

Internal modeling of upcoming speech: A causal role of the right posterior  
cerebellum in non-motor aspects of language production

*Elin Runnqvist<sup>a</sup>, Mireille Bonnard<sup>b</sup>, Hanna S. Gauvin<sup>c</sup>, Shahram Attarian<sup>d</sup>, Agnes  
Trebuchon<sup>b, e</sup>, Robert J. Hartsuiker<sup>c</sup>, & F.-Xavier Alario<sup>f</sup>*

a Aix-Marseille Université, CNRS, LPL UMR 7309, 5 Avenue Pasteur, 13604 Aix-  
en-Provence, France

b Aix-Marseille Université, INSERM, INS UMR S 1106, Faculté de Médecine, 27  
Boulevard Jean Moulin, 13005 Marseille, France

c Ghent University, Department of Experimental Psychology, Henri Dunantlaan 2,  
9000 Ghent, Belgium

d Aix-Marseille Université, Inserm UMR 910, Reference center for  
Neuromuscular disorders and ALS CHU La Timone, 264 Rue Saint-Pierre, 13385  
Marseille, France

e Assistance Publique-Hôpitaux Marseille, 13005 Marseille, France

f Aix-Marseille Université, CNRS, LPC UMR 7290, 3 place Victor  
Hugo, 13331 Marseille, France

Corresponding author:

Elin Runnqvist

elin\_runnqvist@yahoo.es

Abstract

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

Some language processing theories propose that, just as for other somatic actions, self-monitoring of language production is achieved through internal modeling. The cerebellum is the proposed center of such internal modeling in motor control, and the right cerebellum has been linked to an increasing number of language functions, including predictive processing during comprehension. Relating these findings, we tested whether the right posterior cerebellum has a causal role for self-monitoring of speech errors. Participants received 1Hz repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation during 15 minutes to lobules Crus I and II in the right hemisphere, and, in counterbalanced orders, to the contralateral area in the left cerebellar hemisphere (control) in order to induce a temporary inactivation of one of these zones. Immediately afterwards, they engaged in a speech production task priming the production of speech errors. Language production was impaired after right compared to left hemisphere stimulation, a finding that provides evidence for a causal role of the cerebellum during language production. We interpreted this role in terms of internal modeling of upcoming speech through a verbal working memory process used to prevent errors.

Keywords: language production, cerebellum, internal modeling, self monitoring, verbal working memory

## 1. Introduction

Evidence indicates that sensory and motor information forms an integral part of language acquisition, representation, and processing beyond auditory and visual perception or articulation (e.g., Pulvermuller & Fadiga, 2010). This has motivated research into commonalities in the neural structures and dynamics responsible for lower (i.e., sensory-motor) and higher order cognitive abilities (i.e., language) (e.g., Pickering & Garrod, 2013; Hickok, 2012). Here we aimed at further contributing to this endeavor by investigating the causal role of the cerebellum in a particular aspect of language processing, namely self-monitoring of language production beyond its pure motor aspects.

### 1.1 Functional Topography of the Cerebellum

During the last century, the conception of the cerebellum has progressively evolved from that of a pure motor control device to that of a modulator of the cognitive functions tied to any area in cortex to which it is reciprocally connected (e.g., Andreasen & Pierson, 2008; Mariën et al., 2001; Stoodley & Schmahmann, 2010). The cerebellum has reciprocal links through pontine and dentate nuclei and thalamus mainly to frontal and association areas of the cerebral cortex (e.g., Mariën & Manto, 2015). These links include not only frontal motor areas, but also language-related areas such as Broca's region (Desmond et al., 2005; Mariën et al., 2001). As highlighted by Murdoch (2010), "this reciprocal connectivity forms a series of segregated neural loops that are hypothesized to facilitate linguistic function in the same way that the cerebellum enhances motor functions (Leiner et al., 1989)."

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

In parallel with the expansion regarding the functionality of the cerebellum, there has been substantial progress in our knowledge concerning its functional topography (e.g., Stoodley & Schmahmann, 2010). Of special importance for the present purposes are two functional topographic distinctions: regions involved in motor versus non-motor functions, and regions involved in linguistic functions.

Based on connectivity and functional activation patterns, Stoodley and Schmahmann (2009; 2010; see also Desmond & Fiez, 1998 and Ito, 2008 for similar topographical distinctions) distinguish three topographic functional regions: a “sensorimotor region” comprising the anterior lobe (I-V), lobule VIII, and lobule VI to a lesser extent; a “cognitive region” comprising lobules VI, VII and dentate nucleus -though it has been observed that within the dentate, motor and non-motor domains can also be distinguished (e.g., Dum & Strick, 2003); and a “limbic region” comprising vermis and fastigial nucleus (see figure 1a). In the particular case of language production both pure motor (speech articulation) and more cognitive aspects (linguistic processing) can be distinguished. In line with the functional topographic division outlined above, there is evidence for the anterior lobe being implicated in articulatory processes (e.g., Urban et al., 2003; Ackermann et al., 1992), and the posterior lobe being implicated in higher order processes such as phonological, semantic and word generation when factoring out articulation (e.g., Stoodley & Schmahmann, 2009).

Anatomical and functional evidence also speak to the localization of linguistic function within the cerebellum. Several authors have argued that language processing is mostly confined to the right cerebellum (e.g., Stoodley & Schmahmann, 2010; Mariën et al., 2001). Anatomically, projections between the

1 cerebral and cerebellar cortices are largely (though not exclusively) contralateral  
2 (e.g., Brodal, 1979). The lateralization is also supported by fMRI findings that  
3  
4 linguistic functions are mainly localized in the right hemisphere of the  
5  
6 cerebellum, though often involving a small component of the contralateral lobule  
7  
8 (e.g., Stoodley & Schmahmann, 2009). Finally, most clinical reports suggest that  
9  
10 language impairments such as impaired verbal fluency and agrammatism  
11  
12 generally arise following right cerebellar hemisphere lesions (Gebhart et al.,  
13  
14 2002; Hassid, 1995; Hokkanen et al., 2006; Marien et al., 2001; Riva and Giorgi,  
15  
16 2000; Silveri et al., 1994; Zettin et al., 1997; Scott et al., 2001). In this context, it  
17  
18 should be mentioned that a small number of neuropsychological studies have  
19  
20 also reported linguistic deficits following left cerebellar hemisphere lesions (e.g.,  
21  
22 Fabbro et al., 2000; Cook et al., 2004; Murdoch & Whelan, 2007). Though one  
23  
24 possibility is that the pathophysiological mechanism underlying these lesions  
25  
26 was crossed cerebellocerebral diaschisis (e.g., Cook et al., 2004), it is equally  
27  
28 possible that they reflect ipsilateral cerebellar cerebral diaschisis, implying that  
29  
30 the cerebellum might be bilaterally involved in language processing (Murdoch &  
31  
32 Whelan, 2007). Another exception to the lateralization of linguistic function is to  
33  
34 be found in prosodic and auditory language processing, that both seem to be left  
35  
36 lateralized within the cerebellum (e.g., Callan et al., 2007; Petacchi et al., 2005).  
37  
38 These latter findings suggest an even more fine-grained functional cerebellar  
39  
40 specialization mirroring the cortical hemispheric specialization. Nevertheless,  
41  
42 though the involvement of the left cerebellar hemisphere in linguistic function  
43  
44 certainly merits further investigation, the global impression provided by the  
45  
46 previous literature, especially in what concerns the cognitive components of  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 language production, is that the right hemisphere has a predominant, though not  
2 exclusive, role for linguistic functions.  
3

