



**HAL**  
open science

## Learning to associate novel words with motor actions: Language-induced motor activity following short training

Raphael Fargier, Yves Paulignan, Véronique Boulenger, Padraic Monaghan,  
Anne Reboul, Tatjana A Nazir

### ► To cite this version:

Raphael Fargier, Yves Paulignan, Véronique Boulenger, Padraic Monaghan, Anne Reboul, et al..  
Learning to associate novel words with motor actions: Language-induced motor activity following  
short training. *Cortex*, 2011, 48 (7), pp.CORTEX 692. 10.1016/j.cortex.2011.07.003 . hal-00613599

**HAL Id: hal-00613599**

**<https://hal.science/hal-00613599>**

Submitted on 5 Aug 2011

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Learning to associate novel words with motor actions: Language-induced motor activity  
following short training

*Raphaël Fargier<sup>1</sup>, Yves Paulignan<sup>1</sup>, Véronique Boulenger<sup>2</sup>, Padraic Monaghan<sup>3</sup>, Anne  
Reboul<sup>1</sup>, and Tatjana A. Nazir<sup>1</sup>*

1. L2C2-Institut des Sciences Cognitives, UMR 5230 CNRS/UCBL, 67 Bd Pinel, Université Claude  
Bernard Lyon1, 69675 Bron Cedex, France

2. Laboratoire Dynamique du Langage, UMR 5596 CNRS – Université de Lyon, Institut des Sciences  
de l'Homme, 14 Avenue Berthelot, 69363 Lyon Cedex 07, France

3. Department of Psychology, Lancaster University, Fylde College, Lancaster LA1 4YF, United  
Kingdom

Correspondence to:

Raphaël Fargier

L2C2-Language, Brain and Cognition Laboratory

Institute of Cognitive Science

67 Bd Pinel

69675 Bron, France

Email: raphael.fargier@isc.cnrs.fr

Phone number: +33(0) 437911251

## Abstract

1  
2 Action words referring to face, arm or leg actions activate areas along the motor strip that also control  
3 the planning and execution of the actions specified by the words. This EEG study aimed to test the  
4 learning profile of this language-induced motor activity. Participants were trained to associate novel  
5 verbal stimuli to videos of object-oriented hand and arm movements or animated visual images on two  
6 consecutive days. Each training session was preceded and followed by a test-session with isolated  
7 videos and verbal stimuli.  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 We measured motor-related brain activity (reflected by a desynchronization in the  $\mu$  frequency bands;  
13 8-12 Hz range) localized at centro-parietal and fronto-central electrodes. We compared activity from  
14 viewing the videos to activity resulting from processing the language stimuli only. At centro-parietal  
15 electrodes, stable action-related  $\mu$  suppression was observed during viewing of videos in each test-  
16 session of the two days. For processing of verbal stimuli associated with motor actions, a similar  
17 pattern of activity was evident only in the second test-session of day 1. Over the fronto-central regions,  
18  $\mu$  suppression was observed in the second test-session of day 2 for the videos and in the second test-  
19 session of day 1 for the verbal stimuli.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 Whereas the centro-parietal  $\mu$  suppression can be attributed to motor events actually experienced  
28 during training, the fronto-central  $\mu$  suppression seems to serve as a convergence zone that mediates  
29 underspecified motor information. Consequently, sensory-motor reactivations through which concepts  
30 are comprehended seem to differ from those implicated in their acquisition.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

## 1. Introduction

In their seminal work, Hauk et al. (2004) demonstrated that words referring to face, arm or leg actions differentially activated areas along the motor strip that are adjacent to or overlapping with areas activated by the movement described by the words. This result was taken to suggest that the referential meaning of action words has a correlate in the somatotopic activation of motor and premotor cortex. A number of imaging studies have since reported related findings (Aziz-Zadeh et al., 2006; Boulenger et al., 2009; Kemmerer et al., 2008; Tettamanti et al., 2005) but disagreements about how to interpret these observations have also accumulated. Essentially, the debate focuses on the question as to whether language-induced cortical motor activity is a source or, rather, a consequence of language understanding (see Mahon and Caramazza, 2008 for a stimulating discussion). While advocates of “embodied theories” of semantics interpret the results as evidence that we use our motor system to understand language about actions (e.g., Allport, 1985; Fischer and Zwaan, 2008; Gallese and Lakoff, 2005; Martin et al., 1996; Pulvermüller, 1999), opponents of this view suggest that language-induced motor activity is an “after-effect” of language understanding that follows computations of abstract conceptual representations of action words performed elsewhere in the brain (Damasio, 1989; Mahon and Caramazza, 2008; see also Patterson et al., 2007; Simmons and Barsalou, 2003 for related proposals). Given the difficulty of isolating the functional role of motor activity during language processing, this debate seems as yet irresolvable. However, studies that probe the trajectory of learning of motor-language associations may provide insight into the causal role of motor activity for language processing.

The arbitrary relationship between the phonological forms of words and their meaning necessarily entails that cortical motor activity observed during the processing of verbal action description is the result of learning. In fact, according to an idea first put forward by Pulvermüller (1999, 2005), links between brain regions involved in language processing and brain regions involved in action planning/execution could develop through Hebbian associative learning. Since “action words” (mostly verbs) are often acquired and experienced in the context of execution of the depicted actions (Goldfield, 2000), and given Hebb’s postulate that synchronous activity of neurons leads to the formation of neuronal assemblies (Hebb, 1949), Pulvermüller suggested that neural networks including perisylvian language areas and motor areas emerge with experience. By means of these shared circuits, perceiving an action word will then automatically trigger activity in motor regions of the brain (see also Del Giudice et al., 2008, and Keysers & Perret, 2004, for similar ideas regarding potential links between action execution and observation systems).

