whose characteristic feature defined in the anterior constituent means sufficient motivation for the creation of an independent lexeme; it can be used independently as well, as a noun with a special meaning, which must be further specified in the given situation; and which may also be a derivative noun. The anterior constituents of the compounds may be nouns (in nominative or accusative-genitive cases), i.e. either root words (simplexes) or derivative words, or they may also be adjectives: the attributive forms of adjectives; or some verbal derivatives. The latter is mostly the past participle of the verb, or a reduced infinitival form. The compound words with an adjectival basis contain the predicative (non-attributive) forms of the adjectives.

Among the affixes used in the derived elements of the words under review, there are both substantival and adjectival suffixes. The derivatives with the latter may be regarded as nouns with double part of speech labels in the terminology of reindeer husbandry. For
example, the word čoarvveheapmi (< čoarvi) developed with a privative suffix may mean a reindeer with a conspicuously small antler, although its actual meaning is ‘without an antler’. Such adjectives that are used as nouns are actually the epithets of the hoazu ‘reindeer’, whose qualified word has been omitted (ellipsis).

A rather high level of preciseness required in order to reach efficiency does not necessarily contribute to the earlier described endeavor for linguistic economy. The high number of compounds in the words under review is indispensable to define and linguistically express the differences which are sometimes almost impossible to see for an outsider. We have come across the already mentioned noun oaiivi ‘head’ as a posterior constituent in as many as 23 cases; while the word čoarvi meaning ‘antler’ fulfills this role in 45 compounds.

The derivatives found among the terms prove the need for developing a synthetic language. This terminology may contain even several derivatives of a single standard language basic form, which are of course used in special meanings. The adjective lojes, lojis meaning ‘calm, meek’, for example, serves as the underlying form for both the word lojat ‘peaceful, lazy reindeer ox’ and the noun lojáš, which means an ‘extraordinarily meek reindeer cow’.

The vocabulary that I have analyzed from an etymological perspective shows at least such an exciting picture. Out of the 81 words that I have examined, 14 words go back to the Uralian age (11 certain, 3 uncertain), 12 can be traced back to the Finno-Ugrian age (7 certain, 5 uncertain). The Finno-Permic age forms of 4 words can be followed back, and the Finno-Volgaic forms of 8 of them are familiar (5 certain, 3 uncertain). Out of the 81 elements 64 also have standard Sámi reconstructions (we can find 11 standard Sámi reconstructions in the group of words of foreign origin). The Northern Sámi words under review also include derivatives, only the underlying forms of which can be traced back to one of the original languages (e.g. čeaskkut ‘fairly light, snow-white reindeer’ < čeaskat ‘snow-white’ < FP čäčkä ‘clean, white, visible in white’; čoavjjet ‘reindeer cow with calf’ < čoavji ‘belly’ < U čowja, čojwa ‘stomach, paunch, belly’).

In the case of simplexes, it was the narrowing of meaning that played a critical role in the development of Northern Sámi meanings. We could see a high number of examples for how the broader, more general meaning of a form of a word reconstructed for an earlier age has by now taken up a special meaning in the (Northern) Sámi. Just to show one example, the LpN word bákŋi that can be traced back to the Uralian age word pänje ‘head’ means a single, although obviously outstandingly important part of the head of the reindeer, what we call the forehead, while the head of the animal is denoted by the noun oaiivi (< U ojwa ‘head’ (UEW 336, SSS 332)), which is understandably very common as a posterior constituent in compounds and which is also of Uralian origins.

Among the 14 Uralian age words, we cannot find a single one that can be regarded as the term to denote organized reindeer husbandry. As long as the meanings of the ancient (Uralian, Finno-Ugrian, Finno-Permic, Finno-Volgaic) words refer to reindeer, they can be meant for wild reindeer, or the way of life thereof (e.g. čallat ‘rub (the skin from the antler)’ < U čele- ‘clean the antler of skin’; čora ‘(smaller, 10−100 member) reindeer herd’ < FU šur ‘group, (reindeer)herd’; jeagil ‘lichen’ < FP jäkä-lä ‘id.’; áldu ‘reindeer cow’ (which is still followed around by her newborn calf)’ < FV åltš ‘reindeer cow’).

