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Two main characters

- Ellipsis
- phi-features in the noun phrase

Ellipsis

- Basic assumptions
  - the ellipsis site has structure
  - ellipsis involves PF-deletion triggered by a syntactic feature (Merchant 2001)

Ellipsis is regulated by an identity condition of some sort:

- Pat left but I don’t know when she left.
- They bought a foreign car, but I don’t know which foreign car they bought.
- Kim is a birdwatcher and her siblings are birdwatchers too.

Identity condition on ellipsis

- Strict syntactic identity is too strong of a requirement (Merchant 2001; Kroll 2019; Rudin 2019; Ranero 2020)
  - Either the Board grants the license by December 15 or it explains why it didn’t grant the license by December 15.
  - No student finished the exam except Kim did finish the exam.
Identity condition on ellipsis

- Semantic identity is too weak
  - synonymy is insufficient to license ellipsis
    - "Jamie is no longer a bachelor and Peter did get married too" (Omer Preminger's example)
  - voice and argument structure mismatches are rarely available (Chung 2013, Merchant 2013)

Identity Condition

- Syntactic condition is too strong
- Semantic condition is too weak

Q1: What should be included in the Identity Condition?

Ellipsis contexts to consider today

- Noun phrase ellipsis (NPE)
  - Mary's daughter and Jane's daughter are friends.
- Predicate-nominal ellipsis (PNE)
  - Kim is a linguist and Pat is a linguist too.
Features inside a noun phrase

• Decompositional approach to noun phrase (independently motivated):
  • Roots are acategorial (Harley 2014; Merchant 2019, a.o.)
  • Gender is on the categorizing n which combines with √ROOT and carries formal gender features (Kramer 2015)
  • Status of NumP is less clear (Ritter 1998; Picallo 2019)

Decomposing noun phrases

Decomposing noun phrases: Outstanding questions

Do all derivational affixes have the same status?
  • Yes, they are all functional heads (Marantz 2001; Marvin 2003)
  • Yes, they are all roots (Lowenstamm 2015)
Test case: Russian gender

- Little n’s in Russian (possibly elsewhere in Slavic)
  - $n[F^+]$: feminine gender feature, triggers feminine concord
  - $n[F^-]$: masculine gender feature, triggers masculine concord
  - $nO_1$: no gender feature, triggers masculine concord
  - $nO_2$: no gender feature, triggers neuter concord

Test case: Russian gender

- Q2: Russian gender
  a. what is the decompositional structure of the Russian noun phrase (with the emphasis on gender and number)?
  b. what is the status of Russian affixes used to derive gendered nouns?

Test case: Russian gender

- Q2a: what is the decompositional structure of the Russian noun phrase (with the emphasis on gender and number)?
  - Preview of the answer:
    - It is simpler than you think
    - It is more articulated than you think

Test case: Russian gender

- Q2b: what is the status of Russian affixes used to derive gendered nouns?
  - Preview of the answer:
    - Not all derivational affixes are created equal
Test case: Russian gender

Q2b: what is the status of Russian affixes used to derive gendered nouns?

• Preview of the answer:
  • Not all derivational affixes are created equal, so both Marantz and Lowenstam are partially right
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Section outline

• Number matches and mismatches
• Gender: three main classes
• More gender: focus on morphology
Number under ellipsis

"Moi druž’ja kartežniki, i moj muž tože
my friends card players and my husband too
'My friends are card players, and my husband too.'

"Moj muž kartežnik, i moi druž’ja tože
my husband card player and my friends too
'My husband is a card player, and my friends too.'

Number under ellipsis

[NUMBER] mismatches are available (and predicted, e.g., Saab 2019)

\[
\text{NP-ellipsis} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{D} \rightarrow \text{NumP} \\
\text{NumP} \rightarrow nP \\
\text{NP} = \text{deletion of } nP
\]

Section outline

• Number matches and mismatches
• Gender: three main classes
• More gender: focus on morphology

What is going on here?
Gender mismatches under ellipsis

- Greek
  (Merchant 2014, Alexiadou 2015, Sudo & Spathas 2016)

- Spanish

- Portuguese
  (Bobaljik & Zocca 2011)

To my knowledge, Slavic languages have not been systematically investigated with respect to gender matches under ellipsis.