4  
5 In sum, the combination of these two topographic functional distinctions  
6  
7 leaves posterior lobules VI and Crus I and II in the right cerebellar hemisphere as  
8  
9 prime candidates for hosting processes of language production beyond its pure  
10  
11 motor aspects. A further question is exactly what type of cognitive function(s)  
12  
13 the cerebellum is involved in. Concerning language, this function should be  
14  
15 rather indirect (i.e., not directly concerning linguistic representations or their  
16  
17 access) since damage to the cerebellum is not strongly tied to central  
18  
19 disturbances of production and comprehension (e.g., Ito, 2008; Desmond & Fiez,  
20  
21 1998). More generally, several authors highlight that although many functions  
22  
23 have been ascribed to the cerebellum, the uniformity of its synaptic organization  
24  
25 suggests that a single, characteristic computation may be common to all (e.g.,  
26  
27 Medina & Mauk, 2000). This hypothesis of neural computation homogeneity has  
28  
29 lent itself to hypotheses of cognitive computation homogeneity across different  
30  
31 regions of the cerebellum (i.e., motor and cognitive regions). One example of this  
32  
33 which we will focus on in the present study is that the cerebellum is devoted to  
34  
35 internal modeling of self-generated actions, whether motor or cognitive in  
36  
37 nature (e.g., Ito, 2008).  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

## 49 1.2 Internal modeling of upcoming speech 50

51  
52 In the domain of motor control it is widely held that control of somatic  
53  
54 movement involves internal modeling, allowing for the correction of motor  
55  
56 commands by producing expectations of their sensory consequences before their  
57  
58 effective output as physical actions (i.e., corollary discharge or efference copies;  
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  
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

McCloskey, 1981; Jeannerod, 1988). These sensory outcome predictions are then compared with the actual sensory input; whatever matches the outcome predictions is inhibited (i.e., reafference cancellation). In that way, a means is provided to detect any unpredicted sensorial data entailing that correction of the motor command is required (Wolpert, Ghahramani & Jordan, 1995). The posterior lobes of the cerebellum (laterality depending on the task) constitute the hypothetical center of this internal modeling of motor actions (Blakemore & Sirigu, 2003; Blakemore et al., 1998; Blakemore et al., 2001; Imamizu et al., 2000; Miall & King, 2008). Cerebellar activity is modulated by the presence and predictability of the consequences of self-generated movements (e.g., Blakemore et al., 1998; 2001). Ito (2008) proposed to extend the domain of internal models from sensori-motor actions to mental activities based on a review of anatomical (i.e., appropriate neural wiring between the cerebellum and the cerebral cortex), functional (appropriate mental activity involving the cerebellum) and neuropsychological data (the association of some mental disorders with cerebellar dysfunction).

The idea of internal models has also been incorporated into theories and empirical investigations of language processing (Pickering & Garrod, 2013; Pickering & Garrod, 2014; Hickok, 2012; Lesage et al., 2012; Argyropoulos et al., 2011; 2013; 2015). In the domain of language production, certain theories propose that internal models are used to self-monitor (prevent and detect speech errors) some or all levels of our utterances. For example, Hickok (2012) conceives of internal models of speech motor control, and proposed that higher levels (phonological encoding) of such control are modeled through temporo-parietal cortex; while the lower level (phonetic encoding) would be modeled

1 through the cerebellum. Empirical evidence suggestive of a role for internal  
2 modeling of articulation actions (i.e., detecting and correcting errors in the  
3 programming and execution of speech articulation) can be found in the literature  
4 (e.g., Houde, Nagarajan, Sekihara, & Merzenich, 2002; Heinks-Maldonado,  
5 Mathalon, Gray, Ford, 2005; Ghosh, Tourville, & Guenther, 2008). More  
6 hypothetical and less explored is the hypothesis that also levels beyond pure  
7 motor aspects of language might be monitored through internal models as  
8 proposed by Pickering and Garrod (e.g., Alario & Hamamé, 2013; Hartsuiker,  
9 2013; Pickering & Garrod, 2013; Pickering & Garrod, 2014; Strijkers, Runnqvist,  
10 Costa & Holcomb, 2013). Given the above-mentioned (section 1.1) lack of central  
11 disturbances following cerebellar lesions, one might wonder whether it makes  
12 sense to hypothesize about cerebellar involvement in such a general mechanism  
13 as internal modeling. However, internal modeling of upcoming speech, while  
14 indeed being a mechanism of a general nature in the sense that it is supposed to  
15 always co-occur with the preparation of speech, is arguably a process whose  
16 incorrect functioning could be difficult to detect in comparison with many other  
17 components of language processing. This is because the consequences of internal  
18 modeling only become apparent when the speaker is preparing an erroneous  
19 utterance, which is not the default situation. In contrast, other general processes  
20 such as lexical access, phonological and phonetic encoding etc. are not only  
21 always present during language processing, but they are essential to it as no  
22 language comprehension/production can take place without them. Elsewhere it  
23 has been argued that high-level linguistic disturbances subsequent to cerebellar  
24 lesions may be more accurately detected and characterized by high-level  
25 assessments that evaluate the proficiency of more complex language processes  
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

1 beyond single word hierarchies (Murdoch, 2010). Such high-level assessments  
2 would consist in tasks demanding frontal lobe support in the manipulation of  
3 novel situations, lexical- semantic operations, the development of language  
4 strategies, and the organization and monitoring of responses (Copland et al.,  
5 2000). As we will describe below, our experimental task was designed keeping in  
6 mind this potential difficulty of detecting internal modeling functioning.  
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  
Insert Figure 1 about here

### 1.3 The current study

Here we wanted to test whether monitoring language production levels beyond pure motor aspects of speech is achieved through internal modeling, and whether the cerebellum has a necessary role in such modeling. We used repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation rTMS at a frequency of 1Hz, which is known to temporarily inactivate the stimulated area. Guiding our predictions by the two functional topographic distinctions reviewed above, we expected that disrupting cerebellar function in the right posterior lobules Crus I and II might lead to an impaired speech production monitoring (see Figure 1a). As a control condition (and in counterbalanced orders), the same participants received stimulation to the contralateral area in the left hemisphere of the cerebellum, which should be less related to the linguistic processing of language production. Participants engaged in a speeded language production task designed to prime the production of errors (see Figure 1b). By creating a situation of high load on the speech production monitor through the speeded nature of the task and by priming speech errors, we aimed at providing the ideal circumstances for observing a high-level linguistic impairment that would most probably be

1 undetectable with standard language test batteries (e.g., Copland et al., 2000;  
2 Murdoch, 2010). To have an additional marker of self-monitoring beyond global  
3 error rates, we manipulated the lexical status of the primed error outcomes.  
4  
5 Previous research has shown that speakers are more likely to produce errors  
6  
7 resulting in new words than pseudowords, indicating that lexicality is a filter  
8  
9 used to intercept errors during speech production (Baars, Motley, & MacKay,  
10  
11 1975; Hartsuiker, Corley & Martensen, 2005; Nootboom, 2005). Returning to  
12  
13 our task, the following three predictions can be made: 1) Impaired language  
14  
15 processing of any sort (including monitoring) would be apparent through slower  
16  
17 response times and/or higher error rates; 2) Impaired self-monitoring for  
18  
19 accuracy would be indexed by an overall increased error-rate; 3) Impaired self-  
20  
21 monitoring for lexicality would result in a modulation of errors as a function of  
22  
23 their lexical status.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

