

REVIEWS

Иомдин, Л. Л.: *Автоматическая обработка текста на естественном языке: модель согласования*, Москва 1990, стр. 168, together with a bibliography of works on agreement.

There was a period when most theoretical linguists largely disregarded agreement; often it was treated as no more than an indicator of other syntactic relationships. In recent years, however, a good deal of attention has been paid to the general problem of agreement, to the extent that whole conferences have been devoted to the topic. The papers of one such conference can be found in Barlow and Ferguson (1988). In contrast to this general trend, Slavists have been more consistently interested in agreement over the years. Partly this is because the linguistic material forces itself on the researcher's attention: the rich inflectional morphology of the Slavonic languages together with the innovations in the categories involved result in complex agreement systems, often involving options in agreement possibilities. Moreover the Slavists' tradition of using 'real language' examples, whether from a strictly defined corpus or from random reading, has meant that the range of data which syntacticians have been trying to account for has been gradually expanding. It is possible to write rules which cover a large portion of the data, yet typically one is left with much more than isolated examples. And so interest in the topic has been maintained.

Given this background, when considering a new contribution to the field it seems worthwhile to consider very briefly some of the earlier work on agreement in Slavonic languages (not solely that devoted to Russian), and to gather together references to the considerable amount of work which has been done on the topic. Iomdin's work under review is the latest in a series of monographs which Slavists have produced on agreement. The earliest works tended to be normative, but gradually more descriptive and theoretical concerns took over. Rozental' (1960) and Senkevič (1964) were concerned with Russian; Popov (1964) was on Bulgarian and Vanek (1970) on Czech. Skoblikova (1971) dealt with government as well as agreement; she examined Russian material, as did Crockett (1976) and Corbett (1979), while comparison of material from all the Slavonic languages can be found in Corbett (1983a). An important part of the contribution of those working on Slavonic languages has been the attempt to define the difficult notion of agreement; for work on this see Kibrik (1977), Lehfeldt (1980; 1984; 1991), Apresjan (1982) and Schmidt and Lehfeldt (1984). As the bibliography

shows, there has been a wealth of articles devoted to many other aspects of agreement; these range from those which are mainly descriptive to the theoretical. They also include work on dialect phenomena: Chitrova (1964), Bogdanov (1968), Potapova (1960; 1962), Makarski (1973), Neweklowsky (1983), child language acquisition: Dingwall and Tuniks (1973), and historical data: Egorov (1916), Glavan (1927–28), Popova (1955), Iordanskij (1958), Degtjarev (1966), Sannikov (1968; 1978), Malevinskij (1982) and Huntley (1989).

While the literature on the subject is indeed considerable, as Iomdin points out (p. 3), the topic is far from exhausted, and Iomdin makes a useful contribution with this monograph. One of its distinguishing features is that Iomdin's concerns were in the first instance practical: he is a member of the machine translation group in Moscow led by Professor Ju. D. Apresjan, and one of his contributions to the project has been a system of rules for Russian agreement to form part of two machine translation programs (French–Russian and English–Russian) (p. 3). However, Iomdin's aims are theoretical as well as practical, and he decided to approach the problem of agreement as a linguistic rather than an engineering problem (p. 5). Thus, while practical concerns are of great importance in the book – for example certain complexities are excluded because they occur only rarely in texts – there is a clear attempt to give a principled account of agreement. And while the data on which the account is based are scientific and technical texts (p. 7) there are, in fact, numerous examples from literature, presumably because the points illustrated did not occur in the types of text for which the machine translation programs were devised.

A second distinguishing feature is that Iomdin adopts a consistent theoretical position, that of dependency grammar, and more specifically, following the general line of the 'Smysl-tekst' group. Chapter 1 gives an outline of the theory on which this work is based and terms are defined. The model he is working in uses 52 syntactic relations, of which 25 are illustrated in this chapter.

