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I. Introduction

Previous research on loanword adaptation generally agrees on the fact that when loanwords from a source language (henceforth, $L_s$) are introduced into a borrowing language (henceforth, $L_b$), they are usually altered to comply with $L_b$’s phonotactic constraints. However, remains an outstanding controversy regarding loanword adaptation as to the role of phonology and phonetics. From a phonology-only approach (LaCharite & Paradis 2005), the $L_b$-internal phonological grammar is attributable to any alternations of loanwords. Given this, any changes in loanword adaptation are purely phonological, subsequently making subphonemic information unnecessary. On the other hand, a phonetics-only approach (Silverman 1992, Kang 1996, Peperkamp & Dupoux 2003) assumes that loanword adaptation takes place at the level of speech perception, not at the UR $\rightarrow$ SR mapping level. In this framework, maximizing the perceptual similarity between $L_s$ and $L_b$ is the main factor to induce $L_b$ outputs; misperception of $L_s$ enhances loanword adaptation. However, recent studies (Smith 2006, 2009; Yip 2006) try to show that loanword adaptation cannot be attributable only to the $L_b$-internal phonological grammar or perception-only module. Instead, all information $L_b$ speakers have, drawn from $L_s$ and $L_b$ grammar, orthography, perception and other factors, might influence loanword adaptation such that $L_b$ speakers
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produce specifically posited-Ls representations (henceforth, pLs) different from Lb inputs. Then, these forms have a corresponding relationship with the adapted loanword. Based on Smith’s (2006, 2009) integrated approach, which incorporates mostly the Lb-internal phonological grammar, perception, and orthography, this paper suggests that, in addition to these, both morphological knowledge of the Ls grammar and non-loan phonological rules might produce loanword doublets or variations.

This paper is organized as follows. In section 2, different approaches (i.e., phonological, phonetic, and integrated) into loanword adaptation are investigated. Section 3 introduces problematic data in English loanwords, which support the assumption that neither perception-only nor phonology-only methods can sufficiently account for variations of English loans. Then, the paper introduces a new analysis which is sensitive to source-similarity effects and is characterized as having a corresponding relationship (i.e., SB (Ls-to-Lb) correspondence) between Lb outputs and the representations of Ls words perceived by Lb speakers influenced by perception, orthography, and Lb-internal grammar. A conclusion and further remarks are given in Section 4.

II. Previous Research on Loanword Adaptation

A great deal of recent theoretical attention in loanword adaptation has been paid to input forms to the loanword module, in terms of whether it should be handled by phonetic cues or Lb speakers’ phonological grammar. The phonological model in loanword adaptation (Yip 1993, LaCharite & Paradis 2005, Shinohara 2004, following Sapir 1925) supposes that Lb speakers interpret the Ls sounds based on their phonemic inventory; when the Ls sounds do not exactly align with or match the Lb sounds, they are reshaped into the closest alternative phonemes in Lb to better satisfy Lb phonotactics. In this model, speakers who first borrow given words (i.e., bilingual speakers) play a critical role in terms of selecting the underlying form of Ls words. This is diagramed in (1).

(1) Phonology-only approach (Kenstowicz 2006)
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