## 31 2. Methods

32  
33  
34  
35 The study received appropriate ethical approval (filed under “ID-RCB-  
36  
37 2009-A01059-48” at “Comité de Protection des Personnes Sud Méditerranée I”)  
38  
39 and was performed in accordance with the declaration of Helsinki.  
40

### 41 2.1. Participants

42  
43  
44 Sixteen (ten females, six males) right-handed native speakers of French  
45  
46 took part in the study in exchange for a monetary compensation. The average age  
47  
48 of participants was 24 (SD 3), with an average of 16 (SD 2) years of education. No  
49  
50 participant reported any history of language or neurological disorders.  
51

### 52 2.2. Materials

53  
54  
55 Target stimuli consisted of 160 printed French words (see appendix A). For  
56  
57 illustrative purposes the examples in the text are given in English. Across  
58  
59  
60

1 subjects, each word was used twice in combination with another word (e.g., *mole*  
2 *sail*, *mole fence*). When exchanging the first letters of these combinations, one of  
3  
4 them resulted in a new word pair (*sole mail*, lexical error outcome) and the other  
5  
6 in a non-word pair (*fole mence*, non-lexical error outcome). All combinations for  
7  
8 which initial sound exchange resulted in new word-pairs (*mole sail*) were used  
9  
10 also in the exchanged format (*sole mail*). A given subject was only presented with  
11  
12 one combination for each word (lexical or non-lexical outcome), and was only  
13  
14 presented with one of the words differing in only the first sound (*mole* or *sole*).  
15  
16 This resulted in the creation of four experimental lists with 80 word pairs (40  
17  
18 lexical and 40 non-lexical error outcome). Each subject received one such list  
19  
20 divided in two separate blocks of 40 pairs each (20 lexical and 20 non-lexical  
21  
22 outcome). Stimuli pertaining to the two blocks were matched for lexical  
23  
24 frequency of the first word in the combination, overall lexical frequency,  
25  
26 neighborhood density, word length, and phonetic distance.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 During the experiment, each target word combination was preceded by  
35  
36 three priming word pairs. The first two shared the initial consonants and the  
37  
38 third pair had further phonological overlap with the error being primed (*sun*  
39  
40 *mall* – *sand mouth* – *soap mate* – *mole sail*). In each of the two experimental  
41  
42 blocks, subjects were also presented with 70 filler pairs that had no specific  
43  
44 relationship to the target pairs. One to three such filler pairs were presented to  
45  
46 subjects before each sequence of primes and target. Thus, each subject was  
47  
48 presented with 460 unique word combinations divided in two blocks of 230  
49  
50 word pairs each (40 targets, 120 primes and 70 fillers). Each experimental block  
51  
52 contained three sub-blocks in which these 230 words were repeated three times  
53  
54 in different orders. Subjects were instructed to read all target word pairs aloud,  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 all prime pairs silently, 41% of the filler pairs aloud, and 59% of the filler pairs  
2 silently.  
3

### 4 2.3. Procedure

#### 5 2.3.1. *Pre-stimulation protocol.*

6  
7 Participants first received written and oral information about the rTMS  
8 technique, and they underwent a brief examination by a neurologist. They were  
9 then asked to fill in a questionnaire and sign an informed consent. Next, they  
10 were familiarized with the experimental task through written and oral  
11 instructions and through several practice trials.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

#### 22 2.3.2. *rTMS protocol.*

23  
24 A frameless stereotaxic system was used to position the TMS coil on the  
25 scalp in order to stimulate a precise anatomical region-of-interest. All volunteers  
26 participated in a separate MRI session where a high resolution anatomical scan  
27 was acquired. During the TMS session, a Polaris Spectra infrared camera  
28 (Northern Digital Inc., Canada) tracked participants' head and registered it to  
29 their MRI scan. The neuronavigation (Navigation Brain System, Nexstim 2.3,  
30 Helsinki, Finland) was used both to target and to visualize the sites during  
31 stimulation. The areas targeted for stimulation (i.e., lobules Crus I and II of the  
32 right cerebellum and the contralateral area of the left cerebellum) were marked  
33 on each participant's MRI and checked by a neurologist. Topographic mapping  
34 studies of the human motor cortex, using a figure of eight coil with 4.5 cm loop  
35 diameter, suggest a practical spatial resolution of TMS of 0.5 cm (e.g., Brasil-Neto  
36 et al., 1992). This suggests we can be rather confident that we stimulated at least  
37 part if not the complete region of interest, while not affecting untargeted areas.  
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

The choice of stimulation control-site is an important asset of the current study:

1 besides serving as a control for any non-specific effects of the stimulation, it also  
2 keeps the variable of physical discomfort constant across conditions. This is  
3  
4 especially important since cerebellar TMS has been reported to induce muscle  
5 discomfort and twitching (e.g., Théoret et al., 2001; Harrington & Hammond-  
6  
7 Tooke, 2015), making it difficult to dissociate any impact on behavior from a  
8  
9 general attention decline induced by this discomfort. Repetitive transcranial  
10 magnetic stimulation (rTMS) was effectuated with a figure-of-eight coil at 1Hz at  
11  
12 60% of maximum stimulator output intensity, using a Medtronic Magpro X100  
13  
14 TMS system. Each session was carried out in two parts: (1) 15 min stimulation  
15  
16 (900 pulses) followed by 3\*5 min of experimental task; (2) 15 min stimulation  
17  
18 (to the opposite hemisphere) followed by 3\*5 min of experimental task. The  
19  
20 order of stimulation (left/right first) was counterbalanced across participants.  
21  
22 The duration of the off-line effects of low frequency rTMS is estimated to be  
23  
24 between 60 and 100% of the duration of the stimulation (e.g., Nyffeler et al.,  
25  
26 2006; Eisenegger et al., 2008; Chen et al., 1997). This means that we could be  
27  
28 rather confident that the effects of inactivation would last between 9-15 minutes  
29  
30 of the experimental task following the stimulation of each hemisphere, and that  
31  
32 the effects of stimulating one hemisphere would not carry over to performance  
33  
34 on the experimental task after stimulating the other hemisphere.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

### 47 *2.3.3. Experimental task protocol.*

48  
49 Participants wore headphones and they were told to silently read word  
50  
51 pairs, but to name aloud the last word pair they had seen whenever an  
52  
53 exclamation mark was presented. All targets and 41% of the filler items were  
54  
55 followed by an exclamation mark presented for 500 ms. Each word pair was  
56  
57 presented for 700 ms and was followed by a blank screen for 200 ms. In order to  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 encourage participants to speak fast, a tone sounded 500 ms after the  
2 presentation of the exclamation mark. The next item was presented 1000 ms  
3 after the beginning of the tone. Stimulus presentation was controlled using  
4 Eprime software. Productions were recorded both through Eprime and with a  
5 separate recorder and were processed off-line.  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10