The assumption that association learning can rapidly generate such shared neural circuits is supported by studies showing that the selectivity of the brain’s motor response to a given perceptual stimulus changes with learning. In a study by Catmur et al. (2008), a group of participants were trained over

1 three consecutive days to perform an action with the hand while observing a similar hand action.  
2 Another group of participants were trained to perform the hand action while observing an action with  
3 the foot. After training, motor areas that showed greater responses to the observation of hand actions  
4 in the first group, responded more strongly to observation of foot actions in the second group (see also  
5 Catmur et al., 2007). Relatedly, Lahav et al. (2007) showed that shared circuits between auditory  
6 processes involved in music perception and motor processes involved in piano playing can emerge  
7 rapidly with training. In this study, non-musicians were trained to play a piano piece over a five day  
8 training period. When playing the piano, auditory feedback is naturally induced by each of the player's  
9 movements leading to a tight coupling between perception and action. Following training, simply  
10 listening to the newly acquired piece of music triggered activity in cortical motor regions. McNamara  
11 et al. (2008) reported similar results for sound-gesture associations. Finally, in a complex learning  
12 experiment, Kiefer et al. (2007) taught participants over a period of three weeks to categorize a large  
13 number of novel objects into different object categories by either pantomiming a functional action that  
14 could be associated with the object or by simply pointing to the objects. Following training,  
15 presentation of the objects triggered activity in visuo-motor and frontal motor regions when training  
16 involved pantomiming but not when it involved pointing (see also Weisberg et al., 2007 for similar  
17 results for novel tool use).

18 All these learning experiments clearly demonstrate that cortical motor responses to perceptual stimuli  
19 can rapidly change with experience. Consequently, it should not be surprising to find similar effects  
20 when we learn to associate novel word-forms with self-performed motor actions. Indeed, Reville et al.  
21 (2008), using fMRI, trained participants to associate novel verbal stimuli with motion changes of  
22 objects and demonstrated that following training, participants showed greater language-induced  
23 activation in cortical regions that had been linked to the processing of motion and to the processing of  
24 motion-related real words (e.g., left MT/V5 and its anterior part; Kable et al., 2002, 2005; Martin et al.  
25 1995). However, the low temporal resolution of fMRI means it is unclear exactly when this language-  
26 induced motor activity becomes evident and how it evolves during training. To align the findings of  
27 Hauk et al. (2004) with research on the acquisition of word-referent relations, we therefore propose to  
28 monitor the temporal dynamics of learning word-action associations in adult participants, from the  
29 beginning of training to the point when associations are well established in behavior. Following the  
30 prediction by Pulvermüller (1999) and in line with previous learning experiments, we assume that  
31 associating novel verbal stimuli with a novel hand/arm movement (but not with a novel animated  
32 visual image) will lead to co-activation of perisylvian language regions and motor regions of the brain.  
33 Subsequent to training, the verbal stimuli alone should thus trigger activity in motor regions.

34 To study the dynamics of word-action associations, we analyzed oscillations of EEG  
35 (electroencephalogram) in the 8-12 Hz frequency range (i.e., "μ rhythms"; Gastaut, 1952) while  
36 participants listened to initially novel verbal stimuli, at four periods during training over two  
37

1 consecutive days.  $\mu$  rhythms are typically present at rest but are suppressed, for instance, when  
2 performing a movement. This suppression is believed to reflect an event-related desynchronization of  
3 the EEG caused by an increase of neural activity in somato-sensory cortex (Hari et al., 1997). In line  
4 with fMRI studies that indicated neural motor activity while listening to action sounds or observing  
5 actions (Buccino et al., 2004; Kilner et al., 2009; Rizzolatti et al., 1996),  $\mu$  suppression has also been  
6 observed when participants hear the sound of actions (Caetano et al., 2007) or when they observe a  
7 movement performed by others (see Pineda, 2008, for a review). In the present study we therefore first  
8 identified EEG electrodes for which  $\mu$  suppression was evident during movement observation, then we  
9 subsequently focused on these “electrodes of interest” for the analysis of  $\mu$  suppression during  
10 processing of newly acquired action words.

## 17 **2. Materials and method**

### 20 *2.1. Participants*

21 Sixteen right-handed (scores  $0.79 \pm 0.2$ ; Oldfield, 1971) French native volunteers participated in the  
22 study (9 females; mean age  $24.2 \pm 4$  years). None of the participants had a history of psychiatric or  
23 neurological disorders and all had normal or corrected-to-normal vision. Participants gave written  
24 consent to partake in the study in accordance to the Helsinki declaration (1968). They were paid for  
25 their participation.

### 31 *2.2. Stimuli*

32 The stimuli consisted of 20 different video clips (presented on a computer screen 80 cm from the  
33 participants) and 20 novel verbal stimuli. Half of the clips consisted in reaching-and-grasping  
34 movements towards a horizontally or vertically oriented cylinder. The object-directed movement was  
35 performed with the right hand. Each movement started from a rest position (the hand on a table in  
36 front of the actor’s torso) and ended with the grasping of the object. Movements differed in the way  
37 the hand moved towards the object (e.g. a zigzag movement). The other half of the clips consisted of  
38 animated artificial images, which differed in shapes, colors and animations (see Figure 1). Ten  
39 pseudo-words and their temporally reversed counterparts (backward speech<sup>1</sup>) served as verbal stimuli.  
40 Pseudo-words were bisyllabic and were obtained by changing one or two letters from frequent French  
41 words (i.e. they respected the phonotactic rules of French). Average length of the verbal stimuli was  
42 665 msec ( $\pm 123$ ). Average length of video clips was 4600 msec ( $\pm 1170$ ) for movement-clips and  
43 3900 msec ( $\pm 1290$ ) for image-clips. Verbal stimuli were presented binaurally through loudspeakers.

