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Introduction

The location of T'in and her dialects within the total picture of Mon-Khmer may be displayed by means of the following tree:

```
          Mon-Khmer
            |     |
            Khmuic
            |     |
             T'in
               |
              Mal
              |
             MA
             |
            MB
            |
           MB1
           |
          MC
          |
         MC1
         |
        MC2
```

P1, P2, ......., Pn

T'in was classified as a Khmuic language by Thomas and Headley (1970). As I pointed out in my dissertation (Filbeck 1971), there is no T'in language, only dialects. The term T'in may be considered an ethnographic construct for the people in Thailand and Laos who speak a set of related dialects, but synchronically the term has no reality either linguistically or culturally. There are two main branches in T'in the Mal and the Pray, but neither of these can be considered homogeneous dialects. Mal is divided into three dialects having sharp boundaries clearly definable by statable rules of phonological change. Even the Mal subsets (MB1, MC1, MC2) are sharply differentiated, and in a way directly related to th
cussion of this paper for the latter two sub-
jects. On the other hand, Pray is still a language
with a great deal of 'local differentiation' (Swadesh
2). Dialectal boundaries are not sharp; there is
a potpourri of individual changes meandering
through all Pray villages resulting in no accumula-
tion, dialectal effect among the speakers.

The introduction of the above tree schema of
dialects is important in one major respect: it
vides a concise picture of what we are up against
tracing the Proto-T'in phoneme */r/ throughout the
dialects of T'in. The behavior of this proto-phoneme
not confined to dialectal boundaries. Yet a pic-
ture of the dialects of T'in offers a frame of refer-
ence whereby a discussion of this behavior can take
place. Therefore, my purpose in this paper is to
describe the current, varied situation of Proto-T'in */r/
the extant dialects and to present a description
that will account for the changes from */r/ in all
wn dialects, but without regard for the boundaries
these dialects.

Data

The data of Proto-T'in */r/ and its reflexes cut
toss and through all dialects of T'in. That is,
here are dialects in Mal and Pray which contain an
phoneme, and identical developments from */r/ are
ervable in both Mal and Pray dialects. The loca-
ns of these isoglosses, whether /r/ or any devel-
ent from */r/, are often noncontiguous as one
ews from east to west or from north to south. In
larity, villages located in proximity to each other
more than likely display a mosaic of heteroge-
ous retentions of and developments from Proto-T'in
/. For example, just three hours' walk from the
T'in village where I lived for a few years, there were two other T'in villages differing from each other in respect to */r/* as well as differing from the village where I lived in still a third way. Just beyond these two villages were other villages adding their own distinctive patterns to the mosaic. Even where there exists a clustering of villages representing a retention or a particular reflex of */r/*, there have been migrations of villages representing different aspect of the problem into the area. Some T'in villages are even a mixture of */r/* retention and */r/* reflex.

Proto-T'in */r/* can in some cases be used as the sole criterion in differentiating dialects. Such is the case for differentiating Mal C₁ from Mal C₂, but this represents only a trivial dialectal variation within the total picture. For the most part dialectal differentiation in T'in must be an accumulation of different changes of which the behavior of Proto-T' */r/* is only one. I emphasize this at this point because the following discussion may at times give the impression that the development of Proto-T'in */r/* is the only criterion for dialect differentiation. This is far from true. The purpose of this section is to locate isoglossic retentions and reflexes of Proto-T'in */r/* in T'in. I do not mean the geographical location of these isoglosses, for the shifting fortunes of the T'in people under the dark cloud of the Indo-China War makes this impractical and impossible. I mean the dialectal location of */r/* and its reflexes within the schema of T'in dialects presented in the introduction.

In other words, I will use the proto-phoneme */r/* and its reflexes as typological features to classif
T'in dialects into four groups. However, in this
sense, the classification is only arbitrary, perhaps
vauge, but certainly not, as Greenberg (1963:66)
would say, unique; a few dialects may be classified
more than one typological classification. This
will become clear in the discussion.