## 11 2.4. Data processing

### 12 2.4.1. Errors.

13  
14  
15  
16  
17 A person naïve to the purpose of the experiment transcribed  
18 orthographically all productions. The transcriptions were scored as correct,  
19 errors, partial responses (e.g., only one word produced), dysfluencies or  
20 omissions. The errors were classified as “priming related errors” or “other  
21 errors”. “Priming related errors” included full exchanges (*mole sail => sole mail*),  
22 partial exchanges (anticipations, e.g., *mole sail => sole sail*, perseverations, e.g.,  
23 *mole sail => mole mail*, other partial exchanges, e.g., *mole sail => sole saint*),  
24 repaired and interrupted exchanges (*mole sail => so...mole sail*), full and partial  
25 competing errors (*mole sail => star milk/star sail*), and other related errors (*mole*  
26 *sail => mail sole*). “Other errors” included diverse phonological substitutions that  
27 were unrelated to the priming manipulation (e.g., *mole sail => hole saint/ro..mole*  
28 *sail/...saint*).  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

### 46 2.4.2. Response times.

47  
48  
49 Another person naïve to the purpose of the experiment measured the  
50 response times for all individual recordings using the software check-vocal  
51 (Protopapas, 2007).  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56

## 57 2.5. Statistical analyses

1 The data were analyzed using the lme4 package (Bates et al., 2015) in R  
2 version 3.2.2 (R Development Core Team, 2015). Errors were analyzed using  
3 generalized linear mixed models (GLMM) with a binomial link function (e.g.,  
4 Jaeger, 2008), estimating the conditional probability of a response given the  
5 random effects and covariate values. Response times were analyzed with linear  
6 mixed models (LMM), estimating the influence of fixed and random covariates on  
7 the response. One difference between GLMMs and LMMs concerns the type of  
8 hypothesis testing that can be used, which is related to the knowledge about the  
9 dispersion parameter in both cases. In GLMMs of binomial data, the dispersion  
10 parameter is fixed at 1 (e.g., Chen & Conomos, 2015), while in linear mixed  
11 models the residual variance has to be estimated. For this reason, z-scores can be  
12 used in GLMMs while t-values are used in LMMs. Because both z-scores and p-  
13 values are related to the standard normal distribution, p-values can reliably be  
14 obtained from z-scores. The summary output of the GLMM function of lme4 in R  
15 provides p-values based on asymptotic Wald tests, which is common practice for  
16 generalized linear models (e.g., Bolker et al., 2009). The Wald statistic is  
17 asymptotically distributed as a standard normal distribution and uses the z-  
18 score to calculate the p-value. In contrast, the summary output of the LMM  
19 function only provides t-values. Consequently, we report p-values for error-rates  
20 and t-values for response times. Following common practice (e.g., Fisher 1925),  
21 we take t-values to approximate z-scores and assume that absolute values above  
22 1.96 reflect significant effects.

23 A common protocol was used for building and comparing both GLMMs and  
24 LMMs. In order to determine which fixed effects and interactions to include in  
25 the models, a forward selection procedure was used in which each of the

1 variables was entered into the analysis individually, followed by interaction  
2 terms, and only variables or interaction terms that were significant (i.e., with a T-  
3 value above 1.96 or a p-value below .05) were kept in the analyses. In those cases  
4  
5 value above 1.96 or a p-value below .05) were kept in the analyses. In those cases  
6  
7 where a newly added variable was significant and changed the significance of  
8  
9 another variable, the anova function of R was used to compare both models and  
10  
11 non-significant p-values were taken to indicate that the more parsimonious  
12  
13 model should be preferred.  
14  
15

16  
17 In all models, Participants and Items were included as crossed random  
18  
19 effects (i.e., intercept estimates), allowing to tease apart the influence of  
20  
21 subjects/items on their repeated observations from the influence of the fixed  
22  
23 effects of theoretical interest. Errors (i.e., both related and other errors) were  
24  
25 fitted with a first series of models to evaluate a non-specific impairment of self-  
26  
27 monitoring after right hemisphere stimulation. These models included the fixed  
28  
29 factors hemisphere and block. Next, the subset of priming-related errors were  
30  
31 fitted in separate models to evaluate the output-tied lexicality bias (i.e., the  
32  
33 tendency to make more lexical than non-lexical errors) and its interaction with  
34  
35 hemisphere. These models thus included the fixed factors lexicality, hemisphere,  
36  
37 and block.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 For response times, a Box–Cox test (Box & Cox, 1964) indicated that a  
45  
46 logarithmic transformation was the most appropriate to approximate a normal  
47  
48 distribution, and this is what was used. For clarity, however, we also report  
49  
50 approximate estimates of the effect sizes in milliseconds obtained by running  
51  
52 identical models with the untransformed response times. The fixed factors  
53  
54 included in the models were hemisphere and block as well as the interactions.  
55  
56  
57  
58

## 59 2.6. Results

60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## 2.6.1. Errors.

Mean error-rates for overall errors and the subset of priming-related errors are reported in Tables 1a and b respectively, and the final models are summarized in Tables 1c and d respectively. Out of the 3840 target trials, there were 500 errors (13% of the data). As shown in Figure 2a, there were more errors after stimulation to the Right hemisphere (14.2% of 1920 target trials) compared to the Left hemisphere (11.8% of 1920 target trials). Overall, there was a progressive decrease in errors in each experimental block (1st: 15.3%, 2nd: 12.9%, 3rd: 10.9%). For the subset of 161 priming related errors (4.2%), more errors were made in the lexical outcome condition (6.4% overall: 7.3% RH and 5.5% LH) than in the non-lexical outcome condition (2%: 2.1% RH and 1.9% LH); thus, there was a lexical bias effect. No other significant effects of interest were found.

Table 1a. Overall mean error-rates in each experimental condition; numbers in parenthesis represent the standard error of the mean.

Block	Right hemisphere	Left hemisphere
1	15.6 (1.4)	15.0 (1.4)
2	14.2 (1.4)	11.6 (1.3)
3	12.8 (1.3)	8.9 (1.1)

Table 1b. Mean error-rates of priming-related errors in each experimental condition; numbers in parenthesis represent the standard error of the mean.

Block	Right hemisphere			Left hemisphere		
	Lexical	Non-lexical	Av.	Lexical	Non-lexical	Av.
1	8.4 (1.6)	1.6 (0.7)	5.0 (0.9)	6.6 (1.4)	1.9 (0.8)	4.2 (0.8)

2	7.8 (1.5)	2.2 (0.8)	5.0 (0.9)	5.6 (1.3)	2.5 (0.9)	4.1 (0.8)
3	5.6 (1.3)	2.5 (0.9)	4.1 (0.8)	4.4 (1.1)	1.3 (0.6)	2.8 (0.7)

Table 1c. All errors (significant effects)

	Effect estimate	Std.err	z-value	p-value
(Intercept)	-2.25	0.22	-10.28	<0.01
Hemisphere (Right)	0.21	0.10	2.06	0.04
Block (2)	-0.24	0.12	-2.00	0.05
Block (3)	-0.46	0.12	-3.77	<0.01

Table 1d. Priming related errors (significant effects)

	Effect estimate	Std.err	z-value	p-value
(Intercept)	-3.10	0.21	-14.55	<0.01
Lexicality (non-lexical)	-1.25	0.22	-5.80	<0.01

### 2.6.2. Response Times.

Mean response times are reported in Table 2a and the final model is summarized in Table 2b. After excluding the 500 errors (13%), 38 dysfluencies (1%), 57 partial responses (1.5%) 38 non-responses (1%), and 74 recording failures (1.6%), the remaining 3133 correct responses (81.6% of the data) were included in the response time analysis. In the first experimental block, participants were slower after right (457ms) compared to left hemisphere (435ms) stimulation (see figure 2b). No other significant effects of interest were found.