Chapter 2 is concerned with the definition of agreement, one of the concerns of Slavists noted earlier. Iomdin gives careful consideration to the traditional Russian type of definition of agreement and points out the defects in it. He then sketches a more formal type of definition, attempting to define first the clearest cases of agreement and then to treat others as variants of these.¹

In chapter 3, Iomdin gives a free-ranging discussion of difficult areas of Russian agreement, including in particular instances where there is debate as to whether agreement is involved or not. There is considerable difficulty over the relation between numerals and nouns, and Iomdin excludes numerals from agreement (pp. 62–3). Moreover, his concern to ensure that

agreement should be a syntactic phenomenon leads him to exclude cases, such as some instances of agreement with conjoined noun phrases, where the number of the target is semantically significant. This means that certain problems which the reader might expect to be treated at length are discussed here and excluded from further consideration. After an interesting discussion of gender, Iomdin concludes that nouns like *vrač* 'doctor', whose agreement properties have attracted great interest, are in fact two lexemes: one specifically denotes doctors of female sex (and is of feminine gender), the other is not specific as to sex (and is of masculine gender). Either could be used when a female is denoted and the choice is a matter of lexical selection, not agreement, according to Iomdin (p. 84). Unfortunately this particular problem will not go away so easily, since such items may take two different forms of agreement at the same time, as indeed in Iomdin's example (4.118, second variant): *Novyj prem'er-ministr obratilas' k sobravšimsja s reč'ju* 'The new prime minister delivered a speech to those gathered'. Clearly one or other lexeme must be selected and then one of the agreement forms cannot be explained.

In chapter 4 we come to the formal model. There is an interesting list, with examples, of the basic types of agreement, corresponding to the earlier definition. Then the various rules are presented: a rule is given with the conditions on its operation, then notes on the conditions and examples, and so to the next rule. In general, when a particular formalism is used and understood by a small group this can cause problems, since its members take it for granted. The particular formalism adopted here is not easy to read, and its presence does not contribute a great deal. Most of the restrictions are dealt with in notes, and it is more enlightening to read the notes than the original statement. Moreover there are some irritating misprints in the formalism: compare, for example, condition A3 on page 97 with the correct version on page 101; and on p. 122 the notes on the conditions simply do not match the conditions.² The list of rules is quite long and the conditions on their operation frequently repeat each other. Iomdin points out an example of such similarities on page 104. The rules themselves too are repetitive: past tense verbs are treated separately from non-past, adjectival agreement involving the plural is treated separately from the singular (so that the description would actually be simpler if Russian had retained distinctions of gender in the plural), and agreement in person requires five rules. While explicit, this approach shows its machine-translation origin very clearly: it is hardly parsimonious or elegant.

The final chapter, number 5, is devoted to what Iomdin called *opredelitel'-nye konstrukcii* 'determiner constructions'. Its purpose (p. 7) is to illustrate the place of the operators in the analysis and synthesis components of the

machine translation system; while there is interesting material here, it could be better integrated into the general scheme of the book.

Iomdin's initial concern to provide definitions has the very desirable result that he is explicit about what should be covered and what should not. And the careful listing of the constructions shows vividly just how complex Russian agreement is. While those committed to dependency theory may be interested in the detail of the rules, and in the numerous examples with the dependencies indicated according to Iomdin's approach, some readers will prefer to read for the data. And it is here that, in the reviewer's view, a major value of the book is to be found. Iomdin provides many examples of interest, including significant grammaticality judgements. For example, following Es'kova (1977), he points out that masculine inanimates in *-ina*, when accusative, cannot take an adjectival modifier (**V takoj cholodinu* 'in such dreadful cold') (p. 97). He also discusses (p. 100) the difference between variants in the following: *Na stole stojala ogromnaja vaza s fruktami, i Senja vzjal dve spelye/spelych gruši* 'There was a huge bowl of fruit on the table, and Senja took two ripe pears'. According to Iomdin, the accusative (=nominative) form would be more appropriate if Senja took all the pears (or at least all the ripe ones), while the genitive would be more appropriate if there were other (ripe) pears too.

This is not an easy book to read, but Iomdin's machine translation perspective offers a new slant on agreement which, in view of the great deal already written, is to be welcomed.

NOTES

¹ It is surprising that there is no mention of most work in the West on this topic; the notion of the Control Agreement Principle surely merits mention: see G. Gazdar, E. Klein, G. Pullum, I. Sag 1985 *Generalized Phrase Structure Grammar*, Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 83–94.