/r/ Dialects

The first typological group consists of those
dialects where the proto-phoneme */r/* has been
retained throughout. In this type I mean to include
the dialects where */r/* has been retained for
relevant positions of the syllable: initial,
medial, and in initial consonant clusters. There are
also dialects where */r/* has been retained for only
a few positions, but these shall be discussed
below. Furthermore, I mean that the modern reflexes
of */r/*-type; cases where */r/* has developed to
a different sort of phoneme are not included.

There are two T'in dialects where the proto-
phoneme */r/* has been retained. One is Mal A and
the other is what we may term for the purpose of
this paper Pray 1. The listing below gives a number
of cognates from these two dialects where */r/* occurs
in all consonantal positions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mal A</th>
<th>Pray 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ra?</td>
<td>ra?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?iar</td>
<td>si?iar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raŋŋ?aal</td>
<td>raŋŋ lam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pran</td>
<td>pro?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thaar</td>
<td>thaar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mpriŋŋ</td>
<td>mpren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kрак</td>
<td>kрак</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khręčh</td>
<td>khręčh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'to place'
'chicken'
'flower'
'sore'
'rope'
'split bamboo'
'tomorrow'
'ripe'
Mal A is spoken in only one village located at the extreme western edge of T'in territory in Thung Chang District of Nan Province in north Thailand. Pray 1 consists of at least three non-contiguous areas, two in Thailand and one in Sayaboury Province in Laos. (I am indebted to Don Durling of the Christian and Missionary Alliance Church for furnishing data from several T'in villages in Laos.) The first area in Thailand consists of several villages located in a refugee camp in Thung Chang District. The second area is located some 15 miles to the south. The area in Laos includes two villages several miles apart, but the data show they share identical features. Between the villages located in Thailand and those in Laos, there are a few differences, mostly in vocabulary.

The /l/ Dialects

The criterion for classifying or typing T'in dialects here is that for all relevant positions of the syllable, the reflex of Proto-T'in */r/* is the lateral /l/. /l/ is already an established phoneme for all dialects of T'in and for Proto-T'in. Here, however, 'relevant syllable position' takes on a restricted meaning, because, for having undergone the change from Proto */r/* to /l/, there must be a previous rule eliminating all liquids (including /r/) from all consonant clusters. Only one dialect meets this condition and that is the subset Mal C_{1}.
Mal dialect C is spoken only in one large complex in Pua District of Nan Province. C_1 and Mal C_2 divide the 2000-plus speakers in this complex into two linguistic groups. The sole criterion for distinguishing between these two sets is the way Proto-T'in */r/ has changed. Fluids in consonant clusters have been replaced by o in both subsets. In Mal C_1, Proto-T'in */r/ become /l/ in both prevocalic and postvocalic positions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proto-T'in</th>
<th>Mal C_1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>riʔ</td>
<td>liʔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mar</td>
<td>mal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khraak</td>
<td>khaak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phlah</td>
<td>phah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mal dialect C_2 also has /l/ in prevocalic position for Proto-T'in */r/, but differs from C_1 in that postvocalic proto */r/ changed into /y/. This, however, brings us to the third group of T'in dialects, and Mal C_2 should be discussed in this section, along with a number of other dialects.

Glide Dialects

The criterion used here for typologically grouping T'in dialects is that for some position or positions of the syllable, Proto-T'in */r/ has become a glide. This criterion does not result in a unique classification for it does not exclude the retention of /r/ for other positions of the syllable, the change of proto */r/ to /l/ for these other positions.

Three glides have developed from Proto-T'in */r/ in the dialects of T'in. The most common glide is /y/. One of the interesting things about /y/ is that
it is only one part of a split, i.e. where Proto-T'in */r/* has become */γ/*, it has also become something else. For example, in Mal C₂, */r/* became */γ/* in postvocalic position, but */l/* in prevocalic position. In a Pray dialect, which we will call Pray 2, just the reverse has occurred: */γ/* is prevocalic and */l/* is postvocalic. In still another Pray dialect, Pray 3, */γ/* has emerged in consonant clusters while */r/* is retained for all other positions.

