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What is knowledge of language?

A universal or design feature of language:

all natural language utterances are made up of distinct units that are “meaningful” and all natural language systems divide those units into a series of two or more classes or syntactic categories, which constrain how words can be combined into sentences: A system of “words and rules”

In this system Nouns and verbs have a special status

Greenberg, 1966; Hocket, 1958; Robins, 1952
The categories “noun” and “verb” are universal across languages (not so for other categories) and represent elemental building blocks for grammatical rules that combine single words into phrases and sentences.

![Diagram of sentence structure]

The boy likes the koalas

but not....

*The likes boy the koalas

Greenberg, 1966; Hocket, 1958; Robins, 1952
The distinction between nouns and verbs is of fundamental importance not only for understanding language but for all aspects of cognition (think of the structure of propositions, categories, reasoning, mathematics, and even perception and action).

And yet we have only a rudimentary understanding of the role of grammatical category in the organization of the lexicon.
What makes nouns and verbs special?

All languages distinguish them

Differences in acquisition

Dissociations following brain damage

e.g. Cazden (1968); Valian (1986); Maratsos (1988)
EBA: “Oh Lordy, she’s making a mess. She let the thing go, and it’s getting on the floor. They’re stealing something. He’s falling; he’s gonna hurt himself. She’s cleaning these things. She’s looking at him falling, and she’s gonna get some of the stuff he’s giving her.”

CH: “Okay, the boy is, his cookies, he is, uh, his sister is look for him cookies, but he is going to fall out of his stool because his legs are not bent that way. And his mother is, all the time her dishes are bein’, and his mother is, she has got this [kəsɪt] and her faucet is never really on that, and then he has a tree, but he is, I don’t know.”
What are grammatical category deficits?

Not obvious that distinction is one of grammatical category as opposed to any one of various other factors that correlate with grammatical category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nouns</th>
<th>Verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>objects</td>
<td>actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entities</td>
<td>relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concrete</td>
<td>abstract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sensory</td>
<td>functional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imageable</td>
<td>non-imageable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There must be something to talk about and something must be said about this subject of discourse once it is selected. This distinction is of such fundamental importance that the vast majority of languages have emphasized it by creating some sort of formal barrier between the two terms of the proposition. The subject of discourse is a noun. As the most common subject of discourse is either a person or a thing, the noun clusters about concrete concepts of that order. As the thing predicated of a subject is generally an activity in the widest sense of the word, a passage from one moment of existence to another, the form which has been set aside for the business of predicking, in other words, the verb, cluster about concepts of activity. No language wholly fails to distinguish noun and verb, though in particular cases the nature of the distinction may be an elusive one. (Sapir, 1921: 119)
What are grammatical categories?

Nouns are not objects
  Abstract nouns: the **notion** of madness
  Deverbal nouns: he prefers **action** to **talk**

Verbs are not actions
  Stative verbs: cats **exist**
  Psych verbs: I **enjoyed** the fair, but it didn’t **amuse** you
What are grammatical categories?

Nouns bear noun morphology

  Case: cat (nominative/accusative/etc.); cat’s (genitive)

  Number: cat, ox (singular); cats, oxen (plural)

Verbs bear verb morphology

  Tense: walk, run (present); walked, ran (past)

  Person and number (φ): walk (1st singular), walks (3rd singular)
So, what are nouns and verbs?

Prototypical examples of nouns and verbs are concrete objects and actions, but the categories “noun” and “verb” are not isomorphic to the categories “object” and “action.”

(In other words, nouns and verbs have grammatical roles that seem to be dissociable from the semantic properties of prototypical members of each category.)
Grammatical categories are...

Distributional categories

A word’s grammatical category determines the types of phrases in which it appears

‘The boy likes the koalas’ but not ‘The likes boy the koalas’

Morphosyntactic categories

A word’s grammatical category determines the morphological transformations it undergoes

‘The boy liked the koalas’ but not ‘The boyed like the koalas’
How do “grammatical category” deficits arise?

Loss of access to distributional or morphosyntactic information about one category of words

   Grammatical category specific deficits need not be linked to semantic deficits

… or from damage to knowledge about certain aspects of word meaning

   Grammatical category specific deficits are always linked to semantic deficits
Locus of damage in semantic accounts
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1. Neuropsychology of noun and verb production  
   (experiments of nature)
2. “Virtual” neuropsychology (TMS)
3. Cortical signatures of noun and verb processing (fMRI)
How do “grammatical category” deficits arise?

Addressed this issue in two ways.

One way is to find neurological patients whose grammatical category-specific deficits are unlikely to arise from damage to the semantic system.