---

56 <sup>1</sup> Backward speech was used to determine effects of stimulus familiarity. However, for these stimuli  
57 associations were not fully acquired even at the end of Day 2. Therefore, data for these stimuli are  
58 difficult to interpret and were not further considered.

Figure 1 about here.

### 2.3. Procedure

The experiment was conducted over two consecutive days. Each day included three sessions. Day 1 started with a test-session in which participants were instructed to listen attentively to the verbal stimuli and watch the video clips one by one. This first test-session was followed by a training-session in which participants learned to associate verbal stimuli and video clips. The training session was followed by a second test-session, which was identical to the first. Finally, a behavioral test assessed the effectiveness of learning. Day 2 started with a test-session followed by a training-session, a further test-session and the behavioral test. The exact procedure of each part of the experiment is described below. Note that EEG was recorded throughout all sessions. However, during training EEG recordings resulted in noisy signals and were thus not analyzed.

#### 2.3.1. Day 1

*2.3.1.1. First test session.* During the test-sessions the 20 verbal stimuli (pseudo-words and backward speech) and the 20 video clips (image or reaching/grasping movement) were presented in isolation in a pseudo-random order. For each trial, participants were requested to fixate on a crosshair at the center of the computer screen, which lasted for 500 msec, and to pay attention to the auditory or visual stimuli presented subsequently. At the end of each trial a grey screen appeared for 1sec, allowing participants to blink. Each stimulus was presented 5 times for a total of 200 trials.

*2.3.1.2. Training session.* Each training trial started with a fixation cross, presented for 500 msec at the centre of the screen. The cross was followed by the presentation of a video clip (image or reaching/grasping movement). Participants were instructed to watch the video. A white screen of 500 msec marked the end of the clip. The same clip was then displayed again together with the verbal stimulus, which was presented shortly after the onset of the clip. When the clip depicted a movement (movement condition) the onset of the verbal stimulus coincided with the beginning of the movement and participants were requested to imitate the movement while listening to the verbal stimulus. When the clip showed an animated image, participants simply observed the image again while listening to the verbal stimulus (image condition). Participants were explicitly instructed to associate the verbal stimulus with the movement or the image depicted in the clip. To ensure that participants had finished imitating the movement before the beginning of the next trial, the experimenter triggered the trials manually. Each verbal stimulus/video clip pairing was displayed 15 times and the 300 trials in total were presented in pseudo-random order. A break was proposed to the participants after every 100 trials. The coupling of a given verbal stimulus with a given video clip was counter-balanced between

1 participants such that the same verbal stimulus was associated with a movement for one participant  
2 and with an image for another.  
3

4 *2.3.1.3. Second test session.* Identical to 2.3.1.1.  
5

6 *2.3.1.4. Behavioral task.* In order to quantify learning performance, a behavioral test was performed as  
7 the final session on each day. For this, the 20 verbal stimuli were presented one by one and  
8 participants were requested to indicate if the stimulus was associated with an image or a movement in  
9 the previous training session. For verbal stimuli coupled with a movement, participants were asked to  
10 reproduce the movement. For verbal stimuli coupled with an image, they were asked to describe  
11 shapes, colors and animations.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16

17  
18 *2.3.2. Day 2*  
19

20 Day 2 started with a test-session, followed by a training-session, another test-session and the  
21 behavioral test. Except for a reduction in the number of repetitions in the training session (10 instead  
22 of 15) all experimental procedures were identical to those described for day 1.  
23  
24  
25

26  
27 *2.4. Data acquisition*

28 EEG data were recorded using BrainAmp amplifiers (Brain Vision recorder software, Brain Products  
29 GmbH, Munich, Germany). EEG was recorded from 32 scalp sites using the international 10-20  
30 system (American Encephalographic Society, 1994), with a forehead ground. Impedance was 10 K $\Omega$   
31 or less at the start of the recording. All scalp sites were referenced to the left mastoid. Horizontal and  
32 vertical eye movements were monitored using electro-oculograms (EOG) with a bipolar recording  
33 from electrodes placed on the outer canthi of the left eye. ERPs were sampled at 500 Hz.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 *2.5. Data analysis*

41 EEG activity was analyzed using BrainVision Analyzer 2.0 software (Brain Vision analyzer software,  
42 Brain Products GmbH, Munich, Germany). First, a notch filter (>50 Hz) was applied. The EEG was  
43 then re-referenced to an average reference (Bertrand et al., 1985) excluding both hEOG and vEOG. A  
44 manual inspection of the raw data was performed before the application of an ocular correction ICA  
45 (512 ICA steps; convergence bound of  $1 \cdot 10^{-7}$ ). Data were grouped according to the six conditions  
46 (movement video-clips; image video-clips; pseudo-words associated with an image; pseudo-words  
47 associated with a movement; backward speech associated with an image; backward speech associated  
48 with a movement) and epoched from -500 msec to 1500 msec relative to stimulus onset. Trials were  
49 baseline corrected (200 msec pre-stimulus baseline). Wavelet transformation in the 1-30 Hz domain  
50 (frequency steps of 20) was computed for each trial by convolving a Morlet wavelet with the signal  
51 with a width of 7 cycles (van Elk et al., 2010). Trials were averaged for each condition. Grand-  
52 averages were then calculated over all participants.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



