

When linguistic dogma rejects a neuroscientific hypothesis

Chia-Wen Lo^{1*}, Lena Henke¹, Jordi Martorell^{1,2} and Lars Meyer^{1,3}

¹Research Group Language Cycles, Max Planck Institute for Human Cognitive and Brain Sciences, Leipzig, Germany.

²Brain Rhythms and Cognition Group, Basque Center on Cognition, Brain and Language, Donostia-San Sebastián, Spain.

³University Clinic Münster, Albert-Schweitzer-Campus 1, Münster, Germany.

*e-mail: lo@cbs.mpg.de

Kazanina and Tavano argue that delta-band oscillations cannot be involved in multi-word or multi-morpheme chunking during language comprehension because the timing of syntactic structure is too variable (Kazanina, N. & Tavano, A. What neural oscillations can and cannot do for syntactic structure building. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* **24**, 113–128 (2023))¹. According to the authors, comprehension requires the formation of hierarchically organized non-adjacent dependencies between words or morphemes that arrive at variable points in time. Temporally regular chunking would break dependencies, disabling the comprehension of compositional meaning.

However, this verdict relies on a popular premise that should not be taken as ground truth. The authors assume that syntactic representations in the mind conform to one particular linguistic theory — hierarchical phrase structure / transformational grammar^{2,3}: words and morphemes combine with other words and morphemes into phrases that hierarchically combine into larger phrases et cetera. If that is the ground truth, syntax would indeed be too variable in time for an oscillatory brain substrate to have a role in this process.

Yet, decades of theoretical debate could not decide whether syntax in the mind is hierarchical^{2,3}. The neuroscientific application of hierarchical theories has been extremely fruitful, shaping our understanding of the neuroanatomical organization of syntax⁴. Nevertheless, not all theories of syntax, sentence processing, and language acquisition assume hierarchy. For instance, construction grammar represents sentences as linear concatenations of idiom-like multi-word or multi-morpheme snippets². There is also dependency grammar, in which the representation is essentially a non-hierarchical list of all links among a sentence's words and morphemes³.

The cognitive formation of hierarchical representations during real-time comprehension is not a given either. For instance, construction grammar captures item-based learning in language acquisition remarkably well⁵. Moreover, the processing model that corresponds to dependency grammar conceptualizes dependency processing as a set of memory operations that link words and morphemes together, insensitive to linear order let alone hierarchy⁶. Uncanny evidence even suggests that the hard cases (that is, sentences that would require the buildup of hierarchical structure, such as ambiguities, passives and embeddings) mostly yield false interpretations — *nota bene*: the average college student struggles with the sentences that are at the heart of the hierarchy dogma^{7,8}.

But let's assume that hierarchical syntax is ground truth and that the delta band is useless for its formation. We should still not ditch the oscillations-for-chunking hypothesis just yet. The reason is the unknown interface between perception and syntactic structure building. On the one hand, it is safe to

think that syntactic structure is built incrementally. On the other, there is firm evidence that in order to avoid memory loss, our brain samples speech as discrete second-long segments dubbed implicit prosodic phrases⁹ or chunks¹⁰, inter alia. We do not know how this bottleneck interfaces with structure formation, but it has been argued that syntactic dependencies are indeed confined by the boundaries of chunks⁹, such that chunk-wise sampling would ensure that compositional meaning can be understood. It also does remain to be tested whether such proto-syntactic chunks are sufficiently regular in time for a regular mechanism such as neural oscillations.

We suggest that alternative linguistic theories of syntactic representation, well-established processing models of sentence processing, and current knowledge of perceptual sampling better be acknowledged before ditching the hypothesis of a link between syntax and delta-band oscillations based on one particular linguistic theory.

1. Kazanina, N. & Tavano, A. What neural oscillations can and cannot do for syntactic structure building. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* **24**, 113–128 (2023).
2. de Marneffe, M.-C. & Nivre, J. Dependency Grammar. *Annu. Rev. Linguist.* **5**, 197–218. (2019).
3. Frank, S. L., Bod, R. & Christiansen, M. H. How hierarchical is language use? *Proc. R. Soc. B.* **279**, 4522–4531 (2012).
4. Friederici, A. D. *Language in our Brain* (The MIT Press, 2017).
5. Bannard, C., Lieven, E. & Tomasello, M. Modeling children's early grammatical knowledge. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **106**, 17284–17289 (2009).
6. Lewis, R. L., Vasishth, S., Van Dyke, J. A. & Dyke, J. A. V. Computational principles of working memory in sentence comprehension. *Trends Cogn. Sci.* **10**, 447–454 (2006).
7. Ferreira, F. & Qiu, Z. Predicting syntactic structure. *Brain Res.* **1770**, 147632 (2021).
8. Frank, S. L. & Ernst, P. Judgements about double-embedded relative clauses differ between languages. *Psychol. Res.* **83**, 1581–1593 (2019).
9. Glushko, A., Poeppel, D. & Steinhauer, K. Overt and covert prosody are reflected in neurophysiological responses previously attributed to grammatical processing. *Sci. Rep.* **12**, 14759 (2022).
10. Christiansen, M. H. & Chater, N. The now-or-never bottleneck: a fundamental constraint on language. *Behav. Brain Sci.* **39**, 1–72 (2015).