Background

Masculine/feminine pairs of animate nouns fall into three distinct classes under NPE and PNE:

- Nouns that never license ellipsis of their counterpart, regardless of gender
- Nouns that license ellipsis both ways (M > F, F > M)
- Nouns in which the masculine noun of the pair licenses ellipsis of the feminine version, but not vice versa (M > F, *F > M)
  (Merchant 2014)

Examples

- Class I: ellipsis impossible, common in kinship terms (*John is a good uncle and Mary is a good aunt too)

  John [PredP is a good uncle] and Mary [PredP is a good aunt] too
Examples

- Class I: ellipsis impossible, common in kinship terms (*John is a good uncle and Mary is a good aunt too)
- Class II: either element can anteced the other (John is a good lawyer and Mary is a good lawyer too; Mary is a good lawyer and John is a good lawyer too)

Let's add Russian

Three main classes as in other languages
- Class I: car/carica ‘tsar/tsarina’, deduška/babuška ‘grandfather/grandmother’, baran/ovca ‘ram/ewe’
- Class II: nominal advokat ‘lawyer’, doktor ‘doctor’, avtor ‘author’, etc.; deadjectival dežurnyj/ dežurnaja ‘person on call’; epicene tupica ‘dunce’

Class I: Kinship terms

*Vera babuška, i Kostya tože V grandaughter and K too
(*Vera is a grandma and Kostya too.*)
*Kostya deduška, i Vera tože K grandpa and V too
(*Kostya is a grandpa and Vera too.*)
Class I: Nobility names

"Orlov byl graf,
O was count
i Rostova tože
and R too
('Orlov was a count and
Rostova was a countess.')

"Rostova byla grafinja, i
R was countess &
Lenin tože
L too
('Rostova was a countess,
and Lenin was a count.')

Class II: epicenes, professions, deadjectivals

F > M
Maša tupica/advokat/rvan'/dežurnaja
M  dunce/lawyer/raggedy/on duty
i Petja tože
& P too
M > F
Petja tupica/advokat/rvan'/dežurnyj
P  dunce/lawyer/raggedy/on duty
i Maša tože
& M too

Class III

*Masha advokat-essa/učitel'-nica,
M  lawyer-FEM/teacher-FEM
i  Petja tože.
&  P too
('Masha is a lawyer/teacher and Petya too.')

*Emma krol'č-ika, i  Freddy tože.
E  bunny-FEM &  F  too
('Emma is a she-bunny, and Freddie too.')
Gender under ellipsis: Main generalizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Class I</th>
<th>Class II</th>
<th>Class III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M/F pairs</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ellipsis</strong></td>
<td>Symmetrically bad</td>
<td>Symmetrically good</td>
<td>Asymmetrical; %M &gt; F, * F &gt; M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing S, P, G, and R

- Recurring pattern of class asymmetries
- Class content varies across languages despite some overlap
- Class content also varies across speakers (stay tuned)
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Adding morphology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Class I</th>
<th>Class II</th>
<th>Class III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M/F pairs</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Morphology relating M and F</strong></td>
<td>Suppletion; derivational affixes</td>
<td>Zero affixes; gender inflection on deadjectivals</td>
<td>Derivational affixes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ellipsis</strong></td>
<td>Symmetrically bad</td>
<td>Symmetrically good</td>
<td>Asymmetrical; %M &gt; F, * F &gt; M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assumptions

- Defective paradigms can participate in ellipsis (Abels 2018; Mendes 2020; Merchant 2014; Pertsova 2016); repair under ellipsis circumvents morphophonological gaps:

\[ \text{Assumptions} \]

- Defective paradigms can participate in ellipsis; repair under ellipsis circumvents morphophonological gaps:

  - e.g., Russ. kočerga ‘firepoker’ *gen.pl 
    u Peti odna kočerga, a u nas pjt’ *gen.pl 
    by P one firepoker:nom but by us five 
    ‘Peter has one firepoker, and we have five.’

Gender-sensitive morphology

- Inflectional flavor: gender concord ending on deadjectival nouns
  zavedjušč-ij   zavedjušč-aja
  head-M      head-F

- Derivational flavor

  deriving F from M: -ka, -essa, -ša, -ica, -ixa, -finja
  deriving M from F: -ak; suppression of -a, deletion of -ka

Some examples

- F from M
  deputatka, deputatša, deputessa (<deputat) 
  advokatka, advokatša, advokatessa, advokatixa, 
  %advokatis(s)ja, %advocatica (<advokat)

- M from F (non-productive)
  ved’m-ak ‘witcher’ (<ved’ma) 
  dojar ‘milkman’ (<dojarka) 
  njan’ ‘babysitter’ (<njanja)
Morphological irregularities

M but no (regular) F:

- mudak ‘asshole’
- bolvan ‘moron, dumbass’
- pentjux ‘loser’, balbes ‘dumbhead’
- olux ‘dullard, sap’
- indejec ‘Native American’

F but no (regular) M:

- mašinistka ‘typist’
- manikjurša ‘manicurist’, njanja ‘babysitter’
- povituxa ‘midwife’, mokrica ‘douchebag’
- mymra ‘old stick’, bajaderka ‘temple dancer’

Morphological irregularities: Some examples

- kovboj ‘cowboy’ ≠ kovbojka ‘plaid shirt’
- korejec ‘Korean’ ≠ korejka ‘pork loin’
- mašinistka ‘typist’ ≠ mašinist ‘engine driver’

PNE in native speaker Russian: Regular predicate nominals
PNE in native speaker Russian:
Regular predicate nominals

- The results support the division of gender pairs into basic classes
- Minor asymmetry in Class II, with M being preferred antecedent (we may need better measures…), especially with deadjectival forms

PNE in native speaker Russian:
Irregular morphology on predicate nominal (cowboy ~ plaid shirt)

- M > F
- F > M

PNE in native speaker Russian:
Only one gender of predicate nominal available ('dumbass' type)
Summary of the empirical data

• Number mismatches are tolerated but not with *pluralia tantum*
• Gender mismatches vary depending on noun class and morphology

Outline

• Setting the stage: ellipsis, phi-features, Russian
• Russian NPE and PNE: feature matches and mismatches
• Analysis of the empirical data
• Conclusions and outstanding questions

Main points

• Lexical vs functional categories in ellipsis
• Constraints on roots in ellipsis
• Constraints on features in ellipsis
• Different types of derivational affixes with respect to ellipsis

Toward an analysis
Lexical constraint on ellipsis

- the sluice cannot contain any lexical items that are not present in the antecedent (Ross 1969, Merchant 2001, Chung 2006, Saab 2008)

Lexical constraint on ellipsis

- the sluice cannot contain any lexical items that are not present in the antecedent

  - Strict Root Identity (Saab 2008; Ranero 2020): syntactic roots in the antecedent and in the sluice must be strictly identical

Root Identity at work

- Genuine suppletive forms: no ellipsis
  (ram-ewe, many kinship terms)
- One of the forms is absent (null root): no ellipsis
  Although ellipsis often allows speakers to circumvent the material that is absent, that does not happen in the roots
- A pluralia tantum noun has a root different from that of the singular form: no ellipsis

Explaining number mismatches

Two possible solutions:
- pluralia tantum and collective nouns include an additional NUM projection, next to the root (Picallo 2018)
  \[ \text{NumP} \rightarrow \text{P} \]
- there is only one NumP, but pluralia tantum nouns have a dedicated root, and the singular form represents a different root; no root identity
  \[ \text{bliznec}_1 < \text{PL} > \]
  \[ \text{bliznec}_2 < \text{SG} > \]
Consequences of Root Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phenomenon</th>
<th>Form 1</th>
<th>Form 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genuine suppletion</td>
<td>baran ‘ram’, deduška ‘grandpa’</td>
<td>ovca ‘ewe’, babuška ‘grandma’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of the roots is null (absent)</td>
<td>olux ‘dumbass’ (M only)</td>
<td>no corresponding feminine form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accidental root homophony</td>
<td>bliznecy ‘twins’ koreec ‘Korean pilot’</td>
<td>bliznec ‘twin (sg) korejka ‘porkloin’ pilotka ‘triangle-shaped cap’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What’s in the root?

- lack of root identity blocks ellipsis
- roots are not all the same with respect to reference to mixed-gender groups in the plural

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordination impossible</th>
<th>Coordination possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Maria y Juan son mis padres.’</td>
<td>Maria y Juan son mis tíos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(‘Maria &amp; Juan are my parents.’)</td>
<td>‘Maria &amp; Juan are my aunt and uncle.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coordination impossible

- ‘Maša i Petja moi djad’ja/ djadi |
  - (‘M & P are my aunt & uncle.’) | 'M & P are my niece and nephew.' |
**djadjia vs plemjannik**

- Some roots that do not participate in ellipsis still allow plural in reference to mixed-gender groups (*plemjannik* ‘nephew’)

- Such plurals are root-specific (not all nouns act like this) but arbitrary (can vary arbitrarily across languages; cf. Russian *plemjannik* and English *nephew*; cf. Spanish *tío* and Russian *djadjia*)