## 2.6. Statistical analysis

To test for statistical significance, the average amplitude of  $\mu$  oscillations (8-12 Hz range) was computed for each condition and test-session over successive segments of 50 msec, starting from 0 msec to 1000 msec after stimulus onset (van Elk et al., 2010). Repeated-measures analyses of variance (ANOVAs) that contrasted  $\mu$  oscillations in the “movement condition” to the “image condition” were then performed for all time-windows. Main factors included: *day* (first and second day of the experiment), *test-session* (first and second test-session of the day), *condition* (movement and image) and *electrode* (see Results section for the identification of “electrodes of interest”). Note that to reduce false positives, several consecutive intervals should show significant effects ( $p < .05$ ) (see van Elk et al. 2010). Post-hoc (LSD-Fisher) analyses for test-sessions were therefore performed only when three or more consecutive time-bins showed a significant effect of the factor *test-session* and only within the time interval identified in the main analysis.

## 3. Results

### 3.1 Behavioral data

Participants had acquired all associations between verbal stimuli and depicted movements or images at the end of Day 1 and remained at ceiling at Day 2.

### 3.2 EEG data

#### 3.2.1. Videos: Electrodes of interest

The onset of all videos triggered  $\mu$  suppression over large parts of the head. To identify “electrodes of interest”, we thus contrasted the topography of  $\mu$  oscillations to videos that depicted the reaching-and-grasping movements to those that depicted the animated artificial images. Figure 2 shows spatial cartographies that present the difference in  $\mu$  oscillations (in the 8-12 Hz frequency range) between the two conditions (movement-condition minus image-condition) within a time window of 250-1000 msec after video onset. Data are plotted separately for the four test-sessions. In line with previous studies showing reduced  $\mu$  activity during preparation or observation of finger/hand movements over centro-parietal sites contra-lateral to the performing hand (e.g. Pfurtscheller et al., 1997; Babiloni et al. 2002), the contrast between movement-condition and image-conditions revealed a centro-parietal site over the left hemisphere at which stronger  $\mu$  suppression was observed in the movement-condition. This pattern, which despite some variations could be restricted to electrodes CP1, CP3, P3 and Pz (Centro-Parietal cluster), was already present prior to training (i.e., during the first test-session of Day 1) and

1 was observed in the remaining three test-sessions. Moreover, in agreement with data recently reported  
2 by van Elk et al. (2010), a cluster of electrodes over fronto-central regions showed stronger  
3 movement- than image-related  $\mu$  suppression, especially at the second test-session of each day. This  
4 second region of interest involved electrodes F3, F4, Fz, FC1, FC3, FC2 and FC4 (Fronto-Central  
5 cluster).  
6  
7

8  
9 Figure 2 about here

10  
11  
12 Figure 3 illustrates time-frequency analyses (pooled over the previously identified electrodes for the  
13 left centro-parietal region (A) and for the fronto-central region (B)), for the first and second test  
14 session of each day. Data are plotted separately for the movement-condition (upper row) and the  
15 image condition (middle row). The third row shows the difference between the two conditions  
16 (movement-condition minus image-condition). Figure 3C plots  $\mu$  activity (8-12Hz only) for each of  
17 the involved electrodes (black curves represent data for the movement-condition, red curves for the  
18 image-condition). These figures show that in the movement-condition as well as in the image-  
19 condition  $\mu$  suppression started to become evident between 200-400 msec after video onset. However,  
20 at centro-parietal electrodes, a tendency for stronger  $\mu$  suppression during viewing of videos depicting  
21 the reaching-and-grasping movements was evident in all test-sessions. The ANOVA for this cluster of  
22 electrodes revealed no main effects, but a significant interaction between factors *electrode x condition*  
23 was observed for seven consecutive time-bins (from 450-850 msec post-stimulus onset; all  $p < .05$ ).  
24 The interaction between *electrode x condition* was due to variations of the effects at the different  
25 electrodes; see Suppl. material). This analysis thus indicates that at centro-parietal electrodes the effect  
26 of *condition* was present prior to training and was maintained throughout all test-sessions.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
Figure 3 about here.

66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

1 condition was stronger on Day 2 compared to Day 1. In separate ANOVAs for each of the two days no  
2 significant effect of *condition* was evident on Day 1. However, on Day 2 a significant interaction  
3 between *test-session x condition x electrode* was observed for five consecutive time-bins (from 750-  
4 1000 msec post stimulus onset; all  $p < .05$ ). Post-hoc analyses showed that the effect of *condition* was  
5 restricted to the second test-session of Day 2 (from 750-1000 msec; all  $p < .05$ ).  
6  
7

### 8 9 3.2.2. Verbal Stimuli

10  
11 Figure 4 plots the corresponding data for verbal stimuli. As expected, no  $\mu$  suppression was observed  
12 prior to training. However, during the second test-session of Day 1  $\mu$  suppression became evident at  
13 centro-parietal electrodes in the movement-condition. No such effects were observed for stimuli  
14 associated with animated images. On Day 2 this language-induced  $\mu$  suppression was no longer  
15 evident, neither before nor after further training. The ANOVA for the centro-parietal electrode cluster  
16 did not reveal any significant effects, but a t-test (pooled over electrodes) for the second test-session of  
17 Day 1 showed significant effects of *condition* for eleven consecutive time-bins (from 400-950 msec  
18 after stimulus onset; all  $p < .05$ ).  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25  
26 Figure 4 about here.  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 Comparable to what was observed for the videos, modulation of  $\mu$  activity at fronto-central electrodes  
32 was also mainly observed in the second test-session of each day.  
33  
34