Table 2a. Mean response times in each experimental condition; numbers in parenthesis represent the standard error of the mean.

Block	Right hemisphere	Left hemisphere
1	457 (4.9)	435 (4.3)
2	441 (4.9)	448 (4.7)
3	440 (4.9)	443 (5)

Table 2b. Response times in trials with correct responses (significant effects)

	Effect estimate	In ms	Std.Error	t value
(Intercept)	6.06	438	0.04	159.35
Hemisphere (Right)	0.05	25	0.01	4.66
Block (2)	0.03	14	0.01	2.56
Block (3)	0.00	5	0.01	0.26
Hemisphere (Right) x Block (2)	-0.07	-32	0.02	-4.53
Hemisphere (Right) x Block (3)	-0.05	-27	0.02	-3.49

Insert Figure 2 about here

### 3. General Discussion

The aim of this paper was to explore the causal role of the right posterior cerebellum in language production. Specifically, we tested the hypothesis that self-monitoring of not exclusively motor related aspects of language might be achieved through internal models of upcoming speech, instantiated through the cerebellum. To this end, participants received rTMS to the right and left posterior hemispheres of the cerebellum in counterbalanced orders, and then engaged in a task that maximized the load of speech production monitoring by requiring speeded responses and by priming the production of speech errors.

Furthermore, to have an index of a particular type of self-monitoring beyond

1 global error-rates, we manipulated the lexical status of the potential error  
2 outcomes (pseudoword errors are intercepted more often than word errors).  
3  
4 The following three predictions were made: 1) Impaired language processing of  
5 any sort (including self-monitoring) would be apparent through slower response  
6 times and/or higher error rates; 2) Impaired self-monitoring for accuracy would  
7 be indexed by an overall increased error-rate; and 3) Impaired self-monitoring  
8 for lexicality would result in a modulation of errors as a function of their lexical  
9 status. In line with our first two predictions, we observed that after stimulation  
10 to the right hemisphere of the cerebellum compared to the left hemisphere,  
11 participants committed more errors (all three blocks) and took longer in starting  
12 to produce correct responses (first block). Contrary to our third prediction, this  
13 effect was independent of the lexical status of the error outcome (this non-  
14 confirmed prediction will be further discussed below).  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 In general terms, an implication of the right cerebellar lobules Crus I and II  
33 in cognitive aspects of language production had already been highlighted by  
34 functional activation studies and neuropsychological studies (e.g., Stoodley &  
35 Schmahmann, 2009; Mariën et al., 2001). An important contribution of our study  
36 is that it shows within the same participants that this area has a causal role in  
37 language production, and that in a context in which compensatory changes or  
38 rewiring has not had a chance to occur (e.g., as might occur following a stroke).  
39 Furthermore, by including a dependent variable (error-rates) that can be directly  
40 linked to a particular (though admittedly broad) cognitive process (self-  
41 monitoring), this study helps constraining the functional role that the cerebellum  
42 might have in the process of producing language. It should be noted that an  
43 increase in response times as observed in the first block is also consistent with  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 an impaired self-monitoring ability: for example, a delay in the interception and  
2 inner repair of speech errors might lead to such a pattern. However, though  
3  
4 parsimony favors a common origin of the increased error-rates and the response  
5  
6 time delay, other possible accounts such as impairment in the temporal  
7  
8 organization of the sound structure of utterances (e.g., Ackermann et al., 2007)  
9  
10 remain equally possible for the response time delay.  
11  
12  
13

14       Theoretically, these data are consistent with the view that internal models  
15 are used to self-monitor speech production (e.g., Pickering & Garrod, 2013;  
16  
17 Pickering & Garrod, 2014; Hickok, 2012). In what follows we will try to shed  
18  
19 some light at the issue of what level(s) of language production might be subject  
20  
21 to this internal modeling. A first candidate level, which would not assume the  
22  
23 current results to reflect the involvement of any linguistic processing proper, is  
24  
25 articulation. Trouble with the control of motor production might indeed lead to  
26  
27 certain speech errors in the form of pure dysfluencies or mispronunciations,  
28  
29 though many problems of speech motor control will rather be reflected in  
30  
31 properties that do not affect accuracy such as lengthening of certain segments,  
32  
33 vocal quality, pitch, tone, volume, strength, steadiness, speed etc. However, the  
34  
35 errors included in our analyses involved *phonological* units (speakers added,  
36  
37 deleted, or exchanged phonemes), which, in our opinion, is not predicted by an  
38  
39 impaired motor control function. Furthermore, speech motor control is not  
40  
41 expected to be affected by the stimulation to Crus I and II of the right hemisphere  
42  
43 (e.g., Stoodley and Schmahmann, 2009). Disorders related to articulatory aspects  
44  
45 of language production such as dysarthria has been shown to involve lesions in  
46  
47 the upper paravermal region of the right cerebellar hemisphere, the site of  
48  
49 coordination of articulatory movements of the tongue and orofacial muscles (e.g.,  
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  
Ackermann et al., 1992; Urban et al., 2003). Even though TMS lacks focal  
precision at the millimeter level as discussed previously (section 2.3.3), the  
posterior areas we targeted here should be at a sufficient distance from the  
anterior regions responsible for speech motor control.

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
A second candidate level to locate our effects can be found moving a little  
further along the cognitive continuum of language production. As mentioned in  
the Introduction (1.2), the language production model of Hickok (2012)  
conceives a role of the cerebellum for the internal modeling of phonetic aspects  
of language production. However, this explanation is not satisfactory either to  
account for the observed error pattern involving phonological units.

25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
Finally, moving upwards in the cognitive continuum of language  
production, also a third candidate level can be excluded since we found no  
evidence for an implication of the cerebellum in the monitoring of lexical  
processing. That is, speakers intercepted and repaired internally non-lexical  
items about to be produced to the same extent regardless of stimulation site. Of  
course, being based on a null effect, this interpretation should be taken with  
caution. In sum, our data suggest that the cerebellum, besides having a role for  
speech motor control of phonetic aspects of speech, is also implicated in the  
supervision of phonological aspects but not of higher levels of language  
production.

49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
One possibility is that our findings reflect a difficulty of maintaining a  
phonological speech goal (i.e., auditory target in terminology of Hickok, 2012),  
perhaps due to interference with verbal working memory. That is, the referent of  
comparison in the internal modeling process might be more easily disrupted  
because of verbal working memory failure, resulting in phonological errors of

1 both lexical and non-lexical types going undetected. Supporting this  
2 interpretation is the fact that selective activation in tasks involving verbal  
3 working memory in conjunction with language has been reported in posterior  
4 parts of the cerebellum, predominantly in the right hemisphere, within a  
5 network that also involves Broca's area and the supplementary motor area  
6 (SMA) (e.g., Desmond & Fiez, 1998). Desmond and Fiez propose that the  
7 cerebellum might serve to enhance working memory performance by comparing  
8 the output of subvocal articulation with acoustically based phonological  
9 representations in a short-term store. This is supposed to occur especially as the  
10 memory load increases and the need for more accurate and efficient rehearsal  
11 becomes more critical, as was presumably the case in our study in which  
12 speakers were instructed to say aloud the latest word pair they had read  
13 whenever an unpredictable beep sounded. Relevant for the ability of self-  
14 monitoring, discrepancies between actual versus intended motor trajectories are  
15 hypothesized to result in an error-correction that would serve to maintain the  
16 integrity of the rehearsed items. (e.g., Desmond et al., 1997; Desmond & Fiez,  
17 1998). This interpretation suggests that an accurate model of language  
18 production and self-monitoring should integrate both domain-general cognitive  
19 computations such as internal modeling, and interfacing cognitive systems such  
20 as verbal working memory.  
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 4. Conclusion

