arXiv:2303.08080v1 [cs.CL] 11 Mar 2023

Verbal behavior without syntactic structures: beyond Skinner and Chomsky

Shimon Edelman
Department of Psychology
Cornell University
https://shimon-edelman.github.io

February 4, 2019

Abstract

What does it mean to know language? Since the Chomskian revolution, one popular answer to this question has been: to possess a generative grammar that exclusively licenses certain syntactic structures. Decades later, not even an approximation to such a grammar, for any language, has been formulated; the idea that grammar is universal and innately specified has proved barren; and attempts to show how it could be learned from experience invariably come up short. To move on from this impasse, we must rediscover the extent to which language is like any other human behavior: dynamic, social, multimodal, patterned, and purposive, its purpose being to promote desirable actions (or thoughts) in others and self. Recent psychological, computational, neurobiological, and evolutionary insights into the shaping and structure of behavior may then point us toward a new, viable account of language.

Requiescat

Jade bowl
Of the greatest antiquity
'Bout time it got broke.

— Warren S. McCulloch (1965)

1 The Chomsky Option

If proposing a theory that precipitates a paradigm shift in several disciplines and becomes a byword for originality is a sign of a scientist's influence, then Chomsky's legacy is secure. The theory does not have to be right. This last point is central to Dennett's Deal — a Faustian dilemma, which serves as a commentary on varieties of scientific temperament, ambition, and achievement.[1] Chomskian linguistics makes a cameo appearance in the vicinity of the dilemma's second horn:

[1] For the interview in which Dennett discusses those matters, see https://www.edge.org/conversation/dennetts-deal.

> If Mephistopheles offered you the following two options, which would you choose?
>
> (1) to win the race (and the accompanying Nobel Prize!) for pinning down a discovery that became the basis for a huge expansion of scientific knowledge [. . .];
>
> (2) to propose a theory so original, so utterly unimagined before your work, that your surname enters the language — but your theory turns out to be dead wrong, though it continues to generate centuries of arguably valuable controversy (I think of Lamarckian theories of evolution, and Cartesian theories of the mind. The jury is still out on Chomskian linguistics. It certainly passes the originality test. Like the victory of the America in the race that gave the America's Cup its name, there was no second anywhere in sight when Chomsky burst on the scene.)
>
> — D. C. Dennett (1999)

In the couple of decades that went by since that interview with Dennett, the case against Chomskian linguistics gained much momentum.[2] It seems to me, however, that Chomsky's accomplishment extends beyond showcasing option (2) in Dennett's Deal. Independently of whether his theory of language is right or "dead wrong," Chomsky's contribution exemplifies — indeed, epitomizes — a third option, not broached by Dennett:

> (3) to define the parameters of the discourse, in an entire cluster of disciplines, so decisively that even people who oppose your theory are forever forced to argue on your terms.

The discourse parameters set by Chomsky in an extensive body of extremely influential work, beginning with his *Syntactic Structures* (1957) and review of B. F. Skinner's *Verbal behavior* (1959), can be succinctly characterized by a tripartite dogma, stated next.

1.1 The grammar dogma

The following three interlinked assumptions are nearly universally accepted by linguists, regardless of their theoretical persuasion:

1. that the *sentence* is the unit of language production and comprehension;
2. that some sentences are *well-formed*, while others are not;
3. that sentences are generated by a set of formal syntactic rules — a *grammar* — enforcing well-formedness in production and relying on it in comprehension.

The concept of grammar, which anchors the Chomskian dogma, has proved to be particularly pervasive and has spread far beyond the boundaries of linguistics. It has been and is being invoked by theorists in domains of inquiry ranging from psychology, through animal communication, music, anthropology, and various branches of philosophy (of mind; of language; of psychology; of science; of morals), to literary theory, history, archaeology, and cultural analysis.[3][A]

[2] A capsule review of the current version of Chomsky's theory appears in (Everaert et al., 2015). The opposition to it comes from many quarters, represented by (Tomasello, 1998; Lamb, 2004; Postal, 2004b; Evans and Levinson, 2009; Ramscar and Port, 2016).