² There are several misprints and, while a list of abbreviations is provided, it is certainly not complete; for instance if by page 33 the reader has forgotten what a *GMP* is, there is no help in the abbreviations – the only way is to look back to page 18.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

This bibliography includes works devoted exclusively or in large part to agreement. For the sake of completeness, a few items are listed which I have not seen; in these cases the source of reference is given. Further information can be found in works primarily concerned with gender or number. It is hoped that the bibliography will be found useful, but it is only provisional and there are bound to be omissions. The author would be grateful for information on any research inadvertently omitted.

Akopdžanjan, A. A.: 1962a, 'Soglasovanie skazuemogo s podležaščim, vyražennym neopredelenno-količestvennym suščestvitel'nym v sočetanii s suščestvitel'nym v roditel'nym padeže

- (Podležaščee tipa "bol'sinstvo zritelej"), *Elabužskij gosudarstvennyj pedagogičeskij institut: Učenyje zapiski: serija istorii i filologii* 13, 32–84.
- Akopdžanjan, A. A.: 1962b, 'Značenie predikativnogo glagola v predloženiach s podležaščim tipa "bol'sinstvo zritelej": leksičeskoe značenie glagola', *Elabužskij gosudarstvennyj pedagogičeskij institut: Učenyje zapiski: serija istorii i filologii* 13, 85–94.
- Akopdžanjan, A. A.: 1962c, 'Soglasovanie skazuemogo s podležaščim, vyražennym suščestvitel'nym "číslo"' v sočetaanii s roditel'nym padežom množestvennogo čisla', *Elabužskij gosudarstvennyj pedagogičeskij institut: Učenyje zapiski: serija istorii i filologii* 13, 332–336.
- Akopdžanjan, A. A.: 1962d, 'Soglasovanie skazuemogo s podležaščim, vyražennym suščestvitel'nym "časť"' v sočetaanii s suščestvitel'nym v roditel'nom padeže množestvennogo čisla', *Voprosy teorii i metodiki izučeniya russkogo jazyka, vyp. 2, Čeboksary, Čuvaškij gosudarstvennyj pedagogičeskij institut*, 150–165.
- Akopdžanjan, A. A.: 1965a, 'O vidax svjazi glagola-skazuemogo s podpežaščim-količestvennoimennym sočetaaniem', *Elabužskij gosudarstvennyj pedagogičeskij institut: Učenyje zapiski* 15, 122–132.
- Akopdžanjan, A. A.: 1965b, 'O forme čisla glagola-skazuemogo v predloženiach s količestvennym podležaščim: Forma glagola-skazuemogo v predloženiach s podležaščim tipa "tri čeloveka"', *Voprosy teorii i metodiki izučeniya russkogo jazyka, Iževsk, vyp. 4*, 104–113.
- Andrejčin, Lj.: 'Sāglasuvane na otnositelnoto mestoimenie čijto', *Ezik i literatura* 18, 66–67. [Reprinted in Pärvev: 1971, 150–151.]
- Apresjan, Ju. D.: 1982, 'O vozmožnosti opredelenija lingvističeskich ponjatij', *Russian Linguistics* 6, 175–196.
- Babby, L. H.: 1973, 'A note on agreement in Russian', *Glossa* 7, 253–264.
- Babby, L. H.: 1985, 'Noun phrase internal case agreement in Russian', *Russian Linguistics* 9, 1–15. [Reprinted in Barlow and Ferguson: 1988, 287–304.]
- Babby, L. H.: 1987, 'Case, prequantifiers, and discontinuous agreement in Russian', *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 5, 91–138.
- Babić, S.: 1973, 'Sročnost (kongruencija) u suvremenom hrvatskom književnom jeziku', *Zbornik Zagrebačke slavističke škole I*, part 1, 199–218.
- Babić, S.: 1984–1985a, 'O sročnosti općenito', *Jezik* 32, 1, 1–15.
- Babić, S.: 1984–1985b, 'Sročnost s više subjekata', *Jezik* 32, 2, 43–49.
- Babić, S.: 1984–1985c, 'Sročnost s količinskim riječima', *Jezik* 32, 3, 65–75.
- Babić, S.: 1984–1985d, 'Sročnost s riječima u kojima se razlikuje oblik i broj', *Jezik* 32, 4, 113–118.
- Babić, S.: 1984–1985e, 'Sročnost s razlikom u subjektu i imenskom dijelu predikata', *Jezik* 32, 5, 138–140.
- Babickij, K. I.: 1972, 'Soglasovannost' členov kak neobchodimoe uslovie pravil'nosti predloženiya', *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* 15, 76–94.
- Bajec, A.: 1955–1956, 'Vežanje več osebkov s povedkom', *Jezik in Slovtvo* 1, 12–14.
- Barlow, M., Ferguson, C. A. (eds.): 1988, *Agreement in Natural Language: Approaches, Theories, Descriptions*, Stanford, Center for the Study of Language and Information, Stanford University.
- Belić, A.: 1924, 'Napomena o jednoj sintaksičko-morfološkoj osobini srpskohrvatskog jezika', *Južnoslovenski Filolog* 4, 24–28.
- Bilbija, S.: 1985, 'Neslaganje u broju između singularnih antecedentata i njihovih pronominalnih anafora', *Književni jezik (Sarajevo)* 14, no. 4, 197–202.
- Bogdanov, V. N.: 1968, 'Osobyj slučaj dialektnogo soglasovanija skazuemogo s podležaščim po smyslu i kategorija predstavitel'nosti', *Naučnyje doklady vysšej školy: filologičeskije nauki*, no. 4, 68–75.