The fact that meaning is becoming more specific is even more conspicuous if we take the ancient elements with standard Sámi reconstructions into account, which seems to support our earlier formulated opinion that advanced reindeer husbandry as a form of the economy may have developed after the separation of the Sámi people from the related peoples.

Among the 15 loan elements of the Northern Sámi terminology with only standard Sámi reconstructions, or not even those, we can find 7 such words whose direct language of
origin was Finnish, according to the sources that I have relied on. We could see that the Finns started to deal with reindeer keeping later than the Sámi people, this is why this piece of data may be somewhat surprising. For instance, it was the Finnish word naava ‘reindeer moss’ that was lent to the Sámi language to denote the long hair under a reindeer’s neck. On the basis of the forms used in the Sámi dialects, which have equivalent meanings to the Northern Sámi, the standard Sámi forms can also be traced back (nāvē, cf. YS 768), whose meanings are equivalent to those of today’s Northern Sámi words. This means that from these data, we can draw conclusions on the time of the frequent narrowing of meaning that also happened in the case of the borrowed words, but perhaps it should also be interesting to know what the hair under a reindeer’s neck was called before taking over the relevant Finnish word.

There are 3 Northern Sámi words lent from the Finnish whose standard Sámi forms are not familiar. These may also bring up exciting questions. We wonder what may have been the reason for that while LpN gärđi 'fenced area, stockyard' was passed over to the Finnish language (Fi. kaarre 'id.'), the Finnish word aita with the same meaning was taken over by the Sámi language in the form of āidi. The above-mentioned two Finnish words are treated as synonyms by my sources; while Pekka Sammallahti tries to find a difference between the Northern Sámi words gärđi and āidi in his dictionary (SSS 12, 158), in a bracketed comment. According to his explanation, the word gärđi is primarily used for denoting a stockyard for sorting and marking the reindeer. Or, why was it necessary to take over the Finnish word of Swedish origin piettio, piettiö 'reindeer ox' (> LpN biettek 'id.', cf. the Swedish bete 'castrated ram', SSA II/350) if the Northern Sámi reindeer keepers also had the word heargi 'id.' at their disposal, which was a word used for denoting castrated reindeer and one of Baltic origin, also possessing a standard Sámi reconstructed form?

These are already questions answering which would require ethnographical research and on-site work.

Appendix

The Appendix attached to my paper consists of four parts. As mentioned above, it is here that I have attached the table in which the semantic groups are summarized, for an easy overview. I have also prepared a table of the Northern Sámi names of reindeer according to age and sex. Under the title The terminology of reindeer husbandry in Northern Sámi, there is a Northern Sámi glossary of a total of 535 elements. After the title, the classification of the word in question as a part of speech is indicated in square brackets. The words also include synonyms, in which cases I use an arrow for the word lower down in the alphabetical order to indicate where exactly the meaning of this word, as well as its Hungarian and Sámi definitions are to be found.

My linguistic research is limited to the Northern Sámi dialect of the Sámi language, however, it does make sense to get a glimpse of the relevant vocabulary of the Finnish language, which is a tongue with which Northern Sámi has a regular mutual relationship. This aim is served by the 700-element glossary that I have compiled from the Finnish terminology of reindeer husbandry, which is also part of the Appendix. The Reindeer Act, passed in 1995, at the time of the accession of Finland to the European Union, legally confirms the practice that in Finland it is not only the Sámi people but also the Finns that are entitled to keep reindeer, which is a practice different from the Norwegian and Swedish traditions. Common activities require a common language: in the reindeer husbandry terminology of a settlement with mixed population, Sámi and Finnish expressions live side by side, complementing each other in everyday language use. In order to capture the phenomenon that certain elements of this mixed vocabulary later become loan-words, i.e. to draw conclusions on the relationship between the language of origin and the adopting language, it is indispensable to get familiar
with the use of language by reindeer farmers with a purely Sámi mother tongue and those with a purely Finnish mother tongue, respectively.
The Finnish vocabulary is not strictly the subject of my dissertation but the Sámi elements of Finnish origin presented during the etymological analyses justify their representation in the paper, in my opinion.
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