35 However, whereas on Day 1 stimuli associated with a motor movement resulted in  $\mu$  suppression, on  
36 Day 2 a tendency for an increase of  $\mu$  activity was observed. The ANOVA indicated a significant main  
37 effect of *electrode* and a significant interaction between *day x condition* for three consecutive time-  
38 bins (from 300-450 msec post stimulus onset; all  $p < .05$ ). The three-way interaction between *day x*  
39 *condition x test-session*, indicating a potential reversal of  $\mu$  activity between the second test-session of  
40 Day 1 and Day 2, reached significance in one time bin only (from 300-350 msec after stimulus onset).  
41 A separate ANOVA for Day 1 indicated a significant interaction between *test-session x condition* in  
42 three time-bins (from 300-450 msec post stimulus onset; all  $p < .05$ ) and post-hoc analyses restricted  
43 the effect of *condition* to the second test-session (from 300-450 msec; all  $p < .05$ ). For Day 2 the  
44 ANOVA (or t-test) did not reveal any significant effects.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

## 55 4. Discussion

56  
57  
58 By analyzing action-related  $\mu$  oscillations in the EEG of adult participants, the present study monitored  
59 the temporal dynamics of learning word-action associations from the beginning of training to the point  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 when associations are well established in behavior. In agreement with previous associative-learning  
2 experiments (e.g., Catmur et al., 2008; Kiefer et al., 2007; Lahav et al., 2007; McNamara et al., 2008;  
3 Revill et al., 2008; Weisberg et al., 2007), our behavioral data revealed that links between verbal  
4 stimuli and motor actions or images are rapidly established with training. At the end of training on  
5 Day 1, all participants correctly described the actions or images the novel verbal stimuli referred to.  
6 Performance stayed at ceiling on the following day. Moreover, during viewing of videos, strong and  
7 stable action-related  $\mu$  suppression was seen over a centro-parietal region of the hemisphere contra-  
8 lateral to the performing arm during all four test-sessions. In line with results from previous studies  
9 (e.g., Pfurtscheller et al., 1997; Babiloni et al. 2002) this pattern of  $\mu$  suppression thus seemed a good  
10 indicator of motor activity triggered by the observation/execution of actions depicted in the videos.  
11 Despite the fact that the topography of the identified region hinged on the specific contrast we  
12 performed (movement-condition minus image-condition), the pure association account by  
13 Pulvermüller (Pulvermüller, 1999; Gallese and Lakoff, 2005) predicted that after training, simply  
14 listening to verbal stimuli should trigger the pattern of brain activity that was seen during viewing of  
15 videos. Consistent with this prediction, once associations with verbal stimuli were established, a  
16 similar but weaker pattern of  $\mu$  suppression was observed over the centro-parietal region during  
17 listening to verbal stimuli. This language-induced  $\mu$  suppression was observed on Day 1 but not on  
18 Day 2.

19 Action-related  $\mu$  suppression was also seen at electrodes over fronto-central regions of the two  
20 hemispheres. Yet, the pattern of  $\mu$  oscillations at these electrodes was more complex and did not  
21 directly follow the prediction of the association account. Prior to training, activity at these electrodes  
22 was little affected by stimulus display. Moreover, action-related  $\mu$  suppression for videos was not  
23 observed before the end of training on Day 2. Hence, it is unlikely that  $\mu$  suppression at these  
24 electrodes was directly triggered by the observation/execution of actions depicted in the videos. This  
25 view is further supported by the fact that at fronto-central electrodes action-related  $\mu$  suppression for  
26 verbal stimuli was seen *prior* to that of videos, that is, on Day 1. Then, on Day 2, training induced a  
27 tendency for an increase of action-related  $\mu$  activity to verbal stimuli.

28 Hence, while language-induced motor activity seen at centro-parietal electrodes could be attributed to  
29 motor events actually experienced during training, the same does not hold for fronto-central  
30 electrodes. Rather, the observed pattern of training-dependent and action-related  $\mu$  oscillations to  
31 videos and verbal stimuli could imply that these electrodes capture activity from regions that serve as  
32 “convergence zones” (Damasio, 1989) between language and motor structures. According to Damasio  
33 (1989), convergence zones are local brain areas in association cortices that do not by themselves  
34 contain refined representations. Instead, these zones receive/send signals from/to different modalities  
35 and enable correlated activity to occur in different regions of the brain. By way of these convergence  
36 zones - which evolve through learning - the brain can bind information represented in distinct regions

1  
2  
3 into coherent events (e.g. sound and action), and can enact formulas for the reconstitution  
4 (remembering) of representations of events in sensory and motor cortices. The fact that action-related  
5  $\mu$  suppression for verbal stimuli *as well as* for videos emerged concurrently with the acquisition of  
6 word-action associations, suggests that activity at fronto-central electrodes reflects the development of  
7 such convergence zones.