| Mal C₂ | Pray 2 | Pray 3  |  |  |
|--------|--------|---------|  |  |
| may    | mal    | maar    | 'snake' |  |
| m+i+l  | mEL    | rŒr    | 'to walk' |  |
| lœn    | luan    | ruan    | 'path' |  |
| laŋ    | laŋ    | raŋ    | 'flower' |  |
| pham   | khyam  | khyam  | 'person' |  |
| khœn   | khœcœn | khœcœn | 'husband, male' |  |

In Mal B an unusual glide has emerged as a reflex of Proto-T'in */r/* in postvocalic position. It is a high back unrounded vocoid, which we may transcribe as */ï/*. The pronunciation of this vocoid can be observed by comparing three words: */suï/* 'rotten', where there is no tongue movement between */u/* and */ï/*, only an unrounding of the lips; */nthï/* 'bat', where there is a slight backward movement of the tongue; and */koï/* 'claw', where there is an upward movement of the tongue and an unrounding of the lips. This sound is nonsyllabic and is classified as a glide. For other syllable positions in Mal B Proto-T'in */r/* has become */γ/*.

| Proto-T'in | Mal B  |  |  |
|------------|--------|  |  |
| rœŋ       | yeœŋ   | 'crab' |  |
| rœh       | yœh    | 'to rise up' |  |
Proto-T'in    Mal B
riʔ        yiʔ       'energetic'
pher        phεʰ       'to fly'
kar         kaʔ       'straight'
tur         tuʔ       'cracked'
krʔ?        kyuʔ       'deep'
khrʔh       khyʔh      'ripe'
mproy̠n     mpyʔ̠n      'a type of basket'

Because of the change to /y/, Proto-T'in */r/ has lost from consonant clusters occurring contiguous to a high front vowel; e.g. Proto-T'in */mpry̠ʔ/ lit bamboo', Mal B /mpyʔ/.
This has occurred in dialects where */r/ has become /y/ in consonant clusters.

The third glide that Proto-T'in */r/ has changed to is /w/. I have found this in only one village far and in connection with the change to be discussed next.

/r/ and /ŋk/ from */r/*

The cluster */ŋkr/ for Proto-T'in is well tested from evidence in the majority of T'in dialects. However, there is some evidence that a few words found in the dialects with this consonant cluster should be reconstructed simply with Proto-T'in */r/*.

The most common example is /ŋkrem ~ ŋkym/ cover, conceal, disappear', which is found in all dialects that I have investigated, both and Pray. Mal dialect B also has /šem/ in ition to /ŋkym/.

Mal A has /ŋkər/ 'eye aract' while Mal B has /šem/. It might be argued that the best explanation for these variations is that the cluster /ŋk/ was lost from a few words as
Mal B emerged as a separate dialect. But it could also be argued that /ŋk/ was somehow an accretion for these few words. That this is a distinct possibility can be seen from a Pray dialect which we may call Pray 4.

Pray 4 is spoken in a single village located not in a tribal refugee camp in Pua, Nan Province. Pray 4 is a mixed dialect because of heavy lexical borrowing from formerly surrounding villages speaking Mal dialects. The substratum, however, is clearly Pray. In this dialect Proto-T'in */r/ has become the glide /w/ in syllable final position; for example, Proto-T'in */piar/ 'two' has become /piaw/ in Pray 4. In syllable initial position */r/ has developed to /ŋky/. This includes loanwords from Thai beginning with /r/ (here marked Lw).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proto-T'in</th>
<th>Pray 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>raŋ ?aal</td>
<td>ŋkyaan ?aal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raŋ?</td>
<td>ŋkya?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reŋŋ</td>
<td>ŋkyeeŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reŋŋ (Lw)</td>
<td>ŋkyeeŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rak (Lw)</td>
<td>ŋkyak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raap</td>
<td>ŋkyap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>room</td>
<td>ŋkyoom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rooŋ</td>
<td>ŋkyuanŋ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An interesting allophone of /ŋky/ in Pray 4 is [ŋ̍ɭ], a fronted back, voiced, velar fricative; it has almost a palatalized quality about it. With some speakers this allophone varies quite freely with the whole cluster /ŋky/.

