Marcel Danesi. *Loanwords and Phonological Methodology*. *Studia Phonetica*, Volume XX. LaSalle, Quebec: Didier, 1985. Pp. 58.

Observers of the language contact situation are confronted with a complex and fascinating phenomenon when one language borrows a word from another. While socio- and psycholinguists are concerned with the "why" and the "when" loanwords make their way into the borrowing language, theoretical linguists are primarily concerned with the "hows" of nativization processes: how source-language lexical items are reshaped, phonologically and morphologically, and/or how borrowing affects meaning in the two languages (lexico-semantic aspects).

In this slim monography, Danesi presents us with a careful and exhaustive study of nativization phenomena characterizing the Canadian English (CE)-Italo-Canadian (IC) contact situation in Toronto. The author is clearly well-versed in the various aspects of the scientific study of such phenomena, from data-gathering to data analysis. Although he initially provides the reader with essential sociolinguistic background information, his main focus is a detailed analysis of the morphological and phonological incorporation processes operating on English loanwords which become part of the Italo-Canadian lexicon. It is interesting to add at this point that there is as well a documented study of the French-English — Italo-Canadian contact situation in Montréal and of the resultant loanwords (cf. Bruno Villata, "Le lexique de l'italien parlé à Montréal," *Studii și cercetări lingvistice* (Extras, 3, XXXI [1980]), 257–84), a study of which Danesi apparently was unaware. While Villata's study focuses on lexico-semantic aspects of borrowing rather than formal incorporation processes, in the two studies, the lists of loanwords as well as the discussions of sociolinguistic aspects converge at many points, with both researchers making similar observations and reaching similar conclusions.

As concerned as he is with an actual analysis of the data at hand (a corpus of 233 loanwords, consisting mostly of nouns and verbs), much of Danesi's discussion centers around issues of broader methodological and methatheoretical import. In demonstrating how an analysis such as his circumvents some of the problems associated with previous analyses based on "introspective" models, Danesi makes two central claims:

1. In phonological theory formulation, theory-internal concerns are not as important as a responsibility to the [empirical] data base (roughly, the claim for "testability"). Furthermore, loanword phenomena are to be regarded as a particularly rich source of evidence for "psychologically real" phonological processes.
2. An "integrated" or "convergent" model of loanword incorporation phenomena, i. e. one which makes appeal to several theoretical frameworks, provides an adequate empirical "fit," at least in the case of loanword incorporation processes (the claim for "convergence").

These two claims will be considered more carefully in the course of the discussion below.

Before presenting an overview of the monograph contents, a preliminary note to the uninitiated reader: although the author includes a fair amount of introductory discussion, a certain familiarity with linguistic terminology and with distinctive feature notation is assumed. The non-linguist interested in the bilingual situation typical of Italian immigrants and their families in Toronto may find the initial discussion (Chapters 1 and 2, and the first sections of Chapter 3) most suited to his interests, while those readers more conversant with linguistic analyses and their theoretical implications will find more food for thought in the last two chapters.

Even the uninitiated reader, especially if he is bilingual and/or speaks Italian, will doubtless agree that loanwords *per se* are interesting and worthy objects of study. Yet most readers are bound to ask themselves about the specific import of loanwords for phonological theory formulation. In his Preface and in Chapter 1 ("Loanwords and Nativization") Danesi effectively answers the question "*Why* loanwords?" and in doing so, makes a strong case (albeit unwittingly) for the validity of the "exceptional linguistics" framework (interested readers are referred to the volume *Exceptional Language and Linguistics*, edited by Lise Menn and Loraine K. Obler, and especially their own Chapter 1, "Exceptional Language Data as Linguistic Evidence: An Introduction" for a description and rationale of this recent trend). When the synchronic rules provided by a given phonological theory fail to account for the form of loanwords, it is precisely the *deviance* of loanword data that makes them particularly revealing; in Danesi's words, "Nativization . . . provides a so-called window on the phonological processes at work in a language" (7). Obviously, the fundamental underlying assumption here is that nativization processes are not random nor haphazard. Consequently, not only must linguistic theory be responsible for explaining this data, but theoreticians must recognize that such data can furnish us with fertile terrain in attempts to evaluate a particular model or competing phonological models. For example, it is easy to see how loanword data can speak to the issue of abstractness of phonological underlying representations. In fact, evidence from loanword incorporation processes has been invoked, crucially, in arguments for the relative merits of "abstract" versus "concrete" phonological models (the reader is referred to the Kaye and Nykiel and Picard and Nicol articles by Danesi for relevant discussion). In Danesi's words, loanword data can be used "as an instrument for discovering phonological explanations that are psycholinguistically plausible" (6). This statement represents the essence of Danesi's Testability claim, and in this reader's opinion, the arguments he presents for the validity of this claim are both cogent and well-presented.

It seems, then, that the exceptional linguistics framework can provide an answer to some of Danesi's qualms concerning the overuse of intro-

spection and the over-reliance on the notion of "ideal speaker-hearer" in theory construction. In fact, though theory-internal concerns are still of paramount importance, recent trends in generative linguistics are characterized by a greater commitment to the actual data base. One further point can be made here regarding Danesi's comments on the generative enterprise: with respect to his cursory discussion of the notions of "simplicity" and "markedness," (5-6) this reader found them to be an unnecessary digression, the point about phonological explanation and psychological reality having already been successfully made.