8  
9 The possibility that language-induced sensory and motor activity originates from convergence zones in  
10 higher-level association cortices has also been suggested by Kiefer et al. (2008). In their study,  
11 processing words denoting objects for which acoustic features are relevant (e.g., telephone) activated  
12 the auditory association cortex without activating the primary and secondary auditory cortex.  
13 According to Kiefer et al. (2008), conceptual processing only involves a partial reinstatement of brain  
14 activity during perceptual experience because the modality-specific experience of sensory conceptual  
15 features (e.g., experience a “ringing” sound when reading the word “telephone”) would interfere with  
16 action planning processes. Other researchers have developed similar arguments. Willems et al. (2010),  
17 for instance, compared brain activity during reading action words and during explicit motor imagery  
18 of the actions described by the words. Their results revealed task-specific, non-overlapping and  
19 uncorrelated activity in parts of the premotor cortex. Based on this observation, the authors concluded  
20 that in contrast to motor imagery, language-induced motor activity might reflect underspecified rather  
21 than explicit motor representations. The underspecified nature of this representation would assure  
22 rapid and flexible accommodation of incoming information during on-line sentence processing. Thus,  
23 an explicit action plan for a word like “grasp” would differ depending on whether the word refers to  
24 grasping a baseball or grasping a needle. In support of this assumption, van Elk et al. (2010) showed  
25 that the strength of  $\mu$  suppression over fronto-central regions varies when the sentential context offers  
26 more explicit information about the designated action:  $\mu$  suppression observed while reading the verb  
27 “jumped” differed depending on whether the verb indicated an action performed by an animal (“the  
28 deer jumped over the stream”) or by a human (“the athlete jumped over the fence”).

29  
30  
31 Our results are not directly comparable to results obtained in studies that investigated language-  
32 induced sensory-motor activity for well-known words because our study captured dynamic processes  
33 that occur during word-referent acquisition and prior to memory consolidation. However, the basic  
34 features of our findings are compatible with the proposals made by Kiefer and colleagues. Hence,  
35 early during training the pattern of the language-induced  $\mu$  suppression observed at centro-parietal  
36 electrodes resembled the pattern that was observed during perceptual experience. This motor-activity,  
37 which could be interpreted as reinstatement of brain activity during perceptual experience, reduced as  
38 training progressed. Concurrently, action-related  $\mu$  suppression emerged at electrodes that seemed to  
39 capture activity from convergence zones (c.f. over fronto-central regions). At these electrodes motor-  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 activity was not present prior to training but developed for both type of stimuli (verbal stimuli and  
2 videos) with the acquisition of word-action associations<sup>2</sup>. Our training did not last long enough to  
3 capture a final, stable pattern. However, it is likely that over a more extensive training period,  
4 language-induced  $\mu$  suppression would no longer be observed at centro-parietal electrodes, while at  
5 fronto-central electrodes solid patterns of action-related  $\mu$  suppression would emerge for both verbal  
6 stimuli and videos.  
7  
8  
9

### 10 *Conclusion*

11  
12  
13 According to embodied theories of semantics, cognitive processes are rooted in the body's interactions  
14 with the world. Within this theoretical frame, the present study probed the trajectory of learning  
15 motor-language associations to understand the functional role of neural motor activity observed during  
16 language processing (e.g. Hauk et al., 2004). By associating novel verbal stimuli with motor actions or  
17 animated images, our results demonstrated that brain responses to verbal stimuli change rapidly with  
18 training (see also Shtyrov et al., 2010 for related results) and form distinctions between the associated  
19 stimulus categories. Furthermore, verbal stimuli associated with motor actions trigger activity in motor  
20 regions of the brain. However, while this language-induced motor activity was initially very similar to  
21 motor activity observed during the perception of action, this pattern changed with training and  
22 suggested that overlapping activity between language and motor processes is confined to convergence  
23 zones between language and motor structures.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31  
32 In line with suggestions made by other researchers (e.g., Kiefer et al., 2008; Thompson-Schill, 2003;  
33 van Elk et al., 2010; Willems et al., 2010), the present findings imply that language-induced motor  
34 activity observed for well-established words reflects underspecified rather than explicit motor  
35 representations. Such under-specification leads to a relative independence of the concepts in relation to  
36 its content that is identified in the similar but distinct well-described motor activity for action concepts  
37 or words. As a consequence, sensory-motor reactivations, through which concepts are comprehended,  
38 differ from those implicated in the acquisition of such concepts. Yet, even if these results might be  
39 interpreted as showing the first step of a gradual process of abstracting away from modality-specific  
40 representations (see Thompson-Schill, 2003), our findings nonetheless imply that, fundamentally,  
41 concepts are grounded in perception and action.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

---

54  
55  
56 <sup>2</sup> Note that the delay in the emergence of action-related  $\mu$  suppression for verbal stimuli and for videos could be related to our task. Given  
57 that our participants were requested to recall the action associated with the verbal stimuli and not the verbal stimuli associated with the  
58 action, action-related  $\mu$  suppression in convergence zones might emerge first for verbal stimuli and then for videos.  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## 5. References

1  
2 Allport A. Distributed memory, modular subsystems and dysphasia. *In: Current perspectives in*  
3 *dysphasia (Newman SK, Epstein R, eds), Edinburgh: Churchill Livingstone, pp 207-244, 1985.*

4  
5  
6 Aziz-Zadeh L, Wilson SM, Rizzolatti G, and Iacoboni M. Congruent embodied representations for  
7  
8 visually presented actions and linguistic phrases describing actions. *Curr.Biol.*, 16: 1818-1823, 2006.  
9

10  
11 Babiloni C, Babiloni F, Carducci F, Cincotti F, Coccozza G, Del PC, Moretti DV, and Rossini PM.  
12  
13 Human cortical electroencephalography (EEG) rhythms during the observation of simple aimless  
14  
15 movements: a high-resolution EEG study. *Neuroimage.*, 17: 559-572, 2002.

16  
17 Bertrand O, Perrin F, and Pernier J. A theoretical justification of the average reference in topographic  
18  
19 evoked potential studies. *Electroencephalogr.Clin.Neurophysiol.*, 62: 462-464, 1985.

20  
21 Boulenger V, Hauk O, and Pulvermuller F. Grasping ideas with the motor system: semantic  
22  
23 somatotopy in idiom comprehension. *Cereb.Cortex*, 19: 1905-1914, 2009.