---

**What’s in the root?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>plemjannik</th>
<th>djadjia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plural can apply to mixed-gender groups</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encyclopedic meaning component <code>&lt;MALE&gt;</code> of <code>&lt;FEMALE&gt;</code> included in root specification</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can combine with a null <em>n</em></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**What’s in the affix?**

- Bottom line: nouns of different classes can combine with different categorizing *n* heads

---

**New approach to Identity Condition**

- Identity Condition on Ellipsis:

  Antecedent and material properly contained within the ellipsis site must be featurally non-distinct (Ranero 2019, 2020, building on Chomsky 1965)
### Identity Condition via features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antecedent feature</th>
<th>Sluice feature</th>
<th>Mismatch possible?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$X_1^{+Y_1}$</td>
<td>$X_1^{+Y_1}$</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_1^{-Y_1}$</td>
<td>$X_1^{+Y_1}$</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_1^{[null]}$</td>
<td>$X_1^{+Y_1}$</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_1^{+Y_1}$</td>
<td>$X_1^{[null]}$</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### What’s in the affix?

- Class I (kinship, nobility, differentiated animals)
  - Some roots include encyclopedic information regarding the features `<MALE>` or `<FEMALE>` (as seen in the reference to mixed-gender groups)
  - Gender mismatch is impossible both ways because both the masculine and feminine counterpart are specified for [GENDER]
    - In principle those roots that do not include `<MALE>` or `<FEMALE>` can combine with null $n$
    - But it is more informative to use the $n$ with feature [-F] or [+F]

### Class I nouns decomposed

#### Identical root, ‘bunny’

- *krolík* $n\{\sqrt{\text{ROOT}_{32}} \ \eta_{[F]}\}$
- *krol’číxa* $n\{\sqrt{\text{ROOT}_{32}} \ \eta_{[+F]}\}$

#### Distinct roots:

- *papa* $n\{\sqrt{\text{ROOT}_{64}} \ \eta_{[F]}\}$
- *mama* $n\{\sqrt{\text{ROOT}_{59}} \ \eta_{[F]}\}$
Ellipsis in class I (identical roots)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antecedent feature</th>
<th>Sluice feature</th>
<th>Mismatch possible?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(X_{[+Y]})</td>
<td>(X_{[-Y]})</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(X_{[-Y]})</td>
<td>(X_{[+Y]})</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Class II nouns decomposed

- the form referring to a male includes the \(n\) head that is not specified for gender, and the form referring to a female includes \(n_{[+F]}\)
- "masculine" nouns can be used with female referents:

  \(\text{ona} \, \text{naš} \, \text{zaveduščij} \, \text{kafedroj}\)
  she our head department

  ‘She is our department head.’

Class II nouns decomposed

- \(\text{zaveduščij}\) \(\mathcal{r}P_{\text{[ROOT} \, nØ]}\)
- \(\text{zaveduščaja}\) \(\mathcal{r}P_{\text{[ROOT} \, n_{[+F]}]}\)

Ellipsis in Class II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antecedent feature</th>
<th>Sluice feature</th>
<th>Mismatch possible?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(X_{[null]})</td>
<td>(X_{[+Y]})</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(X_{[+Y]})</td>
<td>(X_{[null]})</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What about epicene nouns?

Anton tupica, i Anna tože tupica.
A dunce & A too
‘Anton is a dunce and Anna is too.’

Anna tupica, i Anton tože tupica.
A dunce & A too
‘Anna is a dunce and Anton is too.’

What about epicene nouns?

- Epicene nouns belong to class II
  - they always include nØ
    (cf. Atkinson 2015 for similar conclusions on French)
  - they can optionally have a higher n specified as [+F] or [-F] (discourse gender)
    - this is reflected in their variable agreement and does not affect ellipsis

Class III nouns

Anton is an actor and Anna is too
*Anna is an actress and Anton is too

Petja gor’kaja/gor’kij p’janica,
P bitter.FEM/bitter.M drunkard

a Maša račinajuščaja p’janica
but M beginner.FEM

‘Petya is a complete drunkard, and Masha is only starting as a drunkard.’
Approaching Class III nouns

• l-forms vs f-forms (Harley & Noyer 1999, a.o.)
• l-form affixes can change stress pattern and trigger phonological rules

\[
\text{f-forms} \quad \xrightarrow{\text{XP}} \quad \text{l-forms}
\]

Class III nouns: A proposal

• “masculine” nouns include a null n head
As with Class II nouns, the “masculine” noun can be used in reference to a female:

Ona advokat
she lawyer
‘She is a lawyer.’