53  
54 In conclusion, the research presented here supports a causal role of the  
55 right posterior cerebellum for language production beyond its pure motor  
56 aspects. A plausible specification of this role is that the cerebellum is involved in  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 internal modeling of upcoming speech that is used to detect errors, concretely by  
2 maintaining in verbal working memory acoustically based phonological  
3 representations which can afterwards be compared with the output of subvocal  
4 articulation processes.  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

### 10 11 Acknowledgements 12

13  
14 Elin Runnqvist was supported by a postdoctoral grant from the People  
15 Programme (Marie Curie Actions) of the European Union's Seventh Framework  
16 Programme (FP7/2007-2013) under REA grant agreement n° PIEF-GA-2012-  
17 329339. We acknowledge support from the Brain & Language Research Institute  
18 (Aix-Marseille Université: AMIDEX grant ANR-11-IDEX-0001-02 and Labex grant  
19 ANR-11-LABX-0036). The authors are grateful to Jerome Gaychet for help with  
20 stimuli selection, and to Elie Fabiani and Mourad Kherrab for help with data  
21 processing.  
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

## 5. References

- 1  
2 Ackermann, H., Mathiak, K., & Riecker, A. (2007). The contribution of the cerebellum to  
3  
4 speech production and speech perception: clinical and functional imaging data.  
5  
6 *The Cerebellum*, 6(3), 202-213.  
7  
8  
9 Ackermann, H., Vogel, M., Petersen, D., & Poremba, M. (1992). Speech deficits in  
10  
11 ischaemic cerebellar lesions. *Journal of Neurology*, 239(4), 223-227.  
12  
13  
14 Alario, F. X., & Hamamé, C. M. (2013). Evidence for, and predictions from, forward  
15  
16 modeling in language production. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 36(04), 348-  
17  
18 349.  
19  
20  
21 Andreasen, N. C., & Pierson, R. (2008). The role of the cerebellum in  
22  
23 schizophrenia. *Biological Psychiatry*, 64(2), 81-88.  
24  
25  
26 Argyropoulos, G. P. (2011). Cerebellar theta-burst stimulation selectively enhances  
27  
28 lexical associative priming. *The Cerebellum*, 10(3), 540-550.  
29  
30  
31 Argyropoulos, G. P., & Muggleton, N. G. (2013). Effects of cerebellar stimulation on  
32  
33 processing semantic associations. *The Cerebellum*, 12(1), 83-96.  
34  
35  
36 Argyropoulos, G. P. (2015). The cerebellum, internal models and prediction in 'non-  
37  
38 motor' aspects of language: A critical review. *Brain and Language*.  
39  
40  
41 Baars, B. J., Motley, M. T., & MacKay, D. G. (1975). Output editing for lexical status in  
42  
43 artificially elicited slips of the tongue. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal*  
44  
45 *Behavior*, 14(4), 382-391.  
46  
47  
48 Baayen, R. H., Davidson, D. J., & Bates, D. M. (2008). Mixed-effects modeling with  
49  
50 crossed random effects for subjects and items. *Journal of Memory and*  
51  
52 *Language*, 59(4), 390-412.  
53  
54  
55 Bates, D., Maechler, M., Bolker, B., Walker, S., Christensen, R. H. B., Singmann, H., ... &  
56  
57 Rcpp, L. (2015). Package 'lme4'. *Convergence*, 12, 1.  
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  
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
- Blakemore, S. J., & Sirigu, A. (2003). Action prediction in the cerebellum and in the parietal lobe. *Experimental Brain Research*, 153(2), 239-245.
- Blakemore, S. J., Wolpert, D. M., & Frith, C. D. (1998). Central cancellation of self-produced tickle sensation. *Nature Neuroscience*, 1(7), 635-640.
- Blakemore, S. J., Frith, C. D., & Wolpert, D. M. (2001). The cerebellum is involved in predicting the sensory consequences of action. *Neuroreport*, 12(9), 1879-1884.
- Bolker, B. M., Brooks, M. E., Clark, C. J., Geange, S. W., Poulsen, J. R., Stevens, M. H. H., & White, J. S. S. (2009). Generalized linear mixed models: a practical guide for ecology and evolution. *Trends in ecology & evolution*, 24(3), 127-135.
- Box, G. E., & Cox, D. R. (1964). An analysis of transformations. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, 211-252.
- Brasil-Neto, J. P., Cohen, L. G., Panizza, M., Nilsson, J., Roth, B. J., & Hallett, M. (1992). Optimal focal transcranial magnetic activation of the human motor cortex: effects of coil orientation, shape of the induced current pulse, and stimulus intensity. *Journal of Clinical Neurophysiology*, 9(1), 132-136.
- Brodal, P. (1979). The pontocerebellar projection in the rhesus monkey: an experimental study with retrograde axonal transport of horseradish peroxidase. *Neuroscience*, 4(2), 193-208.
- Callan, D., Kawato, M., Parsons, L., & Turner, R. (2007). Speech and song: The role of the cerebellum. *The Cerebellum*, 6(4), 321-327(7).
- Chen, R., Classen, J., Gerloff, C., Celnik, P., Wassermann, E. M., Hallett, M., & Cohen, L. G. (1997). Depression of motor cortex excitability by low-frequency transcranial magnetic stimulation. *Neurology*, 48(5), 1398-1403.
- Chen, H., & Conomos, M. P. (2015). GMMAT: Generalized linear Mixed Model Association Tests Version 0.6.

- 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
- Cook, M., Murdoch, B., Cahill, L., & Whelan, B. M. (2004). Higher-level language deficits resulting from left primary cerebellar lesions. *Aphasiology*, *18*(9), 771-784.
- Desmond, J. E., Gabrieli, J. D., Wagner, A. D., Ginier, B. L., & Glover, G. H. (1997). Lobular patterns of cerebellar activation in verbal working-memory and finger-tapping tasks as revealed by functional MRI. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, *17*(24), 9675-9685.
- Desmond, J. E., & Fiez, J. A. (1998). Neuroimaging studies of the cerebellum: language, learning and memory. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *2*(9), 355-362.
- Desmond, J. E., Chen, S. H., & Shieh, P. B. (2005). Cerebellar transcranial magnetic stimulation impairs verbal working memory. *Annals of Neurology*, *58*(4), 553-560.
- Dum, R. P., & Strick, P. L. (2003). An unfolded map of the cerebellar dentate nucleus and its projections to the cerebral cortex. *Journal of neurophysiology*, *89*(1), 634-639.
- Eisenegger, C., Treyer, V., Fehr, E., & Knöch, D. (2008). Time-course of “off-line” prefrontal rTMS effects—a PET study. *Neuroimage*, *42*(1), 379-384.
- Fabbro, F., Moretti, R., & Bava, A. (2000). Language impairments in patients with cerebellar lesions. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, *13*(2), 173-188.
- Fisher, R. A. (1925, July). Theory of statistical estimation. In *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society* (Vol. 22, No. 05, pp. 700-725). Cambridge University Press.
- Gebhart, A. L., Petersen, S. E., & Thach, W. T. (2002). Role of the posterolateral cerebellum in language. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, *978*(1), 318-333.