24  
25 Buccino G, Lui F, Canessa N, Patteri I, Lagravinese G, Benuzzi F, Porro CA, and Rizzolatti G. Neural  
26  
27 circuits involved in the recognition of actions performed by nonconspecifics: an FMRI study. *J.Cogn*  
28  
29 *Neurosci.*, 16: 114-126, 2004.

30  
31 Caetano G, Jousmaki V, and Hari R. Actor's and observer's primary motor cortices stabilize similarly  
32  
33 after seen or heard motor actions. *Proc.Natl.Acad.Sci.U.S.A*, 104: 9058-9062, 2007.

34  
35 Catmur C, Gillmeister H, Bird G, Liepelt R, Brass M, and Heyes C. Through the looking glass:  
36  
37 counter-mirror activation following incompatible sensorimotor learning. *Eur.J.Neurosci.*, 28: 1208-  
38  
39 1215, 2008.

40  
41 Catmur C, Walsh V, and Heyes C. Sensorimotor learning configures the human mirror system.  
42  
43 *Curr.Biol.*, 17: 1527-1531, 2007.

44  
45 Damasio AR. Time-locked multiregional retroactivation: a systems-level proposal for the neural  
46  
47 substrates of recall and recognition. *Cognition*, 33(1-2):25-62, 1989.

48  
49 Del GM, Manera V, and Keysers C. Programmed to learn? The ontogeny of mirror neurons. *Dev.Sci.*,  
50  
51 12: 350-363, 2009.

52  
53 Fischer MH and Zwaan RA. Embodied language: a review of the role of the motor system in language  
54  
55 comprehension. *Q.J.Exp.Psychol.(Colchester.)*, 61: 825-850, 2008.

56  
57  
58 Gallese V and Lakoff G. The Brain's Concepts: The Role of the Sensory-Motor System in Reason and  
59  
60 Language. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, 22:455-479, 2005.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Gastaut H. [Electrocorticographic study of the reactivity of rolandic rhythm.]. *Rev.Neurol.(Paris)*, 87: 176-182, 1952.

Goldfield BA. Nouns before verbs in comprehension vs. production: the view from pragmatics. *J.Child Lang*, 27: 501-520, 2000.

Hari R, Salmelin R, Makela JP, Salenius S, and Helle M. Magnetoencephalographic cortical rhythms. *Int.J.Psychophysiol.*, 26: 51-62, 1997.

Hauk O, Johnsrude I, and Pulvermuller F. Somatotopic representation of action words in human motor and premotor cortex. *Neuron*, 41: 301-307, 2004.

Hebb DO. *The Organization of Behavior. A Neuropsychological Theory*. New York: Wiley, 1949.

Kable JW, Kan IP, Wilson A, Thompson-Schill SL, and Chatterjee A. Conceptual representations of action in the lateral temporal cortex. *J.Cogn Neurosci.*, 17: 1855-1870, 2005.

Kable JW, Lease-Spellmeyer J, and Chatterjee A. Neural substrates of action event knowledge. *J.Cogn Neurosci.*, 14: 795-805, 2002.

Kemmerer D, Castillo JG, Talavage T, Patterson S, and Wiley C. Neuroanatomical distribution of five semantic components of verbs: evidence from fMRI. *Brain Lang*, 107: 16-43, 2008.

Keysers C and Perrett DI. Demystifying social cognition: a Hebbian perspective. *Trends Cogn Sci.*, 8: 501-507, 2004.

Kiefer M, Sim EJ, Herrnberger B, Grothe J, and Hoenig K. The sound of concepts: four markers for a link between auditory and conceptual brain systems. *J.Neurosci.*, 28: 12224-12230, 2008.

Kiefer M, Sim EJ, Liebich S, Hauk O, and Tanaka J. Experience-dependent plasticity of conceptual representations in human sensory-motor areas. *J.Cogn Neurosci.*, 19: 525-542, 2007.

Kilner JM, Neal A, Weiskopf N, Friston KJ, and Frith CD. Evidence of mirror neurons in human inferior frontal gyrus. *J.Neurosci.*, 29: 10153-10159, 2009.

Lahav A, Saltzman E, and Schlaug G. Action representation of sound: audiomotor recognition network while listening to newly acquired actions. *J.Neurosci.*, 27: 308-314, 2007.

Mahon BZ and Caramazza A. A critical look at the embodied cognition hypothesis and a new proposal for grounding conceptual content. *J.Physiol Paris*, 102: 59-70, 2008.

Martin A, Haxby JV, Lalonde FM, Wiggs CL, and Ungerleider LG. Discrete cortical regions associated with knowledge of color and knowledge of action. *Science*, 270: 102-105, 1995.



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Martin A, Wiggs CL, Ungerleider LG, and Haxby JV. Neural correlates of category-specific knowledge. *Nature*, 379: 649-652, 1996.

McNamara A, Buccino G, Menz MM, Glascher J, Wolbers T, Baumgartner A, and Binkofski F. Neural dynamics of learning sound-action associations. *PLoS.One.*, 3: e3845, 2008.

Oldfield RC. The assessment and analysis of handedness: the Edinburgh inventory. *Neuropsychologia*, 9: 97-113, 1971.

Patterson K, Nestor PJ, and Rogers TT. Where do you know what you know? The representation of semantic knowledge in the human brain. *Nat.Rev.Neurosci.*, 8: 976-987, 2007.

Pfurtscheller G, Neuper C, Andrew C, and Edlinger G. Foot and hand area mu rhythms. *Int.J.Psychophysiol.*, 26: 121-135, 1997.

