

Integration in the mental lexicon: English verbal roots in Pennsylvania Dutch participles

1 Introduction. Borrowing is conceptualized as a process rather than a state that occurs when bilinguals reproduce a pattern of one language in another. Haugen's (1950) claim that borrowing occurs without the lender's consent or even awareness leads to inquiries of the coexistence and interaction of a bilingual's two languages within the mental lexicon. The bilingual mental lexicon has, due to extensive research and supporting experimental evidence (e.g., Hartsuiker et al., 2004; Dijkstra & van Heuven, 2002; Libben & Goral, 2015), been widely accepted as integrated, meaning that the items stored in the lexicon are not directly associated with a specific language, but are stored together in an integrated space. The viability of this theorized architecture in cases of bilingualism, where language borrowing occurs from one language into another, remains an open question. Pennsylvania Dutch, with its ample borrowings from English, and the status of its speakers as proficient bilinguals of the two languages, offers a valuable lens through which questions of integration of borrowed units as well as the lexicon as a whole, can be explored. In this presentation, we focus on the borrowings of English verbs into Pennsylvania Dutch, specifically the variety spoken in Holmes County, Ohio, and the way in which they are inflected in the participle form. Pennsylvania Dutch speakers' exhibited preference for a particular participle inflection over the other allows us not only document the contemporary subdialect but also investigate whether the perceived integration of a borrowed verbal root influences the choice in participle allomorph.

2 Empirical Focus. Pennsylvania Dutch (PD) is a North American language with over 300,000 speakers that developed from southeastern Palatine German. Due to PD's constant contact with American English (AE) over the past 240 years, there has been a noticeable increase in lexical borrowing of AE verbs into the PD lexicon (Louden, 2019). Primarily, PD participles of AE-borrowed verbs consist of the AE-borrowed verb stem combined with the weak PD participle circumfix *g(e)/-t* (e.g., *peende/gepeendt* 'to paint/painted'; *schpelle/gschpell* 'to spell/spelled'), but there also exist a few borrowed verbs documented in Beam's extensive documentation of PD (2004-2011) that instead receive the strong *g(e)/-e* allomorph (*weare/gwore* 'to wear/wore', *treddede/gedredde* 'to tread/trodden'). Intriguingly, although not formally documented to our knowledge, there also exist 'bare' participles such as *avoid* and *decide* that are not inflected in either the PD or AE fashion. We posit that these bare participles are the result of a verbal root that has been only partially integrated into the PD lexicon. This talk explores the participial allomorph preference when the verbal root is borrowed. It takes a first step in documenting this preference on a dialectal basis by focusing on the preference of speakers of the Holmes County, Ohio dialect of PD. Specifically, the study asks 1) what is the participial allomorph preference in borrowing situations? and 2) to what extent does the perceived integration of a borrowed root influence the selection of allomorph?

3 Methods. Data collection and fieldwork will take place in the summer of 2024 with analysis immediately following. Participants will take part in two experimental tasks – one that elicits a metacognitive judgment and one that elicits production. In the former, participants will judge a nonce PD participle as acceptable across a 5-point scale. The target stimuli will consist of a nonce AE-like verb stem (e.g., *plim*, *spack*) with one of the expected PD participle allomorphs – *g(e)/-e*, *g(e)/-t*, *-e*, *-t* as well as a zero (covert) allomorph that results in a 'bare' participle (e.g., *Ich _ mei Freind un Familye. Ich hab mei Freind un Familye _ .*) In the latter task, participants will produce the past tense version of a present tense sentence, prompting their creation of a Pennsylvania Dutch participle. The sentence will be presented auditorily in PD and the target stimuli will be real AE verbs varying in their status of integration in the PD lexicon. The results of these tasks will reveal the speakers' preferences for weak vs. strong exponency, as well as overt vs. bare exponency. Additionally, these findings will provide insight into how integration of a borrowing into the mental lexicon influences allomorph selection.

4 Conclusion. An investigation of Pennsylvania Dutch participles offers a valuable empirical lens through which the proposal of an integrated mental lexicon of the bilingual speakers of Pennsylvania Dutch could be explored. Similarly, the findings of this investigation would contribute to the documentation of bilingual grammars in language contact situations in the United States.

References.

- Beam, R. C. (2004-2011). *The Comprehensive Pennsylvania German Dictionary*.
- Dijkstra, T., & van Heuven, W. J. B. (2002). The architecture of the bilingual word recognition system: From identification to decision. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 23, 175-197.
- Hartsuiker, R. J., Pickering, M. J., & Veltkamp, E. (2004). Is syntax separate or shared between languages? Cross-linguistic syntactic priming in Spanish/English bilinguals. *Psychological Science*, 15, 409-414.
- Haugen, E. (1950). Analysis of linguistic borrowing. *Language* 26, (2), 210-231.
- Libben, G., & Goral, M. (2015). How bilingualism shapes the mental lexicon. In J. W. Schwieter (Ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Bilingual Processing*, 631-644.
- Louden, M. L. (2019). The English 'Infusion' in Pennsylvania German. In R. Hickey (Ed.), *English in the German-Speaking World*, 384-407.
- Myers-Scotton, C., & Jake, J. L. (2014). Nonfinite verbs and negotiating bilingualism in codeswitching: Implications for a language production model. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 17 (3), 511-525.
- Weinreich, U. (1953). *Languages in contact*.
- Wiese, R. (1996). Phonological versus morphological rules: On German umlaut and ablaut. *Journal of Linguistics*, 32 (1), 113-135.
- van Hell, J. & Tanner, D. (2012), Second language proficiency and cross-language lexical activation. *Language Learning*, 62, 148-171.