Chapter 1 also includes a brief description of the field techniques used to elicit and compile the actual corpus of loanwords. Although the methodology used was obviously Labovian, sociolinguists may have welcomed either a more thorough description of the methods and materials used or a presentation of some quantitative data, or both. Danesi consisely describes (in Sections 1. 1 and 3. 1) the sociolinguistic aspects peculiar to the Italo-Canadian borrowing situation. The study of loanwords is always problematic because of the variability in the data; this is even more the case when the borrowing "language" is more properly a *complex* of local and regional dialects and Standard Italian. It was no small task to factor-out these differences; even given the fact that only fully nativized loanwords were chosen, considerable variability remained. Danesi manages to overcome this difficulty by exploiting a notion he developed in previous studies, that of the *geophoneme*, or dialect-neutral undelying phonological segment (e. g. /o/ and /e/ unmarked for aperture) which would then be variously realized on the surface level, according to dialect-specific rules. The rest of the first chapter gives us working definitions of borrowing and nativization and presents an overview of the previous phonetic, phonemic and generative views of nativization processes. While each perspective has its merits, no one is seen to be sufficient to handle all the relevant data, and so Danesi arrives at the conclusion that an "integrated" theoretical perspective would be the most promising.

In the second chapter, "Degrees of Nativization," the author reviews the notions of *coexistence* of phonological systems in language contact situations, *partial adaptation*, and *total adaptation*, and discusses some of the non-linguistic factors affecting nativization. He then presents, in schematic form, a three-stage model of total adaptation comprising an initial *acceptance* stage (affected by time and usage factors), a *sedimentation* stage (affected by linguistic factors) and a final *integration* stage, when the loanword in question becomes, in effect, a "native" lexical item.

An analysis of the loanword data is given in the context of the proposed integrated model of nativization in Chapter 3. This model is now articulated in two steps: the Paradigmatic Principle (PP) and Phonological Synchronization Principle (PSP). the first subsumes those processes related to form-class membership, i. e. morphological adaptation mechanisms. In

noun reshaping, consonant-final loanwords undergo *vowel suffixation* and all incoming nouns undergo *gender assignment*, in order to conform to the canonical shape of Italian nouns. Danesi proposes a satisfying and highly plausible solution to the thorny problem of deciding to which gender an incoming word will be assigned: assignment is a consequence of the interaction of reference, association, and phonetic parameters (26). In verb reshaping the most salient process is assignment of the borrowed verb to the most regular and productive class of Italian verbs, those ending in -are.

The PSP subsumes those reshaping processes which are phonological. *Phonetic substitution* minimally changes an incoming segment in terms of a single feature relating to point of articulation only: e. g. the feature [+/-high] distinguishes the EC apico-alveolar stops [t] and [d] from their Italian counterparts which are truly dental [t], and [d]. *Phonological repatterning*, whether it be in the form of *phonemic approximation* or *restructuring*, implicates the phonemic system. In the former, manner of articulation may change, as when the EC interdental fricative [θ] becomes a dental stop [t] in IC. (cf. EC 'nothing' [nʌθɪŋ] > IC [nati n]). Phonemic restructuring typically affects the distribution of allophonic variants of a phoneme. *Syllabic/Prosodic Repatterning* processes include *consonant doubling* in intervocalic position, *glide simplification* and *cluster adjustment*, where the first consonant in an EC consonant cluster is assimilated to the second consonant in IC. These are all pervasive and important rephonologization processes; cf. Ec 'job' /jab/ > IC /jobba/; EC 'show' /šow/ > IC /šo/; EC 'contractor' /kantrækər/ > IC /kontrattore/. *Reaccentuation* changes the stress pattern of an incoming loanword in accordance with the general tendency towards penultimate syllable stress in polysyllabic Italian words.

Danesi undoubtedly recognizes and characterizes the major forces operating in the nativization of English loanwords in Italo-Canadian. However, some readers may find the inconsistent use of certain terms (e. g. the various uses of "segmental" on pp. 30–32) confusing, and phonologists may find fault with how certain rules and generalizations are expressed in feature notation. Furthermore, it is unclear to what extent the Paradigmatic Principle differs, substantially, from previous theoretical notions such as Morpheme (or Word) Structure Constraints.

At this point it is worthwhile drawing attention to another recent study (Aleksandra Steinbergs, "Loanword Incorporation Processes: Examples from Tshiluba," *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences*, Vol. 14, 2 [1984], 115–25) which also uses loanword data to explore contemporary phonological theories of borrowing. Although Danesi was not aware of this study, it would not doubt be of interest to him, since Steinbergs' morphological and phonological loanword incorporation processes are analogous to Danesi's Paradigmatic Principle and Phonological Synchronization Principle, respectively, and her claim with respect to the internal ordering of these two types of processes echoes that of Danesi (24).

In the last chapter the issues of testability and convergence are considered again, in the light of the analysis provided in Chapter 3. The issue of testability has already been discussed at length above. It is with Danesi's assertion that an "integrated or convergent model is probably the most adequate from an explanatory standpoint" (12) that this reader had the most problems. While such a model may be descriptively adequate, in the sense that it is powerful enough to account for the relevant data, it is hard to see how such a model could simultaneously be restrictive enough to account for ease and uniformity in acquisition (the so-called problem of "learnability"). In the interest of theoretical coherence, Danesi may wish to propose some constraints on "integrated" models. Or it may be that the answer to Danesi's concern for adequate empirical coverage is to be found in the now highly-articulated "Principles and Parameters" framework, which is especially promising from the cross-linguistic point of view.

In conclusion, the interested reader is invited to consider carefully the particulars of Danesi's analysis and to decide for himself if the integrated approach which it illustrates indeed is a theoretically viable one. However, one thing is certain. The reader will come out of his *lectura* convinced that phonological theory must come to grips with the problematic yet revealing data that loanwords furnish. And he shouldn't be surprised when, during the course of a normal conversation, he finds himself paying extra attention to the when, the why, and especially the *how* those foreign words which we borrow become an integral part of our speech.

MARY ANN CANZANELLA
McGill University