


# Ontogenesis model of L2 lexical representation: Cross-language links to account for bilingual lexical processing

Janet G. van Hell 

Department of Psychology, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, U.S.A.

## Peer Commentaries

**Cite this article:** van Hell JG (2022). Ontogenesis model of L2 lexical representation: Cross-language links to account for bilingual lexical processing. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 25, 232–233. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728921000663>

Received: 19 July 2021  
Revised: 22 July 2021  
Accepted: 28 July 2021  
First published online: 24 August 2021

**Keywords:**

cross-language interaction; language nonselective activation; lexical processing; bilingual mental lexicon

**Address for correspondence:**

Janet G. van Hell, Department of Psychology  
414 Moore Building Pennsylvania State  
University University Park, PA 16802 USA  
Phone: 814-867-2337 E-mail: [jgv3@psu.edu](mailto:jgv3@psu.edu)

In their keynote article, Bordag, Gor, and Opitz (2021) present the Ontogenesis Model of the L2 Lexical Representation. The Ontogenesis Model is a theoretical model that describes the representational architecture of the L2 mental lexicon, and focuses on the development of L2 phonological, orthographic, and semantic representations, and the corresponding mappings and networks of these representations. A particular strength of the Ontogenesis Model is its detailed description of the development and properties of L2 phonological, orthographic, and semantic representations and mappings, as well as the notion of fuzziness and changes in fuzziness as L2 learners seek to attain optima in the ontogenesis of L2 phonological, orthographic, and semantic representations. As rightfully noted by the authors, existing models such as BIA+ (Dijkstra & Van Heuven, 2002), Multilink (Dijkstra, Wahl, Buytenhuijs, van Halem, Al-Jibouri, De Korte & Rekké, 2019), the Revised Hierarchical Model (Kroll & Stewart, 1994), and the Distributed Feature Model (De Groot, 1992; Van Hell & De Groot, 1998) focus on the relationship and interactions between the L1 and L2 lexicons. As the two crucial properties of their Ontogenesis Model, Bordag and colleagues state that their model primarily addresses “properties and aspects of the L2 lexical units” and “developmental aspects of L2 representations.” This focus is a distinctive strength of the Ontogenesis Model: the in-depth and comprehensive description of the developmental dynamics of L2 phonological, orthographic, and semantic representations uniquely positions the Ontogenesis Model in the current literature of models describing the bilingual mental lexicon. But principally focusing on the representational architecture of only the L2 lexicon is also a potential weakness if the model seeks to explain bilingual lexical processing.

The Ontogenesis Model primarily focuses on the initial stages in the acquisition of L2 phonological, orthographic, and semantic representations – in particular, in L2 learners who have already established the triangular architecture of phonological, orthographic, and semantic codes in their native language. Research studies testing such late L2 learners, using a wide range of lexical processing tasks, have found ubiquitous evidence that supports language nonselective activation and cross-language interaction: lexical activation of a word in one language leads to the co-activation of related words in the bilinguals’ two languages, even when the social and linguistic context calls for only one language (for reviews, see Kroll, Bobb, & Wodniecka, 2006; Van Hell & Tanner, 2012). The bilingual mental lexicon is fundamentally permeable across language boundaries, not only for bilinguals who use two languages of the same script, but also for bilinguals who use languages with different scripts or languages from different modalities, as in sign-speech bilinguals. This implies that in order to understand and predict patterns of bilingual lexical processing, theoretical models of the bilingual mental lexicon must describe the triangular architecture in L2, but also the corresponding mappings with the L1 lexicon and the activation mechanisms that describe the activation of phonological, orthographic, and semantic codes across languages. Such activation mechanisms explain how bilinguals navigate cross-language activation and inhibition to optimize lexical processing and reduce unintended interference from the nontarget language.

Does the Ontogenesis model of L2 lexical representation operate independently from the native language? No. A compelling part of the Ontogenesis Model is the detailed description of how the acquisition of, in particular, the L2 semantic and phonological representational architecture builds on L1 representations and how characteristics of the L2 learners’ native language shape the developmental dynamics of L2 representations. But if the Ontogenesis Model strives to also account for bilingual online lexical processing and the rich empirical basis for cross-language interactions during lexical processing, the L2 representational architecture needs to be integrated into a larger model of the bilingual mental lexicon that includes L1 phonological, orthographic, and semantic representations and links connecting L2 and L1 representations. May I add this to the authors’ future agenda?

**Acknowledgments.** The preparation of this commentary was supported by National Science Foundation grants BCS-1349110 and OISE-1545900.

## References

- Bordag D, Gor K and Opitz A** (2021) Ontogenesis model of the L2 lexical representation. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728921000250>
- De Groot AMB** (1992) Bilingual lexical representation: A closer look at conceptual representations. In Frost R and Katz L (eds), *Orthography, phonology, morphology, and meaning*. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science Publishers pp. 389–412.
- Dijkstra A and Van Heuven WJB** (2002) The architecture of the bilingual word recognition system: From identification to decision. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 5, 175–197. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728902003012>
- Dijkstra T, Wahl A, Buytenhuijs F, van Halem N, Al-Jibouri Z, De Korte M and Rekké S** (2019) Multilink: A computational model for bilingual word recognition and word translation. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 22, 657–679. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728918000287>
- Kroll JF, Bobb SC and Wodniecka Z** (2006) Language selectivity is the exception, not the rule: Arguments against a fixed locus of language selection in bilingual speech. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 9, 119–135. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728906002483>
- Kroll JF and Stewart E** (1994) Category interference in translation and picture naming: Evidence for asymmetric connections between bilingual memory representations. *Journal of Memory and Language* 33, 149–174. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jmla.1994.1008>
- Van Hell JG and De Groot AMB** (1998) Conceptual representation in bilingual memory: Effects of concreteness and cognate status in word association. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 1, 193–211. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728998000352>
- Van Hell JG and Tanner D** (2012) Second language proficiency and cross-language lexical activation. *Language Learning* 62, 148–171. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2012.00710.x>