



**HAL**  
open science

## A case-study of language-specific executive disorder

Charlotte Jacquemot, Anne-Catherine Bachoud-Lévi

► **To cite this version:**

Charlotte Jacquemot, Anne-Catherine Bachoud-Lévi. A case-study of language-specific executive disorder. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, 2021, 38 (2), pp.125 - 137. 10.1080/02643294.2021.1941828 . hal-03372987


**HAL Id: hal-03372987**

**<https://hal.science/hal-03372987>**

Submitted on 13 Oct 2021

**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.



### **A case-study of language-specific executive disorder**

Journal:	<i>Cognitive Neuropsychology</i>
Manuscript ID	CN-SR 48.20.R2
Manuscript Type:	Short Report
Keywords:	Language processing, Executive functions, Domain-specific process, Domain-general process, Performance dissociation, Aphasia

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

# **A case-study of language-specific executive disorder**

**Charlotte Jacquemot** <sup>1-3\*</sup>, **Anne-Catherine Bachoud-Lévi** <sup>1-4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> INSERM U955-E01, Neuropsychologie Interventionnelle, Institut Mondor de Recherche Biomédicale, Créteil, France

<sup>2</sup> Département d'Etudes Cognitives, Ecole normale supérieure, PSL University, Paris, France

<sup>3</sup> Université Paris Sup, UPEC, Créteil, France

<sup>4</sup> AP-HP, Service de neurologie, Hôpital Henri Mondor-Albert Chenevier, Créteil, France

\* Correspondence:

Charlotte Jacquemot

charlotte.jacquemot@ens.fr

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS AND FUNDINGS**

This work was supported by the Fondation Maladies Rares [Programme Sciences Humaines et Sociales & Maladies Rares to CJ], the Institut National de la Santé et de la Recherche Médicale [contrat Interface to ACBL] and the Agence Nationale de la Recherche [ANR-17-EURE-0017].

1  
2  
3 **A case-study of language-specific executive disorder**  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8

9 Running title: Language-specific executive disorder  
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

For Peer Review Only

## ABSTRACT

Executive control is recruited for language processing, particularly in complex linguistic tasks. Although the issue of the existence of an executive control specific to language is still an open issue, there is much evidence that executively-demanding language tasks rely on domain-general rather than language-specific executive resources. Here, we addressed this issue by assessing verbal and non-verbal executive capacities in LG, an aphasic patient after a stroke. First, we showed that LG's performance was spared in all non-verbal tasks regardless of the executive demands. Second, by contrasting conditions of high and low executive demand in verbal tasks, we showed that LG was only impaired in verbal task with high executive demand. The performance dissociation between low and high executive demand conditions in the verbal domain, not observed in the non-verbal domain, shows that verbal executive control partly dissociates from non-verbal executive control. This language-specific executive disorder suggests that some executive processes might be language-specific.

Keywords: Language processing; Executive functions; Domain-specific process; Domain-general process; Performance dissociation; Aphasia

## INTRODUCTION

Executive control includes a wide range of mechanisms such as sustained attention, inhibition, planning, flexibility, monitoring and initiation that provide resources for other cognitive functions (Diamond, 2012). Executive control is essential for regulating processes and resolving conflicts in order to orchestrate behavior according to our internal goals: It allows for monitoring and updating working memory information, for inhibiting irrelevant stimulus-driven responses and suppressing task-irrelevant information, and for shifting between processes or stimuli (Miller, 2000).

More specifically, in the language domain, executive control improves the efficiency and fluidity of language, enabling on-line processing of language components (phonology, lexicon, syntax, semantic...) (Baddeley, 2003; Hoffman et al., 2009; Nozari et al., 2016). The impact of executive control in language is limited when comprehending canonical sentences such as active sentences when naming familiar pictures, when producing automatized sequences such as the days of the week or even when producing lexically expected words in sentences; the latter being the basis of the Hayling sentence completion test (Burgess & Shallice, 1997) which provides an excellent illustration of the potential contribution of the executive control in language. In this task, the participant listens to a sentence in which the last word is missing. In section A, the patient has to simply complete the sentence such as "Before going to bed, we switch off the [light]". Whereas in section B, the patient is required to complete the sentence with a nonsense ending word, thus imposing inhibition of the spontaneous meaningful word. Executive control is higher in section B, where in addition to word production and initiation, inhibition processes are required to perform the task. This supports the view that the executive control of language is modulated by **task complexity** and that language may involve monitoring, inhibition, switching or re-analysing of complex structures. Indeed, in speech comprehension, whereas canonical sentences elicit an automatic response, non-canonical sentences conflict

1  
2  
3 with the automatic response and, hence, require a high-order executive control response (Kotz  
4 et al., 2003; Mestres-Misse et al., 2012). Executive control also plays a substantial role in  
5 disambiguation and reanalysis of semantic content or syntactic structure, when the  
6 communicative context requires selecting an appropriate interpretation among multiple  
7 alternatives (topic, speaker, etc) (Jacquemot et al., 2006; Kotz et al., 2003; Novick et al., 2005;  
8 Ye & Zhou, 2009). In speech production, executive control allows for selecting the correct  
9 lexical items from semantic memory according to both the communicative intention and the  
10 context, as well as to plan and monitor the speech output (Indefrey & Levelt, 2004; E Jefferies,  
11 2013; Shao et al., 2012).

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25 An important issue is determining how language and executive control interact. Prior research  
26 has argued for a distinction between two separable systems: language and executive control,  
27 where domain-general executive resources apply in the language system similarly to other  
28 cognitive domains such as arithmetic, music, etc. According to this common view, even if  
29 domain-general executive resources are engaged during language processing and impact  
30 language performance, they are independent from language: language and executive resources  
31 can be selectively impaired and involved distinct networks. Indeed, there is much evidence  
32 from neuropsychological, brain imaging and behavioral studies indicating that even if executive  
33 control and language system interact, the two domains dissociate (Ye & Zhou, 2009). In patients  
34 with brain lesion, double dissociations between language and executive control demonstrate  
35 that two systems may be independently impaired (Fedorenko & Varley, 2016). Some severe  
36 aphasic patients perform flawlessly in executive tasks; conversely, patients without aphasia are  
37 impaired in executive tasks (Reverberi et al., 2009; Varley & Siegal, 2000). Brain imaging  
38 studies also show that executive control and language involve spatially and functionally  
39 different brain networks (Fedorenko, 2014). Whereas left-lateralized brain areas in frontal,  
40 temporal and parietal regions selectively and robustly respond to language processing, a  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 bilateral fronto-parietal network responds to executively-demanding tasks regardless of the  
4  
5 cognitive domain (language, memory, arithmetic, etc.) (Duncan & Owen, 2000), suggesting  
6  
7 that **domain-general** executive control is modulated by task complexity regardless of the  
8  
9 domain. In addition, **domain-general** executive control ability predicts performance in complex  
10  
11 language tasks, suggesting that domain-general control processes support language tasks. Non-  
12  
13 verbal executive control abilities such as was assessed with the go/no go task or the Wisconsin  
14  
15 Card-Sorting Test correlate with performance in complex language tasks such as producing  
16  
17 words under conditions of high lexical competition or speeded action-naming tasks (Shao et  
18  
19 al., 2012; Taler et al., 2010). Evidence also comes from multilingualism in which multilingual  
20  
21 individuals have to intensively control their speech input and output to select the target language  
22  
23 (among the languages they master), while inhibiting the one(s) they are not using (Abutalebi et  
24  
25 al., 2013; Hervais-Adelman et al., 2011). Bilingualism improves linguistic capacity – for  
26  
27 example, multilingual individuals outperformed monolinguals in comprehending non-  
28  
29 canonical sentences in the presence of linguistic interference (Bialystok & Feng, 2009; Filippi  
30  
31 et al., 2012, 2015). Interestingly, monolingual and multilingual individuals perform at the same  
32  
33 level with canonical sentences, suggesting that multilingual individuals show greater advantage  
34  
35 in complex linguistic tasks when the executive demand is high. **In parallel, being multilingual**  
36  
37 **is associated with higher capacity in non-verbal executive control tasks which** require rapid  
38  
39 switching between rules, suppression of irrelevant information, monitoring and updating  
40  
41 changes (Bialystok, 2017; Bialystok et al., 2012; Pelham & Abrams, 2014). **Although these**  
42  
43 **findings suggest that the enhanced executive control capacity observed in multilingualism is not**  
44  
45 **specific to language but spreads to other cognitive domains, this multilingualism advantage has**  
46  
47 **been recently questioned in a growing number of studies (Filippi et al., 2020; Lehtonen et al.,**  
48  
49 **2018; Paap et al., 2014; Paap & Greenberg, 2013).** Finally, impaired performance in children  
50  
51 with specific language impairment (SLI), a developmental disorder affecting language  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 acquisition when processing complex sentences, (Im-Bolter et al., 2006; van der Lely, 2005)  
4  
5 correlates with their deficit in inhibition and working memory; this therefore suggests a link  
6  
7  
8 between general executive control ability and complex language tasks.  
9