Such evidence is provided by patients with *modality-specific grammatical class deficits*

The boy is climbing the fence

The female is fixing the dress

Oral and written production of homonyms – e.g., play

Caramazza & Hillis, 1991
Speaking: The girl is holding the /baêg/.
Writing: The girl is actions a wagon.
Spoken and written production of nouns and verbs (KSR)

- interaction cannot be attributed to differences in relative difficulty of Ns and Vs since same items used in speaking and writing tasks

Rapp & Caramazza, 2002
Oral and written production of homonyms: MML (primary progressive aphasic)

Hillis, Tuffiash, & Caramazza, 2002
At 8 years post onset

"The water is overflowing. The stool is gonna... is gonna happen. The people are... the boy and girl, and they had to... stumble. Also... he's... falling back. The mother is... She's wash... wiping the dishes.

At 10.5 years post onset:

"uh, uh, boy... uh, uh, girl... and... cookies... uh, uh, uh"
(patient just wanted to write).
Category-specific grammatical class deficits with spared semantics

..... not strange consequence of re-organization of function – tests at **6 hours** after onset of neurological signs – and reversed with reperfusion

Hillis, Wityk, Barker, & Caramazza, 2002
MR diffusion-weighted imaging (DWI): identify the acute infarct

perfusion-weighted imaging (PWI): identify areas of low perfusion (poor blood flow)

Scans obtained within 1 hour of testing

a small, acute left subcortical infarct (DWI), and a larger area of hypoperfusion in left PIFG, inferior precentral and postcentral gyri, and insula (PWI)

Hillis, Wityk, Barker, & Caramazza, 2002
Modality-specific grammatical category deficits: conclusion

Grammatical class dissociations in some patients do not seem to be caused by semantic or peripheral (phonological/orthographic) deficits
Locus of damage in lexical accounts
Disconnection account of modality-specific deficits
How do “grammatical category” deficits arise?

Addressed this issue in two ways.

One way is to find neurological patients whose grammatical category specific deficits are unlikely to arise from damage to the semantic system. Such evidence is provided by patients with modality-specific grammatical class deficits.

The other way is to test directly for grammatical category-specific morphosyntactic (or morphophonological) deficits.

Laiacona & Caramazza, 2004; Shapiro & Caramazza, 2003a,b; Shapiro, Shelton, & Caramazza, 2001
Morphological production task

“This is a *fleeve*; these are ____”  (fleaves)  add
“These are *wugs*; this is a ____”  (wug)  remove
“This pig *fleaves*; these pigs ____”  (fleeve)  remove
“These pigs *wug*; this pig ____”  (wugs)  add

And consider whether difficulty in morphophonological production can be selective for grammatical category

Shapiro, Shelton & Caramazza, 2000; Shapiro & Caramazza, 2003; Laiacona & Caramazza, 2004
Dissociation in naming nouns and verbs

Shapiro, Shelton & Caramazza, 2000; Shapiro & Caramazza, 2003; Laiacona & Caramazza, 2004
Morphological production task

“This is a guide; these are ___” (guides) add
“These are sails; this is a ____” (sail) remove
“This pig fleeing; these pigs ___” (fleeve) remove
“These pigs wug; this pig ___” (wugs) add

Shapiro, Shelton & Caramazza, 2000; Shapiro & Caramazza, 2003; Laiacona & Caramazza, 2004
Locus of damage in lexical accounts
How do grammatical category deficits arise?

However it is possible to imagine a remote semantic cause for the observed dissociations... cascading effects from semantic level to later stages of processing.

Implication of this assumption is that whenever a patient presents with a grammatical category-specific naming deficit the patient will also have a grammatical category-specific morphophonological deficit.

Laiacona & Caramazza, 2004; Shapiro & Caramazza, 2003a,b; Shapiro, Shelton, & Caramazza, 2001
Dissociation of naming and morphological production deficits

Laiacona & Caramazza, 2004; Shapiro & Caramazza, 2003b
Grammatical knowledge and semantic knowledge can be damaged *independently* for a given word category.

Processing of grammatical categories constitutes a *discrete component* (?) of sentence processing.

Converging evidence with other methods: a look at the brain.
What neural systems subserve the representation of grammatical knowledge about nouns and verbs?

What areas of the brain are damaged in patients with grammatical category specific deficits?

Verb retrieval impairments tend to occur in patients with damage to the left frontal cortex, while noun deficits are most often associated with damage to the left temporal lobe (Miceli, Silveri, Villa & Caramazza, 1984; Damasio & Tranel, 1993; Daniele et al., 1994; Miceli et al., 1988; Tranel et al., 2001).
What about the brain?

Neuropsychological findings are equivocal with respect to brain areas that may be involved in representing specifically grammatical operations for nouns and verbs.

JR: left inferior frontal and parietal lesion
RC: left frontal opercular and posterior prefrontal lesion

Part of left midfrontal cortex crucial for verb processing?
What about the brain?

- Patient RC
- Patient JR
Transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS)

Repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS) modulates activity in targeted brain regions – assess effects on morphological transformations of nouns and verbs

Task:

“This is a sail; these are ___” (sails)
“These are wugs; this is a ___” (wug)
“This person sails; these people___” (sail)
“These pigs wug; this pig___” (wugs)
Methods

Target sites were located with a specialized navigation system (Brainsight, Rogue Research), using a high-resolution structural MRI obtained for each subject prior to the experiment.
TMS results: inferior mid-frontal gyrus

Shapiro, Pascual-Leone, Mottaghy, Gangitano & Caramazza (2001)
Is the effect *specific* to the area stimulated?