Because of this evidence that Proto-T'in */r/ has been replaced by /ŋky/ in Pray 4, we should not rule out the possibility that a similar process has
T' in dialects. That is, it is possible that for a few sets of cognates beginning with the cluster /ŋkr/ the reconstruction should be to-T' in */r/. However, I believe that this is her controversial for the small amount of data we see, and unfortunately it is a solution we will have to abandon in the course of this paper.

Honological Description

After the above exercise in dialectology a son might be justified in being thoroughly concerned concerning Proto-T' in */r/ and its reflexes in modern T' in dialects. At the beginning I assumed there are dialects in T' in but then I proceeded to disregard these dialectal boundaries instead chose a proto-phoneme to arbitrarily group these dialects typologically according to entions of and changes from this proto-phoneme. Graphically, as is the rule in dialectology, the glosses formed a mosaic and not a straight line descent from one point to another; phonologically, found a wide variety of changes from */r/ as well random combinations of changes, plus random entions of */r/. This, of course, leads us to the ssical tension between dialectology and structural linguistics and only adds to the confusion.

However, the situation is not as chaotic as my cussion makes it appear. We can bring order to very large degree out of all the data we have served by making the assumption that language change is basically a change in grammar, i.e. in erlying competence. Since grammar in this sense characterized by rules, linguistic change is nge in the rules of the grammar. Therefore in s section we are really interested only in making
explicit the changes that have taken place from the proto-phoneme */r/. I will not discuss where */r/ has been retained nor where */r/ has been replaced by zero, for there is nothing of interest in these two aspects. */r/ in certain cases has been lost; e.g. Mal B has /m+/ 'to walk' while Mal A has /m+r/, which must be taken as the reconstruction of this word. Proto-T'in */hr/ has been lost in nearly all the dialects of T'in, the words containing it being replaced by Thai loanwords.

The rules characterizing the changes from Proto-T'in */r/ take as their domain of operation those distinctive features proposed by Chomsky and Halle (1968). Under this system */r/ is classified with the features [+consonant] [+syllabic] [-lateral]. The changes from this set of proto-features may be conveniently summarized by the following schema (I leave the case of /ŋkr ~ ŋky/ for a special discussion later).

```
 */r/          
  |            |           |
 [+]         [-]        
 /l/        [+back]    [-back] 
            [+round]    [-round] 
       /w/           /u/ 
```

This schema is to be interpreted as reflecting what has been available to all T'in speakers in the course of development from Proto-T'in. That is, there has been a 'choice', in terms of binary features, where
direction of the change takes place. As far as goes the schema is descriptive, but not neces-
"rily explanatory; there is much more, as we shall briefly see, to the problem than we presently
understand.

This schema summarizes several rules which characterize the changes from Proto-T'in */r/.
There are two types of rules involved in these changes, those that change features, and those (like
pheme structure rules) that add features.

In the schema above it can be seen that the
cchange involves a change of features, or more properly a change of feature specification. One of
interesting results in assuming the features put
ward by Chomsky and Halle is that the features in
set \[ \begin{array}{c}
+\text{con} \\
+syl \\
-\text{lat}
\end{array} \] become either all 'plus' in specifica-
don, \[ \begin{array}{c}
+\text{con} \\
+syl \\
+\text{lat}
\end{array} = /l/; \text{or all 'minus'}, \begin{array}{c}
-\text{con} \\
-\syl \\
-\text{lat}
\end{array} \text{= glide.}
\]
However, this appears to be a simplification of the
uto-phoneme, which is a favorite theme in genera-
linguistics. Presumably we can say that it is
pler, in a matrix, to have all pluses or all
uses instead of two pluses and one minus. In
er words, it represents a greater generalization
structure to have either all of one or all of
other.