10  
11 Altogether, this suggests that executive control in language is supported by domain-general  
12  
13 resources and modulated by the complexity of the linguistic task (January et al., 2008; Novick  
14  
15 et al., 2005). However, this hypothesis does not preclude that executive processes specifically  
16  
17 dedicated to language may complement general executive functions (Hsu et al., 2017; Hamilton  
18  
19 & Martin, 2005).  
20  
21

22  
23 Here, by reporting the case of a patient with a dissociation between verbal and non-verbal  
24  
25 executive tasks, we argue that there is a part of executive control specifically dedicated to  
26  
27 language. This language-specific component of the executive network could be impaired  
28  
29 independently of its non-verbal component. In tasks with high executive demand, the patient  
30  
31 showed impaired performance in the verbal domain but spared performance in non-verbal  
32  
33 domain. This language-specific executive disorder undermines the notion of domain-generality  
34  
35 of executive control and suggests that some executive resources instead of being domain-  
36  
37 general might be language-specific.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

## 47 MATERIAL AND METHODS

### 48 Case report

49  
50  
51 Patient LG, right-handed and 50-years old, was working as a computer programmer (14 years  
52  
53 of education) at the time of his stroke. He was admitted to the hospital for acute language  
54  
55 difficulties. A CT scan showed a stroke encompassing the left anterior cingulate cortex (ACC)  
56  
57 and the left caudate nucleus. LG was fluent but his spontaneous speech was sprinkled with  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 semantic paraphasias and circumlocutions. The patient was tested from 3 to 9 months after the  
4 stroke. **Healthy participants were included in this study to provide controls for the novel tasks.**

7 The study was carried out in accordance with the recommendations of the code of ethics in  
8 French law for observational studies and of the Declaration of Helsinki. All participants  
9 consented to this research.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17

## 18 **General neuropsychological assessment**

20  
21 Neuropsychological examination included verbal and non-verbal tests to assess global  
22 intellectual function, language, executive functions, working memory, visual processing, and  
23 attention. Whereas the assessment of LG's intellectual functioning with the non-verbal test of  
24 the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale (WAIS III) (Wechsler, 1997) showed normal  
25 performance, LG's intellectual functioning assessed through verbal tests (WAIS III and Binois-  
26 Pichot Vocabulary Test) (Binois & Pichot, 1956) showed only low average performance (see  
27 Table 1). Intellectual assessment revealed a discrepancy between non-verbal and verbal  
28 performance. Because intellectual functioning assessment is highly dependent on executive  
29 functions and language, we further explored executive ability in non-verbal and verbal domains.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 In order to evaluate LG's non-verbal executive ability, we assessed non-verbal tasks from  
44 previous studies and contrasted tasks requiring low and high executive demand (Calabria et al.,  
45 2014; Hoffman et al., 2009, 2011, 2012; Hoffman, Jefferies, et al., 2013; Jefferies et al., 2008;  
46 Jefferies & Lambon Ralph, 2006; Thompson & Jefferies, 2013). The digit cancellation task  
47 (Della Sala et al., 1992) is a three-step task which consists of cancelling a target digit, then two  
48 targets, and finally three target digits in a panel of numbers. It allows for assessing attention  
49 allocation. The Trail Making Test (TMT) consists of two parts (A and B) in which the  
50 participant is instructed to connect a set of dots as accurately and quickly as possible  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 (Tombaugh, 2004). Part A (TMT A) consists of digits and assesses both attention and motor  
4 speed while part B (TMT B), consisting of alternating digits and letters, assesses attention,  
5 motor speed and flexibility, thus requiring executive resources. The Raven progressive matrices  
6 task measures abstract reasoning (Raven, 1983). The participant is asked to identify the missing  
7 pattern within a series of geometrical patterns. In the Wisconsin Card-Sorting Test, which  
8 measures abstract reasoning, task switching and attention, the participant is asked to match  
9 cards with figures differing with respect to color, quantity, and shape (Heaton, 1981). The Rey  
10 figure is a complex figure that the participant is asked to copy (Fastenau et al., 1999). In the  
11 Ratcliff test, the participant is asked to decide in which hand human figures from the front, from  
12 the back or oriented upside down are holding a ball in order to assess spatial orientation  
13 (Ratcliff, 1979). The Protocole d'Evaluation des capacités Gnosiques Visuelles (PEGV)  
14 assesses visuospatial abilities, attention, working memory, planning, and monitoring to detect  
15 eventual visual agnosia. It comprises of several tasks (embedded pictures to recognize, intruder  
16 detection, functional matching, and categorical matching) (Agniel et al., 1992). Patient LG  
17 performed within the normal range of all these non-verbal tests regardless of the executive  
18 demand of the task.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 In contrast, LG displayed a dissociation in performance among verbal tasks, showing low  
41 performance when the executive demand was high but spared when the executive demand was  
42 low. More precisely, LG's speech quality was normal in a free narrative and open-ended  
43 conversation. He performed normally at picture-naming in both the DO80 (Oral Naming 80)  
44 (Deloche & Hannequin, 1997) and the naming part of the French version of the Boston  
45 Diagnostic Aphasia Examination (BDAE) (Goodglass et al., 2007). Conversely, LG's  
46 performance was below the normal range in the Commands part of the BDAE, in which he was  
47 requested to carry out commands such as "place the watch on the other side of the pen and turn  
48 the card over", which imply subsequent embedded actions. He was also impaired in both  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 categorical and letter fluency (Cardebat et al., 1990), tests where subjects are required to orally  
4 elicit as many animal names (categorical) or words beginning with a specific letter (letter) in  
5 two minutes. In contrast to picture naming, fluency tasks require higher executive resources for  
6 monitoring and inhibiting the numerous competitors. Likewise, LG was impaired in the  
7 similarities subtest of the WAIS, a verbal task in which the participant has to describe how two  
8 auditory words or concepts are similar. This task assesses language conceptualization, verbal  
9 abstraction, and analogical verbal reasoning. It examines the ability to think abstractly and to  
10 find similarities among words or ideas that may not appear to be similar on the surface. LG was  
11 also impaired in section B of the Hayling sentence completion test (Burgess & Shallice, 1997)  
12 but not in section A. Consistently, LG was performed flawlessly in the forward digit span,  
13 which is mostly an attentional and immediate memory task, but was impaired in the backward  
14 span (Jacquemot et al., 2019; Wechsler, 1997) which involves the executive control component  
15 of the verbal working memory (Baddeley, 2003b).  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 In summary, the general assessment demonstrated impaired performance in verbal tasks with  
35 high executive demand, but spared performance in verbal tasks with low executive demand and  
36 in all non-verbal tasks regardless of their executive demand. In order to directly assess the role  
37 of executive control in the patient's verbal deficit, we assessed language tasks in which the  
38 executive demand was modulated within-task.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

## 46 **Language assessment**

### 47 *Statistical methods*

48  
49 We performed case-control comparisons using the Crawford modified t-test (Crawford et al.,  
50 2010) which calculates the probability that a single case comes from the distribution of a control  
51 sample. In addition, to demonstrate the existence of a dissociation between performance across  
52 two conditions, we compared the difference between LG's scores with the analogous difference  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 in controls using the Revised Standardized Difference Test (RSDT, Crawford et al., 2010).  
4  
5 Two-tailed p values are reported. For each task, the percent of correct response and standard  
6  
7 deviation are reported. The correlation coefficient (r) among conditions in the control sample  
8  
9 is also reported.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14

### 15 *Language comprehension*

16 Word comprehension was evaluated with an auditory word-picture matching task (Jacquemot  
17  
18 et al., 2007). A total of 64 pictures of common concrete nouns were selected and were visually  
19  
20 presented with an auditory word. The word was either the correct name of the picture (e.g.,  
21  
22 “bureau” /byro/ desk for a picture of a desk), an unrelated distractor (e.g., “pomme” /pom/  
23  
24 apple), a semantic distractor (e.g., “armoire” /armwar/ wardrobe), or a phonological distractor.  
25  
26 There were two types of phonological distractors: words and pseudowords, which were  
27  
28 phonologically equidistant from the target word (e.g., the word /bylo/ wheelk and the  
29  
30 pseudoword /byfo/). Every picture was presented once with each auditory item (the identity and  
31  
32 the four types of distractor) with a total of 320 trials. LG was asked to decide whether the  
33  
34 auditory word matched the picture. His performance was compared to that of matched controls  
35  
36 (N=5; mean age: 52.2 ±2.16, p > 0.1; mean age of education: 14 ±3.9, p > 0.1).  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 Sentence comprehension was evaluated with a sentence-picture matching task. The patient was  
45  
46 asked to decide whether an auditory sentence matched a picture (Teichmann et al., 2005). We  
47  
48 contrasted two syntactic conditions: sentences followed either the French canonical syntactic  
49  
50 order (active and subject relative sentences, e.g. “The girl waters the flower that is white”,  
51  
52 N=16) or a non-canonical syntactic order (passive and object-relative sentences, e.g. “The  
53  
54 flower that is white is watered by the girl”, N=16) (Supplementary material, Table 1). The two  
55  
56 conditions were matched for sentence length and word frequency. LG’s performance was  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 compared to that of matched controls (N=20; mean age: 46.1  $\pm$ 6.6,  $p > 0.1$ ; mean education  
4  
5 age: 13.2  $\pm$ 4.3,  $p > 0.1$ ).  
6  
7  
8  
9