- Brooks, M. Z.: 1973, 'Rola liczby i rodzaju przy zgodzie niektórych podmiotów z orzeczeniem', in L. Matejka (ed.), *American Contributions to the Seventh International Congress of Slavists: Warsaw, August 21–27, 1973*, I, *Linguistics and Poetics*, The Hague, Mouton, 59–66.
- Burzan, M.: 1981, 'Interferencija u kongruiranju predikata sa subjektom u broju u govornoj produkciji mađarsko-srpskohrvatskih bilingva na srpskohrvatskom jeziku', *Prilozi proučavanju jezika* (Novi Sad) 17, 119–139.
- Buttke, K.: 1972, 'Zur Kongruenz des Prädikats mit der Numeralfügung als Subjekt im modernen Ukrainischen', *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 17, 626–635.
- Buzássyová, K.: 1977, 'Kategória určenosti a zhoda spony vo vetách s menným prísudkom', *Jazykovedné štúdie* 13, *Ružičkov zborník*, (Bratislava), 61–72.
- Bylinskij, K. I.: 1939a, 'Osobyje slučai soglasovanija skazuemogo s podležaščim v sovremennom literaturnom jazyke', *Russkij jazyk v škole*, no. 2, 63–73.
- Bylinskij, K. I.: 1939b, 'Osobyje slučai soglasovanija opredelenija s suščestvitel'nyj v sovremennom literaturnom jazyke', *Russkij jazyk v škole*, no. 3, 12–19.
- Černyšev, V. I.: 1938, 'O narušenii soglasovanija v russkom jazyke', in *Pamjati akademika N. Ja. Marra (1864–1934)*, Moskva and Leningrad, AN SSSR, 258–274. [Reprinted in V. I. Černyšev, *Izbrannye trudy*, I, Moskva, Prosvetščenie, 1970, 194–210.]
- Chaustova, Ju. F.: 1972, 'Vy sčastlivaja, vy sčastlivy', *Russkaja reč*, no. 6, 120–121.
- Chitrova, V. I.: 1964, 'Ošibki učaščichsja v soglasovanii v uslovijach sel'skoj mestnosti (po materialam Borovskoj školy Novo-Usmanskogo rajona Voronežskoj oblasti)', in V. I. Sobinnikova, Z. D. Popova, A. I. Čižik-Polejko (eds.), *Materialy konferencii po izučeniju južnorusskich govorov i pamjatnikov pis'memosti (6–8 dekabnja 1962 goda)*, Voronež, Izdatel'stvo Voronežskogo universiteta, 122–128.
- Comrie, B.: 1975, 'Polite plurals and predicate agreement', *Language* 51, 406–418.
- Comtet, M.: 1985, 'Funkcija soglasovanija po principu sosedstva imeni prilagatel'nogo v sovremennom russkom jazyke', *Russian Linguistics* 9, 35–43.
- Corbett, G. G.: 1979a, *Predicate Agreement in Russian*: Birmingham Slavonic Monographs, 7, University of Birmingham, Department of Russian Language and Literature.
- Corbett, G. G.: 1979b, 'The agreement hierarchy', *Journal of Linguistics* 15, 203–224.
- Corbett, G. G.: 1980, 'Neutral agreement', *Quinquereme – New Studies in Modern Languages* 3, 164–170.
- Corbett, G. G.: 1981a, 'A note on grammatical agreement in *Šinel'*', *Slavonic and East European Review* 59, 59–61.
- Corbett, G. G.: 1981b, 'Agreement with honorific *vy* in Russian and its significance for subject-raising and for the analysis of predicative adjectives', *New Zealand Slavonic Journal* 2, 73–88.
- Corbett, G. G.: 1981c, 'Agreement with quantified subjects in Russian: a fictitious linguistic change?', *Russian Linguistics* 5, 287–290.
- Corbett, G. G.: 1982, 'Resolution rules for predicate agreement in the Slavonic languages', *Slavonic and East European Review* 60, 347–378.
- Corbett, G. G.: 1983a, *Hierarchies, Targets and Controllers: Agreement Patterns in Slavic*, London, Croom Helm.
- Corbett, G. G.: 1983b, 'Slaganje predikata sa više subjekata u srpskohrvatskom jeziku', *Naučni sastanak slavista u Vukove dane: Referati i saopštenja* 12/1, Beograd: Međunarodni slavistički centar, 93–102.
- Corbett, G. G.: 1986, 'Agreement: a partial specification, based on Slavonic data', *Linguistics* 24, 995–1023. [Slightly revised version of a paper which appeared in Barlow and Ferguson: 1988, 23–53.]