[3] I have relegated the relevant references to Endnote [A] to avoid distracting the reader inordinately.

In linguistics and in the psychology of language, it is nearly impossible these days to formulate, test, and defend a theory that does not take a stance with regard to the nature and role of grammar.[4] Even researchers who would rather stay clear of the concept of grammar find themselves arguing against it,[5] thereby lending a certain legitimacy to a conceptual framework which, should it go down, would take along linguistics as we know it, re-revolutionize cognitive psychology,[6] and send aftershocks through many parts of the human intellectual endeavor.

Given the scope of the problem of grammar, and how it affects both the formalist, Chomskian orthodoxy and the various "heresies" (functionalist, usage-based, etc.), it is fascinating to observe how much of it is due to poor meta-theoretical choices. These, in turn, signify a disregard of what is otherwise considered to be the standard methodology in the cognitive sciences.

1.2 On the proper methodology in behavioral and brain science

What computational structures and algorithms give rise to linguistic behavior? At present, most linguists — including those who hold that humans (and only humans) possess a language organ (Hauser et al., 2002) and who therefore claim to practice "biolinguistics" (Fitch, 2009) — put this computational/algorithmic question first:

> We need to distill what we know from linguistic theory into a set of computational primitives, and try to link them with models and specific principles of neural computation. [...] We need a list of computations that linguistic theorists deem indispensable to solve their particular problem (e.g., in phonology, syntax, or semantics) (Fitch, 2009, p.298).

Now, building a research program on "computations that linguistic theorists deem indispensable to solve their particular problem" can only work if the linguists have got the *problem* right. Therein lies the rub: across all cognitive domains, it is this abstract, problem level (using Marr's (1982) terminology) that presents the greatest, yet least appreciated difficulties. On this level, it is all too easy to fall in with an intuitively appealing hypothesis, which may then lead the entire research program down a dead-end path. A case in point is vision, where, following Marr's (1982) own influential arguments, it was believed for a long time that the overarching problem is to reconstruct the three-dimensional layout of the visual world and the volumetric part structure of objects. This theoretical approach ultimately proved to be barren (Barrow and Tenenbaum, 1993; Dickinson et al., 1997; Edelman, 2002, 2009), and has been gradually abandoned in favor of the use of learning to map visual data to various task-dictated representations (Edelman, 2012; Krizhevsky et al., 2012; Oliva, 2013).

For this reason, the current consensus view in cognitive sciences, forty years after Marr (1977; see also Marr, 1982; Poggio, 2012), is that representation- and algorithm-level questions cannot be settled without also addressing the other, complementary levels of understanding: the problem level (what is it, in terms of computation, that needs to be done, and why?) and the implementation level (how are the posited algorithms realized by the system?). Moreover, for any natural biological computational phenomenon such as language, the Marr hierarchy must be extended to include evolution, development, and behavioral ecology (Mayr, 1961; Tinbergen, 1963), which are all interrelated (Laland et al., 2011).

[4] This can only be expected, given how polemical discourse typically works (Apothèloz et al., 1993).

[5] Not excepting the present chapter.

[6] Thereby overturning the regime established after the first cognitive revolution (Miller, 2003).