- 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
- Ghosh, S. S., Tourville, J. A., & Guenther, F. H. (2008). A neuroimaging study of premotor lateralization and cerebellar involvement in the production of phonemes and syllables. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 51(5), 1183-1202.
- Harrington, A., & Hammond-Tooke, G. D. (2015). Theta Burst Stimulation of the Cerebellum Modifies the TMS-Evoked N100 Potential, a Marker of GABA Inhibition. *PLoS one*, 10(11), e0141284.
- Hartsuiker, R. J., Corley, M., & Martensen, H. (2005). The lexical bias effect is modulated by context, but the standard monitoring account doesn't fly: Related reply to Baars et al.(1975). *Journal of Memory and Language*, 52(1), 58-70.
- Hartsuiker, R. J. (2013). Are forward models enough to explain self-monitoring? Insights from patients and eye movements. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 36(04), 357-358.
- Hassid, E. I. (1995). A case of language dysfunction associated with cerebellar infarction. *Neurorehabilitation and Neural Repair*, 9(3), 157-160.
- Heinks-Maldonado, T. H., Mathalon, D. H., Gray, M., & Ford, J. M. (2005). Fine-tuning of auditory cortex during speech production. *Psychophysiology*, 42(2), 180-190.
- Hickok, G. (2012). Computational neuroanatomy of speech production. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 13(2), 135-145.
- Hokkanen, L. S. K., Kauranen, V., Roine, R. O., Salonen, O., & Kotila, M. (2006). Subtle cognitive deficits after cerebellar infarcts. *European Journal of Neurology*, 13(2), 161-170.
- Houde, J. F., Nagarajan, S., Sekihara, K., & Merzenich, M. M. (2002). Modulation of the auditory cortex during speech: an MEG study. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, - 14(8), 1125-1138.

1 Imamizu, H., Miyauchi, S., Tamada, T., Sasaki, Y., Takino, R., Pütz, B., Yoshioka, T. &

2 Kawato, M. (2000). Human cerebellar activity reflecting an acquired internal

3 model of a new tool. *Nature*, 403(6766), 192-195.

4  
5  
6  
7 Ito, M. (2008). Control of mental activities by internal models in the cerebellum.

8  
9  
10 *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 9(4), 304-313.

11  
12 Jaeger, T. F. (2008). Categorical data analysis: Away from ANOVAs (transformation or

13 not) and towards logit mixed models. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 59(4),

14  
15  
16  
17 434-446.

18  
19  
20 Jeannerod, M. (1988). *The neural and behavioural organization of goal-directed*

21  
22  
23 *movements*. Clarendon Press/Oxford University Press.

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  
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

the hindbrain contribute to the forebrain?. *Behavioral Neuroscience*, 103(5), 998.

Lesage, E., Morgan, B. E., Olson, A. C., Meyer, A. S., & Miall, R. C. (2012). Cerebellar rTMS

disrupts predictive language processing. *Current Biology*, 22(18), R794-R795.

Mariën, P., Engelborghs, S., Fabbro, F., & De Deyn, P. P. (2001). The lateralized

linguistic cerebellum: a review and a new hypothesis. *Brain and Language*, 79(3),

580-600.

Mariën, P., & Manto, M. (Eds.). (2015). *The Linguistic Cerebellum*. Academic Press.

Medina, J. F., & Mauk, M. D. (2000). Computer simulation of cerebellar information

processing. *Nature Neuroscience*, 3, 1205-1211.

McCloskey, D. I. (1981). Corollary discharges: motor commands and perception.

*Comprehensive Physiology*.

Miall, R. C., & King, D. (2008). State estimation in the cerebellum. *The Cerebellum*, 7(4),

572-576.

- 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
- Murdoch, B. E., & Whelan, B. M. (2007). Language disorders subsequent to left cerebellar lesions: a case for bilateral cerebellar involvement in language?. *Folia Phoniatrica et Logopaedica*, 59(4), 184-189.
- Murdoch, B. E. (2010). The cerebellum and language: historical perspective and review. *Cortex*, 46(7), 858-868.
- Nooteboom, S. G.. (2005). Lexical bias revisited: Detecting, rejecting and repairing speech errors in inner speech. *Speech Communication*, 47(1), 43-58.
- Nyffeler, T., Wurtz, P., Lüscher, H. R., Hess, C. W., Senn, W., Pflugshaupt, T., ... & Müri, R. M. (2006). Repetitive TMS over the human oculomotor cortex: comparison of 1-Hz and theta burst stimulation. *Neuroscience Letters*, 409(1), 57-60.
- Petacchi, A., Laird, A. R., Fox, P. T., & Bower, J. M. (2005). Cerebellum and auditory function: An ALE meta-analysis of functional neuroimaging studies. *Human Brain Mapping*, 25(1), 118-128.
- Pickering, M. J., & Garrod, S. (2013). An integrated theory of language production and comprehension. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 36(04), 329-347.
- Pickering, M. J., & Garrod, S. (2014). Self-, other-, and joint monitoring using forward models. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 8(132).
- Protopapas, A. (2007). Check Vocal: A program to facilitate checking the accuracy and response time of vocal responses from DMDX. *Behavior Research Methods*, 39(4), 859-862.
- Pulvermüller, F., & Fadiga, L. (2010). Active perception: sensorimotor circuits as a cortical basis for language. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 11(5), 351-360.
- Riva, D., & Giorgi, C. (2000). The cerebellum contributes to higher functions during development. *Brain*, 123(5), 1051-1061.

- 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
- Schlerf, J., Wiestler, T., Verstynen, T., & Diedrichsen, J. (2014). Big challenges from the little brain—imaging the cerebellum. *Advanced Brain Neuroimaging Topics in Health and Disease—Methods and Applications*.
- Scott, R. B., Stoodley, C. J., Anslow, P., Paul, C., Stein, J. F., Sugden, E. M., & Mitchell, C. D. (2001). Lateralized cognitive deficits in children following cerebellar lesions. *Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology*, 43(10), 685-691.
- Silveri, M. C., Leggio, M. G., & Molinari, M. (1994). The cerebellum contributes to linguistic production A case of agrammatic speech following a right cerebellar lesion. *Neurology*, 44(11), 2047-2047.
- Stoodley, C. J., & Schmahmann, J. D. (2009). Functional topography in the human cerebellum: a meta-analysis of neuroimaging studies. *Neuroimage*, 44(2), 489-501.
- Stoodley, C. J., & Schmahmann, J. D. (2010). Evidence for topographic organization in the cerebellum of motor control versus cognitive and affective processing. *Cortex*, 46(7), 831-844.
- Strijkers, K., Runnqvist, E., Costa, A., & Holcomb, P. (2013). The poor helping the rich: how can incomplete representations monitor complete ones?. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 36(04), 374-375.
- Théoret, H., Haque, J., & Pascual-Leone, A. (2001). Increased variability of paced finger tapping accuracy following repetitive magnetic stimulation of the cerebellum in humans. *Neuroscience Letters*, 306(1), 29-32.
- Urban, P. P., Marx, J., Hunsche, S., Gawehn, J., Vucurevic, G., Wicht, S., ... & Hopf, H. C. (2003). Cerebellar speech representation: lesion topography in dysarthria as derived from cerebellar ischemia and functional magnetic resonance imaging. *Archives of Neurology*, 60(7), 965-972.