- Crockett, D. B.: 1972, 'More on coordination reduction', in P. M. Peranteau, J. N. Levi, G. C. Phares (eds.), *Papers from the Eighth Regional Meeting Chicago of the Linguistic Society, April 14-16 1972, Chicago, Chicago Linguistic Society*, 52-61.
- Crockett, D. B.: 1976, *Agreement in Contemporary Standard Russian*, Cambridge, Mass., Slavica.
- Degtjarev, V. I.: 1966, 'Osobnosti soglasovanija skazuemogo s podležaščim - imenem sobiratel'nym v drevnerusskom jazyke', *Naučnye doklady vysšej školy: filologičeskie nauki*, no. 3, 138-146.
- Dingwall, W. O.: 1969, 'Government, concord and feature-change rules', *Glossa* 3, 210-240.
- Dingwall, W. O., Tuniks, G.: 1973, 'Government and concord in Russian: a study in development psycholinguistics', in B. B. Kachru, R. B. Lees, Y. Malkiel, A. Pietrangeli, S. Saporta (eds.), *Issues in Linguistics: Papers in Honor of Henry and Renée Kahane*, Urbana, University of Illinois Press, 126-184.
- Donževa-Mareva, L.: 1978, Sāglasuvaneto na učivotu *Vie sās skazuemoto v bālgarskija i ruskija ezik* ot kvantitativno gledišta, *Sāpostavilno ezikoznanie*, no. 3, 70-75.
- Duczmal, S.: 1976, 'Some aspects of subjective-verb concord in Polish and English', *Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics* 5, 165-171.
- Egerman, L. I.: 1975, 'K voprosu o pričinox dvojakogo soglasovanija imen suščestvitel'nych obščego roda v russkom jazyke', *Izvestija Voronežskogo pedagogičeskogo instituta* 150: = A. S. Afanas'ev, E. A. Nazikova, A. M. Slepčova (eds.), *Russkij sintaksis*, 63-69.
- Egorov, V. G.: 1916, 'Soglasovanie čislitel'nych s" suščestvitel'nymi v" velikorusskich" juridičeskich" pamjatnikach" XV-XVII v.v.', *Filologičeskie zapiski*, vyp. 2-3, 189-236, vyp. 4-5, 474-529.
- Es'kova, N. A.: 1977, 'Soglasovanie prilagatel'nych s oduševlennymi i neoduševlennymi suščestvitel'nymi v russkom jazyke', in *Semasiologija i grammatika: Kratkie tezisny doklady i soobščeni jazykovedov Central'no-Černozemnoj zony*, Tambov, 33-34. (Quoted from Iomdin 1990, 163.)
- Faska, H.: 1959, 'Někotre syntaktiske a stilistiske wosebitosće kongruency predikata ze subjektom', *Lětopis Instituta za serbski hudošpyt* (Bautzen), rjad A., vol. 6, 48-72.
- Flaume, T.: 1974, *Singular and Plural Forms in Russian: Semantic and Stylistic Variants*, PhD dissertation, University of Pennsylvania. Distributed by University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, 74-22, 840.
- Franks, S., Greenberg, G. R.: 1988, 'Agreement, tense, and the case of subjects in Russian', in D. Brentari, G. Larson, L. MacLeod (eds.), *CLS 24: Papers from the 24th Annual Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society: Part II: Parasession on Agreement in Grammatical Theory*, Chicago, Chicago Linguistic Society, 71-86.
- Georgieva, E.: 1955, 'Po vāprosa za sāglasuvaneto na skazuemoto s podloga', *Bālgarski ezik* 5, 280-281. [Reprinted in Pārvev: 1971, 135-137.]
- Glavan, V.: 1927-1928, 'Kongruencija u jeziku starih čakavskih pisaca', *Južnoslovenski filolog* 7, 111-159.
- Gotteri, N.: 1984, 'The evasive neuter in Polish', in F. E. Knowles, J. I. Press (eds.), *Papers in Slavonic Linguistics II*, Birmingham, Department of Modern Languages, University of Aston in Birmingham, 1-8.
- Grappin, H.: 1950, *Les noms de nombre en polonais*, Kraków, PAU.
- Gudkov, V.: 1965, 'Dodatak pravilima slaganja predikata sa više subjekata', *Književnost i jezik* 12, 60-61.
- Gudkov, V. P.: 1974, 'Prilog o pravilima kongruencije', *Književnost i jezik* 21, part 1, 58-61.
- Gvozdanović, J.: 1983, 'Kada odstupamo od gramatičkog roda i broja?', *Naučni sustanak slavista u Vukove dane: Referati i saopštenja* 13/1, Beograd: Međunarodni slavistički centar, 213-219.