Class III nouns: A proposal

• “masculine” nouns include a null n head
• “feminine” nouns include an l-affix (ditto for a subset of class I nouns, esp. nobility terms)
Ellipsis in Class III

- Root Identity is not maintained, ellipsis is impossible

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[nP [p^* pvar √ixa]} \quad \text{‘female cook’} \\
\text{<cook> <FEMALE>}
\end{array}
\]

What about M > F ellipsis in Class III?

*Maša ploxaja pvarixa,
M bad.FEM cook.FEM
a Petja xorošij pvar.
but P good.M cook.M

Petja ploxoj pvar,
P bad.FEM cook.FEM
a Maša xorošij pvar.
but M good.M cook.M

Ellipsis in Class III

- Root Identity is not maintained, ellipsis is impossible

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[nP [p^* pvar √ixa]} \quad \text{‘female cook’} \\
\text{<cook> <FEMALE>}
\end{array}
\]

*Maša ploxaja pvarixa,
M bad.FEM cook.FEM
a Petja xorošij pvar.
but P good.M cook.M

‘Masha is a bad cook but Petya is a good one.’

What about M > F ellipsis in Class III?

Ellipsis involves the removal of identical material (root with a null gender categorizer, as in Class II), but not the relationship between a masculine and a feminine noun.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>antecedent</th>
<th>slice</th>
<th>denotation</th>
<th>ellipsis OK?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[p^* ROOT n=]</td>
<td>[p^* ROOT n=]</td>
<td>Either F or M</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From three classes to two

If this analysis is on the right track, there are only two classes of nouns in ellipsis:

• One of the nouns has a null categorizing head, making ellipsis mismatches possible
• All nouns have specified categorizing heads; ellipsis possible only if the features are the same

PNE in native speaker Russian: Regular predicate nominals
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Conclusions and outstanding questions
What I have discussed

- Identity conditions on ellipsis
- Evidence for l- and f-affixes in Russian
- Gender encoding in Russian

Taking stock

- Apparent mismatches in Russian ellipsis are not uniform
- They can be comprehensively accounted for by two separate conditions on roots and affixes: a lexical and a featural condition

Back to the original questions

- Q1: What should be included in the Identity Condition?

Condition on roots
Condition on categorizing heads

Root Identity Condition on ellipsis

- Every ROOT in the ellipsis site must have an identical ROOT in the relevant portion of the antecedent and vice versa (Saab 2008, Ranero 2020)
Identity Condition on ellipsis

- Antecedent and material properly contained within the ellipsis site must be featurally non-distinct (Ranero 2019, 2020)

Identity conditions on ellipsis

- Mismatches in Russian ellipsis are not uniform and are comprehensively accounted for by two separate conditions on roots and affixes
- Altogether, the Russian data provide novel support for identity conditions on ellipsis;

Decomposing Russian noun phrases

Q2: Russian gender
a. what is the decompositional structure of the Russian noun phrase (with the emphasis on gender and number)?

b. what is the status of Russian affixes used to derive gendered nouns?
Decompositional structure of the Russian noun phrase:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c}
\text{NumP} & \text{P} & \text{Root} \\
\hline
\text{discourse} & \text{categorizing} & \text{head} \\
\end{array}
\]

Root homophony accounts for some restrictions on ellipsis.

Russian “gender” affixes:

- At least some derivational affixes are roots (l-forms), supporting the notion that derivational affixes are not uniform in nature.

(contra Lowenstamm 2015, Marantz 2001, in support of Creemers et al. 2018)

Outstanding questions:

- More precise diagnostics needed to determine which Russian affixes are roots and which are functional head.
- Variation across speakers, esp. with respect to the suffixes –ka and –ica.
- Ongoing change in spoken Russian as new feminine derivations (feminitives) enter the language.

Side effect: Homophony

- Root homophony (cf. pluralia tantum).
- Affix homophony: a reasonable expectation is for the same form to be available as an l-form and f-form; variation across speakers should also be expected.
Gender mismatches in other languages: Same as in Russian?

• With specified identity conditions and possible homophony of bound forms, gender and number mismatches can be reduced to a minimum
• Three classes established across languages are no longer needed
• Can gender and number mismatches reported in other languages be similarly reduced?

THANK YOU!
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Selected references

Creemers, J., Don, J., & P. Fenger. 2018. Some affixes are roots, others are heads. NLLT 36: 45–64.
Ranero, R. 2020. The eventive core is not special in ellipsis. Ms., UMD.

Saab, A. 2010. (Im)possible deletions in the Spanish DP. Iberia 2.2: 45–83.