Is the effect *focal* (i.e., does it arise because of stimulation to that site, or spread of inhibition to neighboring sites)?

Stimulate the right frontal lobe (Exp. 1) and other sites in the left frontal lobe (Exp. 2)

Can the effect be generalized to other kinds of grammatical operations?

Use regular and irregular morphological transformations; past tense alternation with verbs

Cappelleti, Fregni, Shapiro, Pascual-Leone, & Caramazza, submitted
TMS: areas stimulated

Posterior mid-frontal gyrus

Inferior mid-frontal gyrus

Broca’s area
Patterns of noun and verb processing

Left – Sham

1. aMFG

2. IFG

3. pMFG

Right – Sham
Patterns of noun and verb processing
Regularity has no effect

Experiment 1: Stimulation to left inferior MFG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control conditions</th>
<th>Sham</th>
<th>Right hemisphere TMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean difference RTs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates a significant difference.
Interim conclusion

Left inferior midfrontal gyrus (IMFG) is crucial for morphological processing of verbs, but not of nouns.

- Not a nonspecific effect of TMS.

Processing in this area does not differentiate between regular and irregular inflection.
TMS shows that part of the left anterior midfrontal gyrus is specifically and crucially engaged in processing grammatical operations for verbs.

What’s going on in the rest of the brain?

Results with fMRI (and PET) have not been particularly encouraging (Warburton et al., 1996; Perani et al., 1999; Fujimaki et al. 1999; Tyler et al., 2004)
Further converging evidence from fMRI using the same morphophonological processing task, with:

• words and pseudowords (Exp 1)
• imageable and abstract words (Exp 2)
• regular and irregular morphology (Exp 3)
### Sample stimuli, Exp. 1-3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Verb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experiment 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: Real words</td>
<td>pond, vase</td>
<td>bathe, teach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Pseudo words</td>
<td>wug, bort</td>
<td>bime, wom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experiment 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: Concrete words</td>
<td>bell, wagon</td>
<td>swim, juggle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Abstract words</td>
<td>sound, purpose</td>
<td>think, reckon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experiment 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: Regular morphology</td>
<td>pig, ball</td>
<td>clean, laugh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Irregular morphology</td>
<td>mouse, loaf</td>
<td>fight, steal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Area of maximum activation for verbs
[Controlling for imageability (Exp 2) and varying regularity (Exp 3)]

L. middle frontal gyrus

Shapiro, Moo & Caramazza, 2006
Nouns > Verbs

Verbs > Nouns

L. fusiform gyrus

L. middle frontal gyrus

L. superior parietal lobule
Results

Brain areas activated by the sentence completion task for both nouns and verbs.

Areas activated only by verbs in green, and areas activated only by nouns in cyan.
A caveat

The areas of maximum activation for verbs relative to nouns do not seem to correspond to the areas which result in verb processing interference consequent to TMS stimulation.
A bar graph showing the relative delay in verb production (msec) for stimulated areas of the brain.

- **Area stimulated**: pMFG and aMFG

- **Δ(V)-Δ(N)**

  - **Relative delay in verb production (msec)**
    - pMFG: -10
    - aMFG: 35
Another caveat

The areas of maximal activation for verbs and nouns are similar to the areas found to be maximally activated when processing tools/manipulable objects.
Schematic of basic findings

1. Lateral Fusiform
2. Medial Fusiform
3. Ventral Premotor
4. Intra-Parietal Sulcus
5. Superior Temporal Sulcus
6. Middle Temporal Gyrus

after Martin and colleagues
Two interpretations of the fMRI results:

semantic information of a very abstract nature, corresponding to the ‘core’ conceptual properties of nouns (entities) and verbs (events)

these areas are sensitive to distributional information (pl., det., past tense etc.) that correlates with the grammatical categories noun and verb – and distributional feature networks might be expected to hew closely to areas involved in the semantic representation of the first words over which categorical inductions are made

Caramazza, 1994; Shapiro, Moo, & Caramazza, 2006
So, where are we now?

- Considerable evidence for independence of grammatical from semantic lexical processes (neuropsychology) but perhaps also for semantic organization of objects and actions along with nouns and verbs (fMRI)
- A number of conclusions are supported by the results I have reviewed…
• Clinical: causes of grammatical category-specific deficits
Conclusions

- Clinical: causes of grammatical category-specific deficits
- Functional: a reconsideration of the classical theory
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Conclusions

• Clinical: causes of grammatical category-specific deficits
• Functional: a reconsideration of the classical theory
• Neural: reconciling the data from neuropsychology, TMS and fMRI
Where are grammatical category processes?

- noun morphology ()?
- verb morphology ()?
- action semantics
- object semantics
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