If the change is made to where all features are
ked plus, then there is nothing more to say, for
resulting realization is */l/*. If, however, the
ge has made all specifications minus, then rules
t add features are needed, for we have seen that
re are three glides that have emerged in the T'in
dialects. These three glides divide themselves into back and nonback varieties. So the first rule of change in this regard adds the feature \([-\text{back}]\):

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
-\text{con} \\
-\text{syl} \\
-\text{lat} \\
+\text{back}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

If \([-\text{back}]\) is specified, then the realization is \(/y/\). Now \([+\text{back}]\) glides in T'in dialects are likewise divided into two groups, being specified by another rule as to \([+\text{round}]\). If the resultant matrix is

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
-\text{con} \\
-\text{syl} \\
-\text{lat} \\
+\text{back} \\
+\text{round}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

then the realization is \(/w/\). If the matrix is

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
-\text{con} \\
-\text{syl} \\
-\text{lat} \\
+\text{back} \\
-\text{round}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

the realization is \(/\tau/\).

I return now to the problem of \(/\eta kr/\) and \(/\eta ky/\).

We have seen that \(/\eta ky/\) for Pray 4 is a reflex of Proto-T'in \(*/r/\), and that some cases of \(/\eta kr/\) in other dialects may be also. It appears that these two clusters form an alternation, for if \(/r/\) and \(/y/\) form an alternation from proto \(*/r/\), then \(/\eta kr/\) and \(/\eta ky/\) should also. Moreover it would seem that the course of events for Pray 4 was proto \(*/r/\) to \(/\eta kr/\) to \(/\eta ky/\) since Proto-T'in \(*/\eta kr/\) has also become \(/\eta ky/\) in this dialect. However, all this is not necessarily true for two reasons. First, because of the scant data we have, it cannot be argued to any convincing degree that some examples of \(/\eta kr/\) are to be traced back to the proto-phoneme \(*/r/\); therefore, \(/\eta kr/\) and \(/\eta ky/\) are not true alternatives and the notion should be dropped from consideration.

Second, I believe the correct sequence of events for Pray 4 was not \(*/r/\) to \(/\eta kr/\) to \(/\eta ky/\), but simply \(*/r/\) to \(/\eta ky/\). By assuming this we can account for
allophone [g⁹], which is in free variation with cluster [ŋky].

Proto-T'in initial */#r-/, as in the majority T'in dialects, was under pressure to become initial /#ɣ-/, but for this dialect it came out [g⁹], which is close in articulation to /ɣ/. In fact [g⁹] very nearly palatalized itself. Now there was no voiced velar obstruent of any type in Proto-T'in. In the change from Proto-Khmuic, Proto-T'in lost all voiced stops, */bdjg/ becoming /ptck/.

A way which compensated for this loss was the emergence of new prenasalized unaspirated stops in addition to the ones already in the language.

Now prenasalized unaspirated stops form a well-established pattern for the T'in dialects, so it is a mystery that the phone [g⁹], having developed from Proto-T'in */#r-/, was further phonemicized to /ŋky-/. This description fits in a neat way into the schema outlined towards the beginning of this section.

Advising that schema to include /ŋky/ and reproducing all the relevant parts of that structure, we can classify the fronted velar [g⁹] as a nonback segment distinguishable from the other nonback segment by the feature [+strident].

\[
\begin{array}{c}
[-\text{con}] \\
[-\text{syl}] \\
[-\text{lat}] \\
[-\text{back}] \\
[+\text{strident}] & [-\text{strident}] 
\end{array}
\]

[+strident] is realized as the front glide /ɣ/. But if [+strident] is added, a whole new process is initiated, namely stridency requires that the segment now be marked [+consonant]. Since the whole process
has been redundantly marked [+voiced] from the beginning, we now have the matrix

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
+con \\
-syl \\
-lat \\
-back \\
+voiced
\end{bmatrix}
\]

At this point I posit an optional Feature Distribution Rule for this T'in dialect which distributes the relevant features sequentially:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
+con \\
-syl \\
-lat \\
-back \\
+str \\
+voiced
\end{bmatrix} \rightarrow [+voiced] + \begin{bmatrix}
+con \\
-syl \\
-lat
\end{bmatrix} + [-back]
\]

\(\text{[g\text{\textbackslash y}] /\eta/ /k/ /\gamma/}\)

([+strident] is obligatorily changed by another rule to [-strident] for this context.) In the environment above, [+voiced] is realized as a nasal homorganic to the succeeding stop consonant, which in turn is realized as the velar /k/. [-back] is realized as the glide /\gamma/. In this way the cluster /\eta kr/ is bypassed completely in a natural way as an intermediate step for this dialect, thus achieving a certain amount of simplicity in our description. Moreover, because of the free variation of [g\text{\textbackslash y}] and [\eta k\gamma] even in the speech of individuals of this dialect, this Feature Distribution Rule characterizes a synchronic competence, a competence that has its roots in a historical process.