Pineda JA. Sensorimotor cortex as a critical component of an 'extended' mirror neuron system: Does it solve the development, correspondence, and control problems in mirroring? *Behav.Brain Funct.*, 4: 47, 2008.

Pulvermuller F. Words in the brain's language. *Behav.Brain Sci.*, 22: 253-279, 1999.

Pulvermuller F. Brain mechanisms linking language and action. *Nat.Rev.Neurosci.*, 6: 576-582, 2005.

Pulvermuller F, Shtyrov Y, and Ilmoniemi R. Brain signatures of meaning access in action word recognition. *J.Cogn Neurosci.*, 17: 884-892, 2005.

Revill KP, Aslin RN, Tanenhaus MK, and Bavelier D. Neural correlates of partial lexical activation. *Proc.Natl.Acad.Sci.U.S.A*, 105: 13111-13115, 2008.

Rizzolatti G, Fadiga L, Gallese V, and Fogassi L. Premotor cortex and the recognition of motor actions. *Brain Res.Cogn Brain Res.*, 3: 131-141, 1996.

Shtyrov Y, Nikulin VV, and Pulvermuller F. Rapid cortical plasticity underlying novel word learning. *J.Neurosci.*, 30: 16864-16867, 2010.

Simmons WK and Barsalou LW. The similarity in topography principle: Reconciling theories of conceptual deficits. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, 20 (3/4/5/6), 451-486, 2003.

Tettamanti M, Buccino G, Saccuman MC, Gallese V, Danna M, Scifo P, Fazio F, Rizzolatti G, Cappa SF, and Perani D. Listening to action-related sentences activates fronto-parietal motor circuits. *J.Cogn Neurosci.*, 17: 273-281, 2005.

1 Thompson-Schill SL. Neuroimaging studies of semantic memory: inferring "how" from "where".  
2 *Neuropsychologia*, 41: 280-292, 2003.

3  
4 van EM, van Schie HT, Zwaan RA, and Bekkering H. The functional role of motor activation in  
5 language processing: motor cortical oscillations support lexical-semantic retrieval. *Neuroimage.*, 50:  
6 665-677, 2010.

7  
8  
9 Weisberg J, van TM, and Martin A. A neural system for learning about object function. *Cereb.Cortex*,  
10 17: 513-521, 2007.

11  
12  
13 Willems RM, Toni I, Hagoort P, and Casasanto D. Neural dissociations between action verb  
14 understanding and motor imagery. *J.Cogn Neurosci.*, 22: 2387-2400, 2010.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## Figures captions

1  
2 Figure 1: Examples of videos used in the experiment. Four screen-shots of two videos of hand/arm  
3 movements: a) a “zig-zag” movement with a vertically oriented cylinder and b) a “crawling”  
4 movement with an horizontally oriented cylinder. c) Four screen-shots of an image video and two  
5 more examples of the images used in the experiment.  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 Figure 2: Topography of  $\mu$  oscillations (8-12 Hz range) averaged over a time window of 250-  
11 1000msec after stimulus onset while watching videos. Data shows the difference between the  
12 movement- and the image-condition for each of the four test sessions (pretest, test1, test2 and test3).  
13  
14

15 Figure 3: Time-frequency analysis (5-30 Hz domain) performed over two clusters during presentation  
16 of videos: A) centro-parietal cluster (CP1, CP3, P3 and Pz) and B) fronto-central cluster (Fz, F3, F4,  
17 FC1, FC3, FC2 and FC4).  
18  
19  
20

21 Data are plotted from -200 msec to 1000 msec post-video onset for the four test-sessions. Top row:  
22 “Movement condition”. Middle row: “Image condition”. Lower row: “Movement minus Image”  
23 contrast. As indicated by the scale, a blue shaded area corresponds to a reduction of the amplitude of  
24 oscillations in a given frequency band while a red shaded area corresponds to an enhancement of the  
25 amplitude of oscillations.  
26  
27  
28  
29

30 Figure 3: C) Time-course of  $\mu$  oscillations during presentation of videos at both centro-parietal (top  
31 row) and fronto-central (lower row) clusters for the four test sessions. Data are plotted from -200msec  
32 to 1000msec relative to video onset. Red curves represent data for the image condition, black curves  
33 for the movement condition. For both conditions, each curve represents one electrode.  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 Figure 4: Time-frequency analysis (5-30 Hz domain) performed over two clusters during presentation  
39 of verbal stimuli: A) centro-parietal cluster (CP1, CP3, P3 and Pz) and B) fronto-central cluster (Fz,  
40 F3, F4, FC1, FC3, FC2 and FC4). Data are plotted from -200 msec to 1000 msec post-stimulus onset  
41 and for all test sessions. Top row: Movement condition. Middle row: Image condition. Lower row:  
42 “Movement minus Image” contrast. As indicated by the scale, a blue shaded area corresponds to a  
43 reduction of the amplitude of oscillations in a given frequency band while a red shaded area  
44 corresponds to an enhancement of the amplitude of oscillations.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 Figure 4: C) Time-course of  $\mu$  oscillations during presentation of verbal stimuli at both centro-parietal  
51 (top row) and fronto-central (lower row) clusters for the four test sessions. Data are plotted from -  
52 200msec to 1000msec relative to video onset. Red curves represent data for the image condition, black  
53 curves for the movement condition. For both conditions, each curve represents one electrode.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

**Suppl. material for online publication only**

**[Click here to download Suppl. material for online publication only: Fargier et al. Suppl. material.doc](#)**

**Figure 1**  
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 2  
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 3a  
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 3b  
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)






Figure 3c  
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 4a  
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 4b

[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 4c

[Click here to download high resolution image](#)

