

Another important psycholinguistic issue in the domain of morphology is acquisition: how do children generalize from individual complex words that they encounter to morphological rules or schemas? Dressler and colleagues deal with this issue on the basis of data of some French and German speaking children.

Finally, frequency properties of complex words also appear to play a role in writing those forms of regular verbs of Dutch that have related homophonous forms.

In sum, this volume gives an excellent survey of present issues and findings in the domain of morphological processing.

Geert Booij

George Smith, *Phonological Words and Derivation in German*. Hildesheim: Olms, xiii, 236 p. ISBN 3-487-11939-0. Euro 29,80. (Germanistische Linguistik Monographien, 13).

This book is the revised edition of a dissertation defended in 2000 at the University of Potsdam. The first part (the first four chapters) presents a well-organized historical survey of the theoretical discussion of the notion 'phonological word' (also called 'prosodic word') as defended by Selkirk, Nespor and Vogel, Booij, and Wiese. The basic insight is that there is no isomorphy between the morphosyntactic and the phonological word. A morphosyntactic word may consist of more than one phonological word. The inverse situation also applies: more than one morphosyntactic word may correspond to just one phonological word, as may be the case for word + clitic combinations. Smith's study focuses on the relation of prosodic structure to the morphological structure of words, and the way in which this relation is dealt with in frameworks such as Lexical Phonology and Optimality Theory.

The second part of the book, Chapter 5, focuses on the phonological properties of German words, and on the prosodic properties of German affixes. The basic generalization is that German underived words consist of either a monosyllabic foot, or a disyllabic foot, with the weak, unstressed syllable at the end. Words with initial weak syllables are much rarer, and are often loans or words that originated as prefixed words. Smith also makes astute observations on the phonotactic and prosodic differences between affixes and lexical morphemes.

Smith provides a detailed discussion of the class of non-cohering affixes in German, that is, those affixes that form their own domain of syllabification, independently from the stem domain. A well-known criterion for considering an affix non-cohering is the possibility of its being omitted in coordination, as in *verwert- oder verwendbar*, where the suffix *-bar* has been omitted in the first derived adjective. Smith claims that, unlike what Booij and Wiese claimed for

Dutch and German, the crucial condition for the admissibility of this kind of gapping is not that the deleted part forms a phonological part of its own, but that the remnant of the partially gapped word must be a phonological word of its own. For instance, in the coordination of the prefixed verbs *be- und entladen* this gapping is only possible if the prefix *be-* is not pronounced with a schwa, but with a full vowel [e] that can bear stress.

This latter observation is certainly to the point, and it is clear that phonological word status of the deleted word part is not a sufficient condition for gapping leading to well-formed results. However, I think it is a necessary condition, because we cannot delete cohering suffixes, even if the remnant can function as a phonological word, as in **Berat- und Verwaltung* where the cohering suffix *ung* has been deleted, and *Berat* would still form a prosodic word. Smith is certainly right, however, that semantic and pragmatic factors are involved as well, and that the remnant must comply with the minimal phonological requirements on phonological words.

Smith deplores the fact there are not many detailed language-specific studies on the phonological word as a domain of phonological rules. However, there are certainly more such studies than Smith mentions, for instance Peperkamp (1997) for Italian, and, more recently (but too late for being mentioned in Smith's book), Vigario (2003).

In sum, this book is a very useful summary of the debate on the phonological word, and adds interesting points to the debate on the proper analysis of gapping in German complex words.

REFERENCES

- Peperkamp, Sharon (1997). *Prosodic Words*. The Hague: Holland Academic Graphics.
 Vigário, Marina (2003). *The Prosodic Word in European Portuguese*. Berlin–New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Geert Booij