### 10 11 *Language production*

12 Speech production was assessed through a word production task, using an oral definition  
13 (Bachoud-Lévi & Dupoux, 2003). We contrasted two conditions: “concrete” and “abstract” in  
14  
15 which the expected responses were respectively, concrete and abstract words as rated by control  
16  
17 participants from 1 to 5. Since the definition of abstract and concrete is debated, the scale was  
18  
19 rated arbitrarily between two examples tomato (1) and freedom (5) (Bachoud-Lévi & Dupoux,  
20  
21 2003). The two conditions were matched for syllable length and word frequency. For each  
22  
23 word, concrete (N=20) or abstract (N=20), a definition was constructed and presented orally to  
24  
25 LG who was asked to produce the word corresponding to the definition (Supplementary  
26  
27 material, Table 2). LG’s performance was compared to that of matched controls (N=17; mean  
28  
29 age: 56.8  $\pm$ 3.6,  $p > 0.1$ ; mean education age: 14.2  $\pm$ 2.6,  $p > 0.1$ ).  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 We designed the CATEX® (CATegory / EXemplar) (Jacquemot & Bachoud-Lévi, 2019), a  
41  
42 picture-naming task in which the executive demand is modulated independently of linguistic  
43  
44 factors. We contrasted two conditions: “exemplar” and “category”, in which the expected  
45  
46 responses were respectively, exemplar and category words. In this task, LG and matched  
47  
48 controls (N=37; mean age: 50.8  $\pm$ 20.6,  $p > 0.1$ ; mean education age: 11.4  $\pm$ 4.95,  $p > 0.1$ ) were  
49  
50 asked to produce a single word describing two pictures either of the same item (“exemplar”  
51  
52 condition, e.g. a banana and a peeled banana, with “banana” as the expected response) or of  
53  
54 two different items from the same category (“category” condition, e.g. a banana and an apple,  
55  
56 with “fruit” as the expected response). The production of category words is more demanding  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 of executive resources than the production of exemplar words, but conditions were equalised  
4 for linguistic demand. We selected exemplar (N=31) and category (N=31) items with a mean  
5 accuracy above 90% (data from a naming agreement pilot study with 40 participants), matched  
6 for syllable length (mean syllable number of Exemplar:  $1.87 \pm 0.72$ ; Category:  $1.87 \pm 0.56$ ;  $p =$   
7  
8 1), phonemes number (mean phoneme number of Exemplar:  $4.6 \pm 1.12$ ; Category:  $4.44 \pm 1.32$ ;  
9  
10  $p = 0.6$ ) and word frequency (mean word frequency<sup>1</sup> of Exemplar:  $65.2 \pm 112.1$ ; Category:  $52.2$   
11  
12  $\pm 54.2$ ;  $p = 0.6$ ) (Supplementary material, Table 3).  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

### 23 **Semantic cognition**

24  
25  
26 **Lambon Ralph et al., (2017) refers to semantic cognition as the ability to use, manipulate**  
27 **and generalize knowledge acquired over a lifespan to support verbal and non-verbal**  
28 **behaviours.** It combines semantic memory, referring to acquired knowledge and its  
29 executive control component regulating and organising both retrieval and access to  
30 semantic memory. To assess semantic cognition, we constructed non-verbal picture tasks  
31 such as anomalous picture detection, picture completion, categorical intruder detection  
32 and functional matching (N=140). In addition, we assessed LG's capacity to retrieve  
33 semantic information related to pictures of artefacts, animals, vegetables and tools  
34 (N=66). LG had to answer yes/no questions with respect to pictures (e.g. "Is it edible?",  
35 "Does it fit in a shoe box?", "Is it from inside or outside the house?", N=308) (Jacquemot  
36 et al., 2012). Finally, we assessed whether LG understood the concept of "category" by  
37 asking him to produce a word from the same category of a given auditory word (N=28).  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59

---

60 <sup>1</sup> Lemma frequency from movies, [www.lexique.org](http://www.lexique.org).



1  
2  
3 For instance, on hearing the word “fork”, the patient was expected to reply “knife”,  
4  
5 “spoon”, etc.  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10

## 11 RESULTS

### 12 Language comprehension

#### 13 *Word comprehension*

14  
15 In word comprehension, LG performed as well as controls (percent of correct responses, LG:  
16  
17 99.4%; controls: 99.8±0.3%; Z-score: -1.43; t = -1.4, df = 4, p = 0.16).  
18  
19

#### 20 *Sentence comprehension*

21  
22 In sentence comprehension, LG comprehended canonical sentences as well as controls, but his  
23  
24 comprehension of non-canonical sentences was poorer than controls (percent of correct  
25  
26 responses for canonical sentences, LG: 93.7%; controls: 99±9.6%; Z-score: -0.5; t = -0.52, df  
27  
28 = 19, p > 0. 1; percent of correct responses for non-canonical sentences, LG: 81.3%; controls:  
29  
30 90.3±2.2%; Z-score: -3.8; t = -3.7, df = 19, p < 0.001; r = 0.59). The difference between LG’s  
31  
32 performance on canonical and non-canonical sentences differs significantly from the  
33  
34 distribution of differences in controls (RSDT t = 3.3, p = 0.004, ES = 3.5) (Table 2).  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

### 50 Language production

#### 51 *Concrete and abstract word production*

52  
53 LG’s production was flawless for concrete words, but impaired for abstract words compared to  
54  
55 controls (correct responses for concrete words, LG: 95%; controls: 94±4%; Z-score: 0.22; t =  
56  
57 0.2, df = 16, p = 0.8; correct responses for abstract words, LG: 65%; controls: 90.6±5%; Z-  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 score:  $-5.17$ ;  $t = -5.0$ ,  $df = 16$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ;  $r = 0.21$ ). The difference between LG's performance  
4  
5 in concrete and abstract words differs significantly from the distribution of differences in  
6  
7 controls<sup>2</sup> (RSDT  $t = 3.9$ ,  $p = 0.001$ ,  $ES = 4.3$ ), (Table 2). The distribution of LG's errors is  
8  
9 reported Table 3.  
10  
11  
12

### 13 *Exemplar and category word production (CATEX)*

14  
15

16 In the CATEX, LG performed similarly to controls for the exemplar condition (correct  
17 responses, LG: 90.3%; controls:  $94 \pm 5\%$ ; Z-score:  $-0.76$ ;  $t = -0.75$ ,  $df = 36$ ,  $p = 0.45$ ) but lower  
18  
19 than controls for the category condition (correct responses, LG: 51.6%; controls:  $89.1 \pm 8\%$ ; Z-  
20  
21 score:  $-4.93$ ;  $t = -4.9$ ,  $df = 36$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ;  $r = 0.5$ ). The difference between LG's performance in  
22  
23 exemplar and category conditions differs significantly from the distribution of differences in  
24  
25 controls (RSDT  $t = 4.1$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ,  $ES = -4.2$ ), (Table 2).  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

## 34 **Semantic cognition**

35  
36

37 LG's semantic cognition was intact. LG was unimpaired in non-verbal picture tasks:  
38  
39 anomalous picture detection, picture completion, categorical intruder detection and  
40  
41 functional matching (97.1% of correct responses). LG's capacity to retrieve semantic  
42  
43 information related to pictures of artefacts, animals, vegetables and tools was flawless  
44  
45 (100% of correct responses). LG performance in yes/no questions about semantic information  
46  
47 related to depicted items on picture was spared too (98.8% of correct responses). He performed  
48  
49 flawlessly in naming exemplars from the same category of pictures of items (96.4% of correct  
50  
51 responses), indicating a spared understanding of the concept of category.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

---

58 <sup>2</sup> Note that in controls, the absence of performance difference between concrete and abstract words,  
59 and exemplar and category words is not due to a ceiling effect, since their performance with abstract  
60 and category words are not at ceiling.