Any research program in linguistics must, therefore, be examined for tacitly assumed, and possibly wrong, answers to questions that arise on various levels of the Mayr/Tinbergen/Marr hierarchy.[7] In this paper, I do so while focusing on programs that belong to two camps: formalist, whose adherents hold that the core issues in linguistics have to do with the structure of utterances, and functionalist, where the overarching concern is with the use of language in communication (for a discussion of this distinction, see, e.g., Newmeyer, 2016). The history of modern linguistics is the history of the tension between these two camps, which stems from the disparity between the answers they give to the fundamental problem-level question:

- What is language for? (Section 2)

It may be surprising to some that the answers offered by formalists and by functionalists to the next two questions

- What is language like? (Section 3)
- What does it mean to know language? (Section 4)

are identical; both hinge on the concept of grammar. To decide whether or not this has been a good methodological choice (that is, whether the assumption it incorporates was ultimately fruitful), I then ask:

- Where has this gotten us? (Section 5)

The conclusions of the ensuing review of the achievements of the formalist and functionalist research programs are rather bleak,[8] which is all the more reason to move on to the last question:

- Where should we go from here? (Section 6)

In that section, I outline an alternative research program that aims to engage with all the levels of the Mayr/Tinbergen/Marr hierarchy: evolution, development, behavior, computational problems, algorithms, and implementation in the brain.

2 What is language for?

Asking this kind of question about a mental faculty[9] is always a useful exercise, because the intuitively obvious answer so often ends up being wrong. What is memory for? The storehouse metaphor, which had been a staple of psychology textbooks ever since the cognitive revolution, and which suggests that memory is "for storing information," has by now been largely rejected (Koriat and Goldsmith, 1996; Glenberg, 1997; Gilbert and Wilson, 2007). Indeed, the very notion that memory involves a definite number of discrete

[7] A mistaken view, on which the levels are independent and can be studied in isolation, appears to be prevalent in linguistics. Thus, while Walenski and Ullman (2005) refer to the importance of levels of explanation as "another tenet of the cognitive revolution," they proceed to state that "On this view, a given phenomenon is best accounted for at a particular level of explanation that is largely independent from other levels."

[8] Some of the points I make here merit book-length treatment. In formulating them, I opted for brevity: rather than pretending that the issues can be easily settled, my goal is to provoke doubt, with regard to even the most hallowed assumptions of the orthodoxy.

[9] Or even about an aspect of an animal's anatomy or physiology.

storage slots (as per G. A. Miller's (1956) famous title "magical number seven, plus or minus two") is now seen as a baseless idealization (Ma et al., 2014; Brady et al., 2016). Instead, a plausible concise answer to the memory question at present is that memory works "in the service of perception and action" (Glenberg, 1997) — in other words, memory is for behavior.

A similar process of transcending the obvious, and wrong, answer is under way in vision. What is vision for? The opening passage of Marr's *Vision* (1982), one of the most influential books in cognitive science, stated that "the plain man's answer (and Aristotle's, too) would be, to know what is where by looking." Although this idea still drives much of the research in "neural networks"-style AI, it is increasingly recognized as inadequate in robotics (Aloimonos et al., 1988; Ballard, 1991; Breazeal et al., 2001) and especially in theories of biological vision (Noë, 2004; Edelman, 2006, 2012, 2015). It seems that vision is *for* the same thing memory is for: behavior (Edelman, 2016). What, then, could language be for?

2.1 The formalist approach

Relying too much on common sense in deciding what language is for is not something that formalist linguistics can be accused of. Marr's "plain man" (and perhaps Aristotle, too) would likely be surprised by the Chomskian answer to this question, namely, that language is *for* structured thinking (Everaert et al., 2015). Isn't language the ultimate tool of human sociality, which has evolved in the service of, and used for, communication? Not according to the Minimalist view, which holds that the use of language in communication is derivative and "ancillary" (Everaert et al., 2015) to its use as a formal computational system, or grammar, for structuring thoughts. On this view, communication is mediated by two interfaces: one that maps back and forth between the grammar and logical forms that express meanings and the other that maps between the grammar and sequences of motor acts in the auditory or gestural medium. Through this second interface, the grammar of a language supposedly sanctions all and only the well-formed sentences (that is, stand-alone utterances) in that language.

