
This book is the author's revised Ph.D. thesis, which bore the more cogent title "The Printed Sources of Normative Word-Stress in Modern Russian", and is the first exhaustive survey of Russian and non-Russian scholarly materials devoted to the problems of Russian stress. Although its primary purpose is to analyze those sources which are normative and deal with the stress of the literary language, it also discusses works of a more theoretical and historical character, pointing out areas of controversy, suggesting alternative approaches and advancing proposals for further research. It must be said in advance that as a bibliographical tool and as a survey of accomplished research, the book is remarkable for its thoroughness and wealth of information. If it disappoints, it is where it attempts to go beyond such a purely bibliographical and descriptive purpose, i.e., where it tries to discover a pattern in the seemingly "anomalous" (a frequently recurrent word in the book) phenomena of Russian stress, and where it embarks on historical interpretations.

In the first chapter, we are given a detailed account of the major Russian lexicographical sources, beginning with the dictionary of Dal' (4th ed., 1904-1914) and ending with the dictionaries of pronunciation and stress by Avanesov and Ozhegov (1955 and 1959) and Ageenko and Zarva (1960). The second chapter, entitled "Encyclopedic sources" is actually a survey of works incorporating anthroponymic and toponymic materials and an analysis of their accentual peculiarities. As the author correctly points out, the treatment of stress in these two types of works is neither exhaustive nor consistent. Dal's dictionary, with its 200,000 entries, is still one of the fundamental reference books on Russian stress, and especially on the stress of some dialectal forms. Unfortunately, Dal' only rarely cites oblique forms, but is most informative for the stress of base forms (the nom.-sing. of nouns and infinitives of verbs) and of derivatives. Dal's dictionary need not, however, be blamed for what the author calls a "lack of system". In the light of the underdeveloped state of Russian accentology and dialectology around the middle of the last century, Dal' could hardly be faulted for not having accomplished more than he did. But even now, a hundred years later, there are hardly any dependable, systematic descriptions of Russian dialect stress. Nicholson justly criticizes Kiparsky (p. 69) for his scepticism with regard to the stresses of dialect-forms and his belief that these may vary "endlessly" (*unendlich*), but his own belief in the importance of available accentual dialect studies, and in the new light that these might shed, is definitely exaggerated. On the other hand, he himself is ready to admit, with Kiparsky, that such an "endless" variety of accentual forms might have existed in Old Russian, although the historical development was obviously in the direction or dialect-splitting and greater linguistic differentiation.
The author detects inconsistencies and a prescriptive bias in various recent normative dictionaries, including the dictionary of Avanesov and Ozhegov. The most valuable work, as far as stress-notation is concerned, is, in his opinion, the dictionary of Ushakov, which cites consistently inflected forms together with their variants, as well as some regional varieties. The author feels that Russian lexicographical research of the last twenty years has suffered a lowering of standards. If the survey of the dictionaries deals mostly with the stress of inflected forms, the analysis of the "encyclopedic" sources given in Ch. II takes up primarily questions of stress of derived forms. Among the latter sources the author singles out Supersankaia's monograph on the stress of Russian personal and family names (1956) and Benson's *Dictionary of Personal Names* (1954).

No such comprehensive sources are so far available for the study of the stress of place-names. The author dwells at greater length on family names formed with the suffixes -skii, -in, -ov, -ykh/-ikh, -ovo, and on the compound formations of place names such as Leningrăd and Novgorod. His general classification of major sources into "dictionaries" and "encyclopedic sources" and his separation of proper names from appellatives must, however, be recognized as artificial, despite the fact that the stress of proper names, like some of their other features, differ in various respects from that of common names. The study of these differences must not, however, obscure their fundamental similarity and the exploration of their common features. Thus, it is methodologically untenable to discuss "the basic principles of anthroponymic and toponymic stress" (p. 66) in such form as Novgoródskii, Vologódskii apart from the similar stress in belobarodyi, pribërgëie, or even in the comparative molózhe.

But the stress pattern of common name derivatives is, with the exception of diminutives and augmentatives, hardly touched upon in the book. It is equally unconvincing to treat the end-stress of place names such as Tver' or Perm' apart from the stress of such nouns as put', glush', liubov'. The author's account of the origin of this stress in terms of analogy with the loc. sing in -i is patently speculative, whereas his identification of this stress with the stress of numerals is misleading ("dva, tri, chetyre present", in the author's words, "no problems", being "declensionally end-stressed" (sic!), except for the "anomalously stem-stressed instrumental", p. 11 ff.). The appeal to a "rhythmic stress change" in the compound adjectives of the Novgoródskii type contributes little to our understanding of these accents. Explanations of this kind unfortunately abound in the book, which makes little effort at generalizations and at fitting the facts into a broader system.

These shortcomings are even more conspicuous in the last two chapters of the book, which examine the more general and theoretical studies of Russian stress, beginning with nineteenth century works and ending with contemporary Soviet and non-Soviet research. The discussion of these works is, on the whole, thorough and informative, though the selection is at times arbitrary. Thus it is not quite clear why the works of Sobolevskii (pp. 68-71) or Kiparsky (pp. 100-111) should be singled out and discussed in far greater detail than the equally, if not more important works of Brandt, Chernyshev or Stang, which are mentioned only in passing. Nicholson's survey leaves little doubt that some of the basic problems of Russian, as of Slavic accentology in general, have been subject to far-reaching re-examination and are in need of further elaboration and discussion. The author contributes some valuable remarks to this discussion, as when he criticizes Kiparsky's atomistic approach (p. 109), his normative tendencies (p. 102) and some of his historical reconstructions (p. 102). His own confining descriptivism and lack of system does not, however, prevent him from endorsing other equally untenable views and assumptions, as when he finds value ("particularly well-argued") in Kiparsky's theory that the nosit