1 Wolpert, D. M., Ghahramani, Z., & Jordan, M. I. (1995). An internal model for  
2 sensorimotor integration. *Science-AAAS-Weekly Paper Edition*, 269(5232), 1880-  
3  
4 1882.  
5  
6

7 Zettin, M., Cappa, S. F., D'amico, A., Rago, R., Perino, C., Perani, D., & Fazio, F. (1997).  
8  
9 Agrammatic speech production after a right cerebellar  
10  
11 haemorrhage. *Neurocase*, 3(5), 375-380.  
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

# The Cerebellum and Self-monitoring in Language Production

## Appendix A.



	LEXICAL				NON-LEXICAL			
	Set A		Set B		Set A		Set B	
1								
2								
3								
4	malade	sinus	durée	pédale	légion	barreau	bouton	coussin
5	dentier	répit	raison	maquette	ciment	belote	loto	jonction
6	faveur	semelle	ragot	fumeur	poker	sapin	primeur	colosse
7	tendue	voiture	marine	fission	musée	peinture	fournée	bordée
8	rosier	gâteau	coteau	poupon	lavoir	moisson	boulette	jointure
9	matin	passage	tonus	boucan	monteur	filleul	poulet	taverne
10	pillage	sommier	lutin	bocal	tracas	recteur	couture	poison
11	cadeau	rocher	garage	palette	cuisson	manière	têtard	lamelle
12	verger	bison	nature	ration	gardon	façon	croupier	filon
13	ministre	seringue	crochet	briquet	tonton	rouleau	paresse	fraction
14	titre	voile	clé	bol	vieux	brique	mâche	pomme
15	ciel	fil	gag	troupe	robe	coeur	lueur	cote
16	lierre	poupe	foire	prime	masque	fosse	plaque	gerbe
17	flic	coin	douche	salle	veste	singe	place	fable
18	butte	lave	gaule	tare	boule	lampe	four	dague
19	dame	rose	banque	marque	roc	panne	braise	contre
20	serre	valve	natte	pièce	course	forge	grange	touche
21	mec	bise	note	puits	vase	pion	liège	tête
22	rage	cap	dune	lieu	selle	fiche	suite	disque
23	casse	tube	soir	lac	soupe	foudre	cause	gousse
24	gosier	râteau	blé	col	lecteur	joker	toison	boulet
25	patin	massage	loir	sac	lanière	fêtard	gamelle	ponton
26	sillage	pommier	mise	bec	maçon	journée	pilon	bouture
27	radeau	cocher	rap	cage	bouleau	moto	traction	piment
28	berger	vison	tag	groupe	poussin	savoir	carreau	roulette
29	sinistre	meringue	vitre	toile	fonction	troupier	pelote	fracas
30	saveur	femelle	verre	salve	molosse	lardon	lapin	fusée
31	fagot	rumeur	poire	frime	cordée	frimeur	ceinture	région
32	farine	mission	souche	dalle	pointure	conteur	boisson	caresse
33	poteau	coupon	gare	taule	caverne	mouton	tilleul	buisson
34	cil	fiel	salade	minus	pelle	risque	crique	pousse
35	pierre	loupe	rentier	dépit	case	sueur	coupe	frange
36	foin	clic	maison	raquette	verbe	tour	bosse	montre
37	lutte	bave	venue	toiture	sable	poudre	linge	bourse
38	rame	dose	purée	dédale	vague	foule	rampe	soeur
39	barque	manque	bonus	toucan	pause	mouche	casque	fraise
40	patte	nièce	butin	local	tâche	piège	gorge	canne
41	pote	nuits	parage	galette	fête	lobe	lion	vote
42	lune	dieu	rature	nation	doc	geste	biche	dieux
43	tasse	cube	brochet	criquet	glace	fuite	flaque	somme
44	cause	panne	selle	pomme	clé	pièce	butte	cap
45	soupe	coeur	vase	cote	ciel	tare	mec	lave

# The Cerebellum and Self-monitoring in Language Production

1	boule	fosse	veste	gerbe	lierre	valve	rage	bise
2	lueur	singe	suite	fable	flic	salle	gag	marque
3	robe	lampe	vieux	dague	natte	coin	titre	fil
4	masque	contre	course	brique	note	lieu	serre	rose
5	grange	forge	mâche	touche	dune	prime	foire	troupe
6	liège	pion	four	tête	casse	voile	douche	puits
8	braise	fiche	roc	disque	dame	bol	gaule	lac
9	plaque	foudre	place	gousse	soir	tube	banque	poupe
10	ciment	peinture	couture	bordée	tendue	sinus	pillage	briquet
11	bouton	moisson	poker	jointure	durée	gâteau	coteau	bocal
12	tracas	filleul	croupier	taverne	rosier	sommier	tonus	seringue
13	légion	recteur	tonton	poison	matin	rocher	lutin	fission
14	loto	manière	gardon	lamelle	cadeau	voiture	garage	ration
15	musée	façon	primeur	filon	verger	poupon	nature	bison
16	boulette	rouleau	têtard	fraction	crochet	fumeur	ministre	boucan
17	paresse	coussin	cuisson	barreau	faveur	maquette	malade	répît
18	fournée	jonction	poulet	belote	ragot	palette	dentier	passage
19	monteur	colosse	lavoir	sapin	marine	semelle	raison	pédale
20	coupe	sœur	linge	sueur	pote	fiel	blé	taule
21	bosse	foule	verbe	geste	lune	cage	mise	nuits
22	case	vote	flaque	poudre	tasse	salve	rap	dieu
23	rampe	lobe	vague	dieux	patte	col	tag	loupe
24	casque	montre	pause	canne	cil	nièce	vitre	dose
25	sable	fuite	tâche	mouche	Pierre	manque	verre	bave
26	lion	piège	fête	tour	foin	dalle	poire	groupe
27	biche	fraise	doc	risque	lutte	cube	souche	frime
28	gorge	frange	glace	pousse	rame	bec	gare	sac
29	pelle	somme	crique	bourse	loir	toile	barque	clic
30	ceinture	piment	cordée	bouture	patin	femelle	gosier	toiture
31	boisson	mouton	pointure	joker	sillage	râteau	butin	coupon
32	tilleul	fracas	maçon	fusée	radeau	mission	salade	dépît
33	lecteur	région	toison	ponton	berger	minus	rentier	pommier
34	lanière	moto	gamelle	lardon	brochet	dédale	maison	cocher
35	caverne	troupier	pilon	frimeur	saveur	massage	venue	raquette
36	bouleau	roulette	traction	fêtard	fagot	toucan	purée	rumeur
37	poussin	caresse	carreau	buisson	farine	galette	parage	criquet
38	fonction	journée	pelote	boulet	poteau	vison	rature	local
39	molosse	conteur	lapin	savoir	bonus	meringue	sinistre	nation

Figure 1

A



B






Figure 1. Schematic representation of the stimulation sites and the experimental task.

A, top: Areas targeted for stimulation in the right and left cerebellum marked in the MRI of one experimental subject. A, bottom: Division of the cerebellum into ten lobules (adapted from Schlerf et al., 2014). B, top: An example sequence of events in a trial priming for a lexical error outcome. B, bottom: An example sequence of events in a trial priming for a non-lexical error outcome.

Figure 2

A



B




Figure 2. Error-rates and Response times

(A) Percent of overall errors out of the 1920 trials in each hemisphere broken down by cerebellar hemisphere of stimulation and experimental block. (B)

Response times, similar break down. Error bars represent standard errors of the mean.