**Unexplained Facts**

The previous section offers a description of the changes that have taken place from Proto-T'in */r/,

but there are still a number of facts left unexplained. For example, why do particular reflexes of proto */r/ occur in only certain positions of the
nable and not in all positions? Also, why are there certain combinations of reflexes—i.e. pre-postvocalic occurrences of different reflexes—found in the T'in dialects?

The phonotactic facts of Proto-T'in */r/ and reflexes found in the various dialects are these:

|__|  |__y  |y__↑ |ηky__w |Cy__r |CΦ__y |CΦ__ |
| CΦ |__ |

From the standpoint of phonological theory, why have these combinations emerged? A few are explainable; it seems natural that /ηky/ would not occur as reflex of */r/ in syllable final position. Also, it is natural to expect /y/ in consonant clusters be lost when occurring contiguous to a high front vowel. These two facts can easily be explained in model of linguistic change because they have to with physiological limitations on just what can pronounced, given the environment of the syllable under discussion. But why should /I/ be a reflex of to-T'in */r/ in one position and /y/ in another? why should /y/ emerge only in consonant clusters le /r/ is retained for all other positions?

And other similar phonotactic facts have no explanation; no theory I know of can offer an explanation of why the changes from proto */r/ have positioned themselves in these ways and no other.

There are a number of missing combinations.

For example, these */r/ reflex combinations are not found in any T'in dialect I know of:

|y__y |y__l |y__w |w__ |ηky__y |ηky__l |r__l |
| l__r |
These combinations are plausible; indeed most of them occur already in various T'in dialects but of course not necessarily due to development from the proto-phoneme */r/. The question here is why */r/ and its reflexes have not formed these particular combinations. There is no reason why these should not have emerged in addition to the others discussed above. Maybe a few have, in some yet undescribed dialect or unknown village. Perhaps some of these missing combinations may yet emerge in some of the dialects where /r/ has been retained.

One possible explanation for these missing combinations is the need to avoid homophonic words. That is, these combinations have not been utilized because of overloading the speech act with too many homonyms, thus impairing communication. However, there is no way to gauge what is and what is not overloading in this respect. Moreover, avoidance of homonyms seems to play no significant role in determining what particular phonotactic combination emerges in a T'in dialect. Both Mal C₁ and C₂ are chock-full of homonyms because of changes from Proto T'in */r/ and other sound changes, such as loss of prenasalization. I have a difficult time understanding these two dialects because of these resulting homonyms, but I have not noticed that there is any comparable lack of understanding when native speakers speak to each other. Therefore, I must conclude that the need to avoid homonyms is not sufficient to explain why certain combinations of reflexes from Proto-T'in */r/ do not occur in T'in dialects.

It appears that we must allow a certain amount of indeterminacy—or fickleness, if you wish— in
scribing the resulting phonotactics of Proto-T'in r/ and its reflexes. When a proto-phoneme such as r/ splits into different reflexes in different positions in the syllable, we find a sort of capriciousness about it all. It is not a capriciousness of structure or structuring, for changes from proto r/ in these cases do not fly off into all directions along the spectrum of phonological features. It is still possible to structure the data in terms of abstract features and underlying rules of phonological change. Indeterminacy must come in when we try to predict where a certain phonological structure will occur in a syllable. This we cannot do in most cases for the dialects of T'in, and it is a position that generative linguists do not find particularly satisfying. Linguistic facts without possibility of theoretical explanation are currently considered tasteless. Yet, as far as natural languages go, there is a fact of life we must learn to live with.
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