## DISCUSSION

LG displayed a language disorder with normal intellectual abilities following a left ACC and left caudate nucleus lesion. He showed normal performance in executively-undemanding verbal tasks (i.e. section A of the Hayling test, automatic speech, forward digit span, picture naming, repetition, word comprehension) but impaired performance in executively-demanding verbal tasks requiring executive control (i.e. section B of the Hayling test, verbal fluency, backward digit span, similarities subtest of the WAIS, comprehension of commands and complex sentences). In contrast, his performance was unaffected in non-verbal tasks regardless of the executive demand: LG succeeded in both executively-undemanding tasks such as the TMT A and the digit cancellation test, as well as in executively-demanding tasks such as the Raven progressive matrices, the Wisconsin card-sorting test, the TMT B and tasks assessing visual, spatial and mental rotation skills, i.e. the Ratcliff test, the Rey figure copying test and the PEGV (Table 1). The results of the language assessment in which conditions of high and low executive demand were contrasted within each verbal task confirmed that LG was specifically impaired in conditions requiring high executive demand.

Unlike previous cases displaying a domain-general executive deficit affecting verbal and non-verbal tasks indiscriminately (Calabria et al., 2014; Hoffman et al., 2012; Thompson & Jefferies, 2013; Vuong & Martin, 2015), LG displayed an impairment specific to verbal tasks requiring executive control to be performed while sparing capacities in non-verbal tasks. Acknowledging that comparison between tasks might mask uncontrolled biases, we further assessed language through speech comprehension and production tasks in which we contrasted two conditions within tasks: low executive control demand versus high executive control demand while keeping constant linguistic parameters. Sentence length, syllable length and word frequency were matched between conditions in the sentence picture matching task, in the concrete/abstract word production task and in the CATEX® task, suggesting that LG's lower

1  
2  
3 performance in high executive conditions was not due to linguistic parameters. In addition, we  
4 ensured that LG had no semantic cognition impairment as demonstrated by LG's excellent  
5 performance in semantic cognition and category concept assessments.  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 One could argue that LG suffers from a disorder of semantic cognition in which semantic  
11 control processes interact with semantic memory to ensure that the information accessed at any  
12 given moment is appropriate for the current task and context (Jefferies & Lambon Ralph, 2006).  
13 Indeed, two kinds of deficits affect semantic cognition: semantic dementia and semantic  
14 aphasia. Semantic dementia is characterized by an impairment of semantic memory affecting  
15 all tasks regardless of the modality (spoken and written words, pictures, environmental sounds,  
16 object use...) and lower performance for specific concept and unique features (Patterson et al.,  
17 2007). For instance, patients with semantic dementia will forget the zebra stripes before  
18 forgetting a common feature in animals like its tail. Semantic dementia occurs after bilateral  
19 anterior temporal lobe damage. In contrast, semantic aphasia is due to an executive control  
20 deficit of semantic memory and associated with prefrontal or temporo-parietal infarcts.  
21 Patients' performance with semantic aphasia is consistent across the different modalities but  
22 inconsistent across tasks since it depends of the executive control requirement of the tasks  
23 (Jefferies & Lambon Ralph, 2006; Noonan et al., 2010). Patients show deficits in executively  
24 demanding semantic tasks in both verbal and non-verbal domains (Corbett et al., 2008, 2009;  
25 Jefferies & Lambon Ralph, 2006; Thompson & Jefferies, 2013). In addition, their performance  
26 in language tasks is highly influenced by the degree of competition between concepts and the  
27 extent to which the task constrains semantic processing (Krieger-Redwood et al., 2015). We  
28 can easily rule out semantic dementia in LG because the behavioural and anatomical data are  
29 not consistent with the etiology of this neurodegenerative disease: LG's performance in  
30 semantic cognition tasks is not impaired and the anterior parts of his temporal lobe are not  
31 damaged. It is also unlikely that LG had semantic aphasia for several reasons. First, when  
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

1  
2  
3 assessing semantic cognition, LG showed no impairment even in tasks requiring the control of  
4 semantic memory such as categorical intruder detection or functional matching. Second,  
5  
6  
7  
8 contrary to patients with semantic aphasia who perform poorly on a variety of executive  
9  
10  
11  
12 measures such as the WCST, the Raven matrices, the TMT B (Jefferies et al., 2008; Thompson  
13 & Jefferies, 2013), LG was not impaired in non-verbal executive tasks. Third, in semantic  
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

assessing semantic cognition, LG showed no impairment even in tasks requiring the control of semantic memory such as categorical intruder detection or functional matching. Second, contrary to patients with semantic aphasia who perform poorly on a variety of executive measures such as the WCST, the Raven matrices, the TMT B (Jefferies et al., 2008; Thompson & Jefferies, 2013), LG was not impaired in non-verbal executive tasks. Third, in semantic aphasia, we would expect some difficulties in the auditory word-picture matching task, especially with semantic distractors and in the exemplar naming task, which was not the case with LG (Jefferies & Lambon Ralph, 2006).

LG was impaired in speech production tasks in conditions that involve executive control (abstract and category words) in comparison to exemplar and concrete words production. This dissociation between performance in abstract and category words compared to concrete and exemplar words deserves special interest. What factors make abstract and category words special compared to concrete and exemplar words? Concrete words are associated to richer perceptual experiences and a higher number of active semantic features, than abstract words (Gao et al., 2019; Jones, 1985; Paivio, 1990). As the meaning of abstract words does not refer to an object that may be perceived directly in the world (e.g. peace) and relates to intangible experiences or properties (Paivio, 1990), their context is highly variable (Hoffman, 2016). For example, “peace” combines different contextual frameworks. It may refer to a state of mind or to the status of two countries after a war. Similarly, a category refers to the relationships between several exemplars that may differ considerably (e.g., cats and lions are very different, but both are from the same category of felines). The meaning of abstract and category words is heavily dependent on the context -the so-called semantic diversity- in which they are being used (Hoffman et al., 2010, 2015; Hoffman, Jones, et al., 2013; Jefferies, 2013; Jefferies & Lambon Ralph, 2006). In contrast to exemplar and concrete words, abstract and category words can occur in many different contexts: they refer to many meanings, less tangible items with lower

1  
2  
3 sensory-perceptual content and lower number of active semantic features. Hence, processing  
4 them requires greater demands on executive control of semantic knowledge to provide access  
5 to competing aspects of semantic cognition not dependent on any particular perceptual  
6 experience for retrieving the correct meaning in speech comprehension and selecting the correct  
7 word in production. This suggests that LG's verbal performance depends on the executive  
8 demand of the task (Table 2). Consistently, LG was also impaired in the sentence  
9 comprehension task, but only for non-canonical sentences, the condition that involves executive  
10 control in comparison to canonical sentences. LG's verbal performance is modulated by  
11 executive demand whereas non-verbal performance is unaffected by executive demand (Table  
12 1).

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27 This dissociation between verbal and non-verbal domains suggests that executively-demanding  
28 language tasks rely at least partly on mechanisms different from those used in the non-verbal  
29 domain. This effect might be the result of an impaired interaction between language processing  
30 and a general executive system, where language modality would be specifically affected, or the  
31 result of an impaired language-specific executive component (Jacquemot & Bachoud-Lévi, in  
32 revision). It has been recently proposed that executive control involved in language tasks,  
33 instead of being considered as a domain general "central controller" may be an emergent  
34 property of distributed systems (Eisenreich et al., 2017). A similar proposal has been made in  
35 the domain of short-term memory, where short-term memory capacity is an emergent property  
36 of the language system relying on the links between the speech comprehension and speech  
37 production modalities rather than a separate system (Jacquemot & Scott, 2006; Majerus, 2013).  
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

1  
2  
3 supports the view that verbal executively-demanding tasks rely on processes different from  
4 those involved in non-verbal executively-demanding tasks which may specifically be impaired.  
5  
6

7  
8 The location of LG lesions in the left ACC and caudate nucleus enhance their role in the  
9 neuronal architecture underpinning executive functions dedicated to language. Previous  
10 literature showed that executive control is associated with a fronto-parietal network including  
11 the prefrontal cortex, the ACC, the temporo-parietal junction and basal ganglia (Duncan &  
12 Owen, 2000; Friederici, 2006; Monchi et al., 2006; Noonan et al., 2013; Pini et al., 2020; Ye &  
13 Zhou, 2009). Within this network, a key role is attributed to the ACC when effortful control is  
14 required (Bush et al., 2000). Functional and structural imaging studies on language showed that  
15 the caudate nucleus and putamen (dorsal striatum) played a critical role in language control and  
16 flexibility, notably in tasks involving selection among linguistic alternatives switching between  
17 languages (Abutalebi et al., 2013; Crinion et al., 2006; Giavazzi et al., 2018; Hervais-Adelman  
18 et al., 2015). Because they focused on the modulation of executive control in verbal tasks, these  
19 studies did not indicate whether some parts of the network would be specific to executive  
20 control in language or rather be involved in domain-general executive control. In contrast, LG's  
21 case allowed us to dissociate language-specific executive processes from non-verbal executive  
22 processes. A potential candidate for the language-specific executive network may involve the  
23 ACC and the caudate nucleus.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 This patient case study shows that contrary to the traditional view, some executive processes  
47 are language-specific and can be selectively impaired without affecting non-verbal executive  
48 performance. We refer to executive control as a whole without distinguishing between different  
49 executive processes (flexibility, monitoring, inhibition, etc.). A further step would be to  
50 determine how domain-general and language-specific executive resources interact by focusing  
51 on each type of executive process and assessing them separately. Finally, investigating their  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 neural correlates within the fronto-striatal network may help in comprehending the language  
4  
5 system.  
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

For Peer Review Only



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

Disclosure of interest

The authors report no conflict of interest.

For Peer Review Only

## REFERENCES

- Abutalebi, J., Della Rosa, P. A., Ding, G., Weekes, B., Costa, A., & Green, D. W. (2013). Language proficiency modulates the engagement of cognitive control areas in multilinguals. *Cortex*, *49*(3), 905–911. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2012.08.018>
- Agniel, A., Joannette, Y., Doyon, B., & Duchain, C. (1992). *Protocole Montreal-Toulouse. Evaluation des gnosies visuelles et auditives*. L'Ortho Edition.
- Bachoud-Lévi, A.-C., & Dupoux, E. (2003). An influence of syntactic and semantic variables on word form retrieval. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, *20*(2), 163–188. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02643290242000907>
- Baddeley, A. (2003a). Working memory and language: An overview. *J Commun Disord*, *36*(3), 189–208.
- Baddeley, A. (2003b). Working memory: Looking back and looking forward. *Nature Review Neuroscience*, *4*(10), 829–839.
- Bialystok, E. (2017). The bilingual adaptation: How minds accommodate experience. *Psychological Bulletin*, *143*(3), 233.
- Bialystok, E., Craik, F. I., & Luk, G. (2012). Bilingualism: Consequences for mind and brain. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *16*(4), 240–250.
- Bialystok, E., & Feng, X. (2009). Language proficiency and executive control in proactive interference: Evidence from monolingual and bilingual children and adults. *Brain and Language*, *109*(2–3), 93–100.
- Binois, R., & Pichot, P. (1956). *Test de vocabulaire: Manuel d'application*. Centre de psychologie appliquée.
- Burgess, P., & Shallice, T. (1997). *The Hayling and Brixton Tests. Test manual*. Thames Valley Test Company.
- Bush, G., Luu, P., & Posner, M. I. (2000). Cognitive and emotional influences in anterior cingulate cortex. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *4*(6), 215–222. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s1364-6613\(00\)01483-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1364-6613(00)01483-2)
- Calabria, M., Marne, P., Romero-Pinel, L., Juncadella, M., & Costa, A. (2014). Losing control of your languages: A case study. *Cogn Neuropsychol*, *31*(3), 266–286. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02643294.2013.879443>
- Cardebat, D., Doyon, B., Puel, M., Goulet, P., & Joannette, Y. (1990). [Formal and semantic lexical evocation in normal subjects. Performance and dynamics of production as a function of sex, age and educational level]. *Acta Neurol Belg*, *90*(4), 207–217.
- Corbett, F., Jefferies, E., & Lambon Ralph, M. A. (2008). The use of cueing to alleviate recurrent verbal perseverations: Evidence from transcortical sensory aphasia. *Aphasiology*, *22*(4), 363–382.
- Corbett, F., Jefferies, E., & Ralph, M. A. L. (2009). Exploring multimodal semantic control impairments in semantic aphasia: Evidence from naturalistic object use. *Neuropsychologia*, *47*(13), 2721–2731.
- Crawford, J. R., Garthwaite, P. H., & Porter, S. (2010). Point and interval estimates of effect sizes for the case-controls design in neuropsychology: Rationale, methods, implementations, and proposed reporting standards. *Cogn Neuropsychol*, *27*(3), 245–260. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02643294.2010.513967>
- Crinion, J., Turner, R., Grogan, A., Hanakawa, T., Noppeney, U., Devlin, J. T., Aso, T., Urayama, S., Fukuyama, H., Stockton, K., Usui, K., Green, D. W., & Price, C. J. (2006). Language control in the bilingual brain. *Science*, *312*(5779), 1537–1540. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1127761>
- Della Sala, S., Laiacona, M., Spinnler, H., & Ubezio, C. (1992). A cancellation test. *Its Reliability in Assessing Attentional Deficits in Alzheimer's Disease*, *22*(4), 885–901.

1  
2  
3 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291700038460>

4 Deloche, G., & Hannequin, D. (1997). *Test de denomination orale de 80 images*. ECPA.

5 Diamond, A. (2012). Executive Functions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 64.

6 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-113011-143750>

7 Duncan, J., & Owen, A. M. (2000). Common regions of the human frontal lobe recruited by  
8 diverse cognitive demands. *Trends Neurosci*, 23(10), 475–483.

9 Eisenreich, B. R., Akaishi, R., & Hayden, B. Y. (2017). Control without Controllers: Toward  
10 a Distributed Neuroscience of Executive Control. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 29(10),  
11 1684–1698. [https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn\\_a\\_01139](https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_01139)

12 Endress, A. D. (2019). Duplications and Domain-Generality. *PSYCHOLOGICAL BULLETIN*,  
13 145(12), 1154–1175. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000213>

14 Fedorenko, E. (2014). The role of domain-general cognitive control in language

15 comprehension. *Front Psychol*, 5, 335–335. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00335>

16 Fedorenko, E., & Varley, R. (2016). Language and thought are not the same thing: Evidence  
17 from neuroimaging and neurological patients. *Ann N Y Acad Sci*, 1369(1), 132–153.

18 <https://doi.org/10.1111/nyas.13046>

19 Filippi, R., Ceccolini, A., Periche-Tomas, E., Papageorgiou, A., & Bright, P. (2020).

20 Developmental trajectories of control of verbal and non-verbal interference in speech  
21 comprehension in monolingual and multilingual children. *Cognition*, 200, 104252.

22 Filippi, R., Leech, R., Thomas, M. S., Green, D. W., & Dick, F. (2012). A bilingual advantage  
23 in controlling language interference during sentence comprehension. *Bilingualism: Language  
24 and Cognition*.

25 Filippi, R., Morris, J., Richardson, F. M., Bright, P., Thomas, M. S., Karmiloff-Smith, A., &  
26 Marian, V. (2015). Bilingual children show an advantage in controlling verbal interference  
27 during spoken language comprehension. *Bilingualism (Cambridge, England)*, 18(3), 490.

28 Friederici, A. D. (2006). What's in control of language? *Nature Neuroscience*, 9(8), 991–992.

29 Gao, C., Baucom, L. B., Kim, J., Wang, J., Wedell, D. H., & Shinkareva, S. V. (2019).

30 Distinguishing abstract from concrete concepts in supramodal brain regions.

31 *Neuropsychologia*, 131, 102–110.

32 Giavazzi, M., Daland, R., Peperkamp, S., Palminteri, S., Brugières, P., Jacquemot, C.,

33 Schramm, C., Cleret de Langavant, L., Bachoud-Lévi, A.-C., Peperkamp, S., Brugieres, P.,

34 Jacquemot, C., Schramm, C., Cleret de Langavant, L., & Bachoud-Levi, A. C. (2018). The

35 role of the striatum in linguistic selection: Evidence from Huntington's disease and

36 computational modeling. *Cortex*, 109, 189–204. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2018.08.031>

37 Goodglass, H., Kaplan, E., Mazaux, J. M., & Orgogozo, J. M. (2007). *HDAE, échelle*

38 *d'évaluation de l'aphasie adaptation française du Boston diagnostic aphasia examination de*  
39 *H. Goodglass et E. Kaplan*. ECPA, les Éd. du Centre de psychologie appliquée.

40 <https://books.google.fr/books?id=EOSbcgAACAAJ>

41 Hagoort, P., & Donders, F. C. (2004). How the brain solves the binding problem for language.

42 *International Journal of Psychology*, 39(5–6), 349–349.

43 Hamilton, C. A., & Martin, R. C. (2005). Dissociations among tasks involving inhibition: A  
44 single-case study. *Cognitive, Affective, & Behavioral Neuroscience*, 5(1), 1–13.

45 <https://doi.org/10.3758/CABN.5.1.1>

46 Heaton, R. (1981). Wisconsin card sorting test manual; revised and expanded. *Psychological*  
47 *Assessment Resources*, 5–57.

48 Hervais-Adelman, A. G., Moser-Mercer, B., & Golestani, N. (2011). Executive control of  
49 language in the bilingual brain: Integrating the evidence from neuroimaging to

50 neuropsychology. *Front Psychol*, 2, 234–234. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2011.00234>

51 Hervais-Adelman, A., Moser-Mercer, B., Michel, C. M., & Golestani, N. (2015). fMRI of  
52 Simultaneous Interpretation Reveals the Neural Basis of Extreme Language Control. *Cereb*  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 *Cortex*, 25(12), 4727–4739. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhu158>
- 4 Hoffman, P. (2016). The meaning of “life” and other abstract words: Insights from  
5 neuropsychology. *J Neuropsychol*, 10(2), 317–343. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jnp.12065>
- 6 Hoffman, P., Binney, R. J., & Lambon Ralph, M. A. (2015). Differing contributions of  
7 inferior prefrontal and anterior temporal cortex to concrete and abstract conceptual  
8 knowledge. *Cortex*, 63, 250–266. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2014.09.001>
- 9 Hoffman, P., Jefferies, E., Ehsan, S., Hopper, S., & Lambon-Ralph, M. A. (2009). Selective  
10 short-term memory deficits arise from impaired domain-general semantic control  
11 mechanisms. *J Exp Psychol Learn Mem Cogn*, 35(1), 137–156.  
12 <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013985>
- 13 Hoffman, P., Jefferies, E., Ehsan, S., Jones, R. W., & Lambon-Ralph, M. A. (2012). How  
14 does linguistic knowledge contribute to short-term memory? Contrasting effects of impaired  
15 semantic knowledge and executive control. *Aphasiology*, 26(3–4), 383–403.
- 16 Hoffman, P., Jefferies, E., Haffey, A., Littlejohns, T., & Lambon-Ralph, M. A. (2013).  
17 Domain-specific control of semantic cognition: A dissociation within patients with semantic  
18 working memory deficits. *Aphasiology*, 27(6), 740–764.  
19 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02687038.2012.751578>
- 20 Hoffman, P., Jefferies, E., & Lambon Ralph, M. A. (2010). Ventrolateral prefrontal cortex  
21 plays an executive regulation role in comprehension of abstract words: Convergent  
22 neuropsychological and repetitive TMS evidence. *J Neurosci*, 30(46), 15450–15456.  
23 <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3783-10.2010>
- 24 Hoffman, P., Jefferies, E., & Lambon-Ralph, M. A. (2011). Explaining semantic short-term  
25 memory deficits: Evidence for the critical role of semantic control. *Neuropsychologia*, 49(3),  
26 368–381. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2010.12.034>
- 27 Hoffman, P., Jones, R. W., & Lambon-Ralph, M. A. (2013). Be concrete to be comprehended:  
28 Consistent imageability effects in semantic dementia for nouns, verbs, synonyms and  
29 associates. *Cortex*, 49(5), 1206–1218. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2012.05.007>
- 30 Hsu, N. S., Jaeggi, S. M., & Novick, J. M. (2017). A common neural hub resolves syntactic  
31 and non-syntactic conflict through cooperation with task-specific networks. *BRAIN AND*  
32 *LANGUAGE*, 166, 63–77. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bandl.2016.12.006>
- 33 Im-Bolter, N., Johnson, J., & Pascual-Leone, J. (2006). Processing limitations in children with  
34 specific language impairment: The role of executive function. *Child Development*, 77(6),  
35 1822–1841.
- 36 Indefrey, P., & Levelt, W. J. (2004). The spatial and temporal signatures of word production  
37 components. *Cognition*, 92(1–2), 101–144.
- 38 Jacquemot, C., & Bachoud-Lévi, A. C. (in revision). *Striatum and language processing:*  
39 *Where do we stand?*
- 40 Jacquemot, C., & Bachoud-Lévi, A. C. (2019). *CATEX: Modulation of executive demand in*  
41 *language Processing* (Institut National de la Protection Industrielle Patent No. eSoleau  
42 DSO2019017223).
- 43 Jacquemot, C., Dupoux, E., & Bachoud-Levi, A. C. (2007). Breaking the mirror:  
44 Asymmetrical disconnection between the phonological input and output codes. *Cogn*  
45 *Neuropsychol*, 24(1), 3–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02643290600683342>
- 46 Jacquemot, C., Dupoux, E., Decouche, O., & Bachoud-Levi, A.-C. (2006). Misperception in  
47 sentences but not in words: Speech perception and the phonological buffer. In *COGNITIVE*  
48 *NEUROPSYCHOLOGY* (Vol. 23, Issue 6, pp. 949–971). PSYCHOLOGY PRESS.  
49 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02643290600625749>
- 50 Jacquemot, C., Dupoux, E., Robotham, L., & Bachoud-Levi, A. C. (2012). Specificity in  
51 rehabilitation of word production: A meta-analysis and a case study. *Behav Neurol*, 25(2), 73–  
52 101. <https://doi.org/10.3233/BEN-2012-0358>

- 1  
2  
3 Jacquemot, C., Lalanne, C., Sliwinski, A., Piccinini, P., Dupoux, E., & Bachoud-Levi, A. C.  
4 (2019). Improving language evaluation in neurological disorders: The French Core  
5 Assessment of Language Processing (CALAP). *Psychol Assess.*  
6 <https://doi.org/10.1037/pas0000683>
- 7 Jacquemot, C., & Scott, S. K. (2006). What is the relationship between phonological short-  
8 term memory and speech processing? *Trends Cogn Sci*, *10*(11), 480–486.  
9 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2006.09.002>
- 10 January, D., Trueswell, J. C., & Thompson-Schill, S. L. (2008). Co-localization of Stroop and  
11 Syntactic Ambiguity Resolution in Broca's Area: Implications for the Neural Basis of  
12 Sentence Processing. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, *21*(12), 2434–2444.  
13 <https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn.2008.21179>
- 14 Jefferies, E. (2013). The neural basis of semantic cognition: Converging evidence from  
15 neuropsychology, neuroimaging and TMS. *Cortex*, *49*(3), 611–625.  
16 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2012.10.008>
- 17 Jefferies, E., Patterson, K., & Ralph, M. A. L. (2008). Deficits of knowledge versus executive  
18 control in semantic cognition: Insights from cued naming. *Neuropsychologia*, *46*(2), 649–658.  
19 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2007.09.007>
- 20 Jefferies, Elizabeth, & Lambon Ralph, M. A. (2006). Semantic impairment in stroke aphasia  
21 versus semantic dementia: A case-series comparison. *Brain*, *129*(8), 2132–2147.
- 22 Jones, G. V. (1985). Deep dyslexia, imageability, and ease of predication. *Brain and*  
23 *Language*, *24*(1), 1–19.
- 24 Kotz, S. A., Frisch, S., von Cramon, D. Y., & Friederici, A. D. (2003). Syntactic language  
25 processing: ERP lesion data on the role of the basal ganglia. *Journal of the International*  
26 *Neuropsychological Society*, *9*, 1053–1060.
- 27 Krieger-Redwood, K., Teige, C., Davey, J., Hymers, M., & Jefferies, E. (2015). Conceptual  
28 control across modalities: Graded specialisation for pictures and words in inferior frontal and  
29 posterior temporal cortex. *Neuropsychologia*, *76*, 92–107.
- 30 Lambon Ralph, M. A. L., Jefferies, E., Patterson, K., & Rogers, T. T. (2017). The neural and  
31 computational bases of semantic cognition. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, *18*(1), 42–55.
- 32 Lehtonen, M., Soveri, A., Laine, A., Järvenpää, J., De Bruin, A., & Antfolk, J. (2018). Is  
33 bilingualism associated with enhanced executive functioning in adults? A meta-analytic  
34 review. *Psychological Bulletin*, *144*(4), 394.
- 35 Majerus, S. (2013). Language repetition and short-term memory: An integrative framework.  
36 *Front Hum Neurosci*, *7*, 357–357. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2013.00357>
- 37 Miller, E. K. (2000). The prefrontal cortex and cognitive control. *Nature Reviews*  
38 *Neuroscience*, *1*(1), 59–65. <https://doi.org/10.1038/35036228>
- 39 Monchi, O., Petrides, M., Strafella, A., Worsley, K., & Doyon, J. (2006). Functional role of  
40 the basal ganglia in the planning and execution of actions. In *ANNALS OF NEUROLOGY*  
41 (Vol. 59, Issue 2, pp. 257–264). WILEY-LISS. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ana.20742>
- 42 Noonan, K. A., Jefferies, E., Corbett, F., & Lambon Ralph, M. A. (2010). Elucidating the  
43 nature of deregulated semantic cognition in semantic aphasia: Evidence for the roles of  
44 prefrontal and temporo-parietal cortices. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, *22*(7), 1597–  
45 1613. <https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn.2009.21289>
- 46 Noonan, K. A., Jefferies, E., Visser, M., & Lambon Ralph, M. A. (2013). Going beyond  
47 inferior prefrontal involvement in semantic control: Evidence for the additional contribution  
48 of dorsal angular gyrus and posterior middle temporal cortex. *Journal of Cognitive*  
49 *Neuroscience*, *25*(11), 1824–1850. [https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn\\_a\\_00442](https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_00442)
- 50 Novick, J. M., Trueswell, J. C., & Thompson-Schill, S. L. (2005). Cognitive control and  
51 parsing: Reexamining the role of Broca's area in sentence comprehension. *Cognitive,*  
52 *Affective, & Behavioral Neuroscience*, *5*(3), 263–281. <https://doi.org/10.3758/CABN.5.3.263>

- 1  
2  
3 Nozari, N., Mirman, D., & Thompson-Schill, S. L. (2016). The ventrolateral prefrontal cortex  
4 facilitates processing of sentential context to locate referents. *Brain and Language*, *157–158*,  
5 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bandl.2016.04.006>
- 6 Paap, K. R., & Greenberg, Z. I. (2013). There is no coherent evidence for a bilingual  
7 advantage in executive processing. *Cognitive Psychology*, *66*(2), 232–258.
- 8 Paap, K. R., Johnson, H. A., & Sawi, O. (2014). Are bilingual advantages dependent upon  
9 specific tasks or specific bilingual experiences? *Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, *26*(6), 615–  
10 639.
- 11 Paivio, A. (1990). *Mental representations: A dual coding approach*. Oxford University Press.
- 12 Patterson, K., Nestor, P. J., & Rogers, T. T. (2007). Where do you know what you know? The  
13 representation of semantic knowledge in the human brain. *Nature Review Neuroscience*,  
14 *8*(12), 976–987. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn2277>
- 15 Pelham, S. D., & Abrams, L. (2014). Cognitive advantages and disadvantages in early and  
16 late bilinguals. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*,  
17 *40*(2), 313.
- 18 Pini, L., Jacquemot, C., Cagnin, A., Meneghello, F., Semenza, C., Mantini, D., & Vallesi, A.  
19 (2020). Aberrant brain network connectivity in presymptomatic and manifest Huntington’s  
20 disease: A systematic review. *Human Brain Mapping*, *41*(1), 256–269.  
21 <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.24790>
- 22 Ratcliff, G. (1979). Spatial thought, mental rotation and the right cerebral hemisphere.  
23 *Neuropsychologia*, *17*(1), 49–54.
- 24 Raven, J. C. (1983). Manual for Raven’s progressive matrices and vocabulary scales.  
25 *Standard Progressive Matrices*.
- 26 Reverberi, C., Shallice, T., D’Agostini, S., Skrap, M., & Bonatti, L. L. (2009). Cortical bases  
27 of elementary deductive reasoning: Inference, memory, and metaduction.  
28 *Neuropsychologia*, *47*(4), 1107–1116.
- 29 Shao, Z., Roelofs, A., & Meyer, A. S. (2012). Sources of individual differences in the speed  
30 of naming objects and actions: The contribution of executive control. *Quarterly Journal of*  
31 *Experimental Psychology (2006)*, *65*(10), 1927–1944.  
32 <https://doi.org/10.1080/17470218.2012.670252>
- 33 Taler, V., Aaron, G. P., Steinmetz, L. G., & Pisoni, D. B. (2010). Lexical neighborhood  
34 density effects on spoken word recognition and production in healthy aging. *Journals of*  
35 *Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *65*(5), 551–560.
- 36 Teichmann, M., Dupoux, E., Kouider, S., Brugieres, P., Boissé, M.-F., Baudic, S., Cesaro, P.,  
37 Peschanski, M., & Bachoud-Lévi, A.-C. (2005). The Role of the striatum in rule application:  
38 The model of Huntington’s disease at early stage. *Brain: A Journal of Neurology*, *128*, 1155–  
39 1167. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awh472>
- 40 Thompson, H. E., & Jefferies, E. (2013). Semantic control and modality: An input processing  
41 deficit in aphasia leading to deregulated semantic cognition in a single modality.  
42 *Neuropsychologia*, *51*(10), 1998–2015.  
43 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2013.06.030>
- 44 Tombaugh, T. N. (2004). Trail making test A and B: normative data stratified by age and  
45 education. *Arch Clin Neuropsychol*, *19*(2), 203–214. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0887-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0887-6177(03)00039-8)  
46 [6177\(03\)00039-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0887-6177(03)00039-8)
- 47 van der Lely, H. K. J. (2005). Domain-specific cognitive systems: Insight from Grammatical-  
48 SLI. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *9*(2), 53–59. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2004.12.002>
- 49 Varley, R., & Siegal, M. (2000). Evidence for cognition without grammar from causal  
50 reasoning and ‘theory of mind’ in an agrammatic aphasic patient. *Current Biology*, *10*(12),  
51 723–726.
- 52 Vuong, L. C., & Martin, R. C. (2015). The role of LIFG-based executive control in sentence  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 comprehension. *Cogn Neuropsychol*, 32(5), 243–265.

4 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02643294.2015.1057558>

5 Wechsler, D. (1997). *WAIS-III - Échelle d'intelligence de Wechsler pour adultes* (3rd ed.).

6 Pearson Clinical & Talent assessment.

7  
8 Ye, Z., & Zhou, X. (2009). Executive control in language processing. *Neuroscience &*

9 *Biobehavioral Reviews*, 33(8), 1168–1177.  
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

For Peer Review Only

# TABLES

Table 1

Test		Score	Z-score or cut-off <sup>1</sup>	LG's deficit <sup>2</sup>	
<b>VERBAL TESTS</b>					
Intellectual function					
	Binois-Pichot Vocabulary Test <sup>3</sup>	13/44 IQ= 83	-1.33	Low Average	
	WAIS-III	Information	8/19	-0.67	Average
Language					
	Hayling test	Section A	15/15	/	
	DO80	Picture naming	75/80	<73	
	BDAE				
	Comprehension	Word discrimination	60/72	-1.80	
		Body-part identification	18/20	-0.64	
		Commands	10/15	-3.38	**
		Logical reasoning	8/12	-0.73	
	Fluency	Articulatory agility	7/7	/	
		Phrase Length	7/7	/	
		Verbal production	12/14	-0.83	
	Automatic speech	Automized sequences	9/9	/	
		Reciting	2/2	/	
	Repetition	Words	10/10	/	
		Concrete sentences	8/8	/	
		Abstract sentences	8/8	/	
	Production	Confrontation naming	85/105	-1.30	
Executive functions					
	WAIS-III verbal tests	Similarities	6/19	-1.33	Low average
	Verbal fluency	Animal (2 min)	12	-2.86	**
		Letter P (2 min)	4	-2.58	**
		Letter R (2 min)	0	-2.32	*
		Letter V (2 min)	10	-1.32	
	Hayling test	Section B	6/15	-3.97	**
Working memory					
	WAIS III	Digit span	7/19	-1.00	Low average
	Forward digit span		6	-0.45	
	Backward digit pan		3	-2.14	*



Test		Score	Z-score or cut-off <sup>1</sup>	LG's deficit <sup>2</sup>
<b>NON-VERBAL TESTS</b>				
Intellectual function				
WAIS-III	Raven progressive matrices	54/60 IQ>135	+2.33	Very superior
Executive functions				
Trail Making Test B		24/25 (80 sec)	<21 (>151 sec)	
Wisconsin card-sorting test	Series	6/6	/	
	Criteria	3/3	/	
WAIS-III picture arrangement		12/19	+0.67	Average
Ratcliff Manikin test	Mental rotation	14/16	-0.21	
Attention				
Trail Making Test A		25/25 (27 sec)	<22 (>67 sec)	
Digit cancellation test	1 digit	10/10	/	
	2 digits	20/20	/	
	3 digits	24/30	0.19	
Visual process				
PEGV	Identical figures	10/10	/	
	Entangled figures	10/10	/	
	Functional matching	10/10	/	
	Category matching	10/10	/	
Rey figure		35/36	0	

Z-scores or published cut-offs are reported for LG's scores that are not at ceiling. A negative Z-score value indicates that LG had a lower score than healthy participants. Cut-offs are indicated with superior or inferior signs. For score cut-offs, the value is the score under which a score is considered as abnormal. For time cut-offs, the value is the time above which a duration is considered as abnormal.

LG's deficit with a Z-score below 1.96 (outside the 95% confidence interval) is indicated with \* and below 2.58 (outside the 99% confidence interval) with \*\*, except for LG's WAIS normative scores for which the WAIS score interpretation is reported (Wechsler, 1997).

Table 2

	Low executive condition	High executive condition	Dissociation between low and high executive load compared to controls (RSDT)
Language comprehension	Canonical sentences: 93.7% Z-score: -0.5	Non-canonical sentences: 81.2% Z-score: -3.8	p = 0.004 ES = 3.5, 95% CI = [2.2 to 5.1]
Language production	Concrete words: 95% Z-score: 0.22	Abstract words: 65% Z-score: -5.17	p = 0.001 ES = 4.3, 95% CI = [2.6 to 6.2]
	Exemplar words: 90.3% Z-score: -0.76	Category words: 51.6% Z-score: -4.93	p < 0.001 ES = -4.2, 95% CI = [-5.5 to -2.9]

Table 2: Dissociation of LG's performance in language as a function of executive load. Conditions of the language comprehension and production tasks are classified according to the executive resources they require to be performed (low or high executive load). We reported LG's score, as well as a Z-score of LG's performance in each condition and the statistical difference (two tailed probability) between LG's standardized scores for low and high executive language conditions compared to controls using the Revised Standardized Difference Test (RSDT, Crawford et al., 2010). Effect sizes (ES) for the difference between LG and controls (Z-DCC) and 95% Bayesian Credible Interval (CI) are also reported. LG's pattern of performance fulfils the criteria of dissociation between low and high executive conditions for each of the language tasks.

Table 3

	Picture Naming		CATEX		Word finding from definition	
	DO80	BDAE	Category	Exemplar	Concrete	Abstract
Superordinate			5	1		
Semantic paraphasia	5	15	3	2		6
Phonological paraphasia					1	1
Circumlocution		5	5			
Single exemplar			2			

Table 3: Type of errors by LG in speech production tasks. The number of errors in each task is reported according to the error type. Superordinate error means that LG produced a word of a superordinate category instead of the correct word (i.e., animal instead of feline). Circumlocution error means that LG produced a phrase that circles around the target item (i.e., an item that can be found in a room instead of furniture). Single exemplar is an error that can only be produced in the Category condition of the CATEX task and where LG produced a word that corresponds to only one of the two exemplars he was presented with.

## Supplementary material

Table 1: Sentence comprehension task. Items of the Canonical and Non-canonical conditions.

Canonical sentences	
la fille qui arrose la fleur est noire	<i>the girl who waters the flower is black</i>
le cheval qui attrape le garçon est noir	<i>the horse that catches the boy is black</i>
le garçon qui attrape le cheval est noir	<i>the boy who catches the horse is black</i>
le pompier qui a des bottes noires arrose la valise	<i>the fireman who has black boots water the suitcase</i>
la fleur qui arrose la fille est blanche	<i>the flower that waters the girl is white</i>
le facteur qui a des chaussures noires mord le chien	<i>the postman with black shoes bites the dog</i>
le fleur qui arrose la fille est blanche	<i>the flower that waters the girl is white</i>
le cheval qui attrape le garçon est noir	<i>the horse that catches the boy is black</i>
le garçon qui attrape le cheval est noir	<i>the boy who catches the horse is black</i>
le pompier qui a des bottes noires arrose la valise	<i>the fireman who has black boots water the suitcase</i>
la fille qui arrose la fleur est blanche	<i>the girl who waters the flower is white</i>
le facteur qui a des chaussures noires mord le chien	<i>the postman with black shoes bites the dog</i>
le chien mord le facteur qui a des chaussures noires	<i>the dog bites the postman who has black shoes</i>
la valise arrose le pompier qui a des bottes noires	<i>the suitcase waters the fireman who has black boots</i>
le chien mord le facteur qui a des chaussures noires	<i>the dog bites the postman who has black shoes</i>
la valise arrose le pompier qui a des bottes noires	<i>the suitcase waters the fireman who has black boots</i>
Non-canonical sentences	
le garçon qu'attrape le cheval est blanc	<i>the boy the horse catches is white</i>
le cheval qu'attrape le garçon est noir	<i>the horse the boy catches is black</i>
le garçon qu'attrape le cheval est noir	<i>the boy caught by the horse is black</i>
la fille qu'arrose la fleur est blanche	<i>the girl who waters the flower is white</i>
la fille qu'arrose la fleurs est blanche	<i>the girl who waters the flowers is white</i>
la fleur qu'arrose la fille est blanche	<i>the flower the girl waters is white</i>
le cheval qu'attrape le garçon est noir	<i>the horse the boy catches is black</i>
la fleur qu'arrose la fille est blanche	<i>the flower the girl waters is white</i>
le facteur qui a des chaussures noires est mordu par le chien	<i>the postman who has black shoes is bitten by the dog</i>

1		
2		
3	la pompier qui a des bottes noires est arrosé par	<i>the fireman who has black boots is hosed down</i>
4	la valise	<i>by the suitcase</i>
5		
6	le pompier qui a des bottes noires est arrosé par	<i>the fireman who has black boots is hosed down</i>
7	la valise	<i>by the suitcase</i>
8		
9	le facteur qui a des chaussures noires est mordu	<i>the postman who has black shoes is bitten by the</i>
10	par le chien	<i>dog</i>
11		
12	la valise est arrosé par le pompier qui a des	<i>the suitcase is hosed down by the fireman who</i>
13	bottes noires	<i>has black boots</i>
14		
15	le chien est mordu par le facteur qui a de	<i>the dog is bitten by the postman who has black</i>
16	chaussures noires	<i>shoes</i>
17		
18	le chien est mordu par le facteur qui a de	<i>the dog is bitten by the postman who has black</i>
19	chaussures noires	<i>shoes</i>
20		
21	la valise est arrosé par le pompier qui a des	<i>the suitcase is hosed down by the fireman who</i>
22	bottes noires	<i>has black boots</i>
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		

Table 2: Word finding from definitions. Items of the Abstract and Concrete conditions

	Concrete		Abstract
lit	<i>bed</i>	paix	<i>peace</i>
chaise	<i>chair</i>	tante	<i>aunt</i>
chaîne	<i>chain</i>	messe	<i>mass</i>
bague	<i>Ring</i>	paire	<i>pair</i>
beurre	<i>Butter</i>	dette	<i>debt</i>
delle	<i>delle</i>	panne	<i>breakdown</i>
hanche	<i>hip</i>	honte	<i>shame</i>
feuille	<i>leaf</i>	deuil	<i>mourning</i>
quille	<i>keel</i>	bail	<i>lease</i>
barbe	<i>beard</i>	perte	<i>loss</i>
forêt	<i>forest</i>	santé	<i>health</i>
rideau	<i>curtain</i>	salut	<i>salvation</i>
cheval	<i>horse</i>	retard	<i>delay</i>
montagne	<i>Mountain</i>	semaine	<i>week</i>
journal	<i>newspaper</i>	vertige	<i>vertigo</i>
casquette	<i>cap</i>	discours	<i>speech</i>
serpent	<i>snake</i>	serment	<i>oath</i>
jardin	<i>garden</i>	respect	<i>respect</i>
horloge	<i>clock</i>	organe	<i>organ</i>
éponge	<i>sponge</i>	usure	<i>wear</i>

Table 3: Picture naming task (CATEX). Items of the Exemplar and Category conditions.

	Exemplar		Category	
1	piano	<i>piano</i>	reptiles	<i>reptiles</i>
2				
3	couteau	<i>knife</i>	vêtements	<i>clothing</i>
4				
5	marteau	<i>hammer</i>	couverts	<i>cutlery</i>
6				
7	table	<i>table</i>	outils	<i>tools</i>
8				
9	artichaut	<i>artichoke</i>	meubles	<i>furniture</i>
10				
11	banane	<i>banana</i>	animaux	<i>animals</i>
12				
13	cerveau	<i>brain</i>	oiseaux	<i>birds</i>
14				
15	fourmi	<i>ant</i>	fleurs	<i>flowers</i>
16				
17	collier	<i>necklace</i>	arbres	<i>trees</i>
18				
19	canon	<i>cannon</i>	légumes	<i>vegetables</i>
20				
21	requin	<i>shark</i>	fruits	<i>fruits</i>
22				
23	terre	<i>Earth</i>	végétaux	<i>plants</i>
24				
25	cerises	<i>cherries</i>	organes	<i>organs</i>
26				
27	voiture	<i>car</i>	insectes	<i>insects</i>
28				
29	jambe	<i>leg</i>	bijoux	<i>jewelry</i>
30				
31	un	<i>one</i>	armes	<i>weapons</i>
32				
33	serpent	<i>snake</i>	nourriture	<i>food</i>
34				
35	manteau	<i>coat</i>	félins	<i>felines</i>
36				
37	perroquet	<i>parrot</i>	jeux	<i>games</i>
38				
39	aigle	<i>eagle</i>	poissons	<i>fishes</i>
40				
41	rose	<i>pink</i>	rongeur	<i>rodent</i>
42				
43	palmier	<i>palm</i>	pièces	<i>rooms</i>
44				
45	cactus	<i>cactus</i>	bagages	<i>luggage</i>
46				
47	cœur	<i>heart</i>	planètes	<i>planets</i>
48				
49	gâteau	<i>cake</i>	desserts	<i>desserts</i>
50				
51	castor	<i>beaver</i>	vivants	<i>Living being</i>
52				
53	valise	<i>suitcase</i>	véhicules	<i>vehicles</i>
54				
55	commode	<i>dresser</i>	singes	<i>monkeys</i>
56				
57	chimpanzé	<i>chimpanzee</i>	membres	<i>limb</i>
58				
59	trompette	<i>trumpet</i>	instruments	<i>instruments</i>
60				
	trois	<i>three</i>	chiffres	<i>numbers</i>