2.2 The functionalist approach

An alternative take, which justifies my choice of the "functionalist" label for the theories that share it, is that language is *for* communication, because that's what the overt function of language seems to be. While language is clearly extremely useful in assisting and augmenting human thinking (A. Clark, 1998), most psychologists (and some linguists) hold that the primary utility of language and the origin of its versatility are in the social domain: "Language is first and foremost an instrument of communication — the "*exchange* of thoughts," as one dictionary puts it — and it is only derivatively an instrument of thought" (H. Clark, 1996, p.325; see also Bruner, 1975; Bates and MacWhinney, 1982; Pinker and Jackendoff, 2005). In this framework too, thoughts that are to be communicated take the form of well-formed sentences, each with a well-defined meaning, as per the standard view of what communication is and how it works (for a recent, computationally sophisticated and explicit example, see Goodman and Frank, 2016).

3 What is language like?

The shared focus on sentences and well-formedness characterizes also the respective answers offered by formalists and functionalists regarding the question of what language is like. Indeed, here there is even less of a difference between the two frameworks.

3.1 The formalist approach

While the details of the formalist answer to the question of what language is like have changed more than once between the publication of *Syntactic Structures* (Chomsky, 1957) and *The Minimalist Program* (Chomsky, 1995), the core story has remained the same. It goes roughly as follows. Although language superficially appears to consist of linear sequences of gestures (vocal, visual, or others), what it *really* consists of, and what determines whether or not sentences (standalone, self-contained sequences) are well-formed, is their hidden hierarchical structure — specifically, labeled trees in which both intermediate nodes and leaves may belong to abstract categories, including empty elements and traces left by elements that moved elsewhere.[10]

The notion of syntax (Shibatani, 2015) within this framework corresponds to a set of phenomena that are derived from two key assumptions: (i) the discrete infinity of language and (ii) the existence in utterances of structure that transcends the mere linear sequencing of elements (Phillips, 2003). (Although these assumptions are treated by syntacticians as self-evident axioms, they can and have been questioned, as we'll see in Section 6.) A corpus of language is thus supposed to consist of well-formed sequences of potentially unbounded length that possess hidden structure, characterized by constituency, hierarchy (c-command, scope), various types of dependencies, and constraints on dependencies.[11]

3.2 The functionalist approach

The functionalist answer to the question of what language consists of is identical to the formalist one: hierarchical structures over discrete elements, which may include abstract category labels. For instance, an early construction grammar analysis of the sentence "What did Lisa buy the child?" includes, in addition to the six trivial, fully lexicalized constructions (words), five fully abstract ones: ditransitive, question, subject-auxiliary inversion, VP, and NP (Goldberg, 2003, fig.1).

In another example, Arbib and Lee (2008, Figures 3-6) describe the hypothetical process of mapping a meaning to a sentence that expresses it as beginning with a semantically annotated tree structure that encodes the desired meaning, and proceeding through a series of derivations to cover that tree with another tree — a kind of phrase structure representation from which the resulting sentence can be read out.[12]

3.3 The language myth

The above comparison reveals that the difference between formalists and functionalists regarding the nature of language is rather superficial. On the formalist account, which puts thinking first, a *thought* is a well-formed sentence, to which there is attached a meaning. In comparison, on the functionalist account, which focuses on communication, a *message* is a well-formed sentence, to which there is attached a meaning. Thus, in both cases, grammar rules the day, so to speak, insofar as it underlies sentence well-formedness.

This preoccupation with grammar and syntactic well-formedness handicaps any theory of semantics that accedes to playing second fiddle to syntax (Lakoff, 1971; Partee, 2014). Merely elevating semantics above syntax is, however, of no avail, as long as one does not acknowledge an even more serious theoretical liability: the view of language as a code. As Love (2004, p.529) states it,

[10] For a typical example, plucked at random from a huge literature, see (Graf, 2012, Fig.1).

[11] The same conceptual domain of syntactic phenomena is sketched by Townsend and Bever (2001, ch.3), under the heading "What every psychologist should know about grammar."

[12] Note that unless the sentence — the carrier of meaning — is complete and well