Стенсланд, Л., *Акцентировка и акцент. Акцентологический анализ рукописника XV в. Chil. 323.* (= *Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis 19.*), Stockholm, Almqvist & Wiksell, 1990, 231 pp.¹

Akcentirovka i akcent makes a number of original and important contributions that will be of interest to anyone engaged in the study of accented Slavic manuscripts and imprints. These contributions include: the preparation and organization of a new body of data; careful and sophisticated paleographic analysis, both methodological (theoretical) and practical (applied); and an attempt to make linguistic sense of a source that mixes Bulgarian, East Slavic, and, possibly, Serbian features. The first two of these contributions are unqualified successes; if the third is not completely satisfying, this is essentially a reflection on the recalcitrant data and the relatively immature state of the art, rather than evidence of any avoidable inadequacy in the author's treatment of his material.

The monograph under review is divided into seven chapters: Introduction (9–23), "Sistema akcentirovanija XS²" (24–48), "'Akcentnaja sistema' XS" (49–61), Nonroot Accent Marks (62–122), Root Accent Marks (123–91), Word Forms without Accent Marks (192–201), and Conclusions (202–209). These chapters are followed by lists of abbreviations (210–13), a bibliography that includes most relevant materials (214–22), and an index to words cited or discussed in the text (223–31).

The author observes that his work is among the first accentual analyses based on an examination of every accented word in a manuscript or imprint (§ 1.1, pp. 10–11).³ This alone, especially given the general accuracy of his transcriptions, makes a lasting contribution to Slavic accentology, since, even if later scholars should disagree with certain aspects of Steensland's analysis, his compilation of the data has saved future generations from having to return to the original manuscripts. The material in this manuscript can later be reanalyzed or incorporated into dictionaries or electronic data bases simply by drawing on Steensland's publication, where it is much more accessible than in the original manuscript.

Manuscript citations in the book are reproduced with appropriate attention to paleographic detail (§ 1.1, p. 11) and with explanatory footnotes that mention the occasional graphic complexity that could not be represented with adequate precision using the available typefaces (e.g., § 5.3.3, p. 135 fn 46).⁴ The only serious limitation in format – one that is lamentably common in linguistic studies of original written or printed sources, both accentual and otherwise – is the almost exclusive use of abbreviated addresses that refer only to folio and side, but not to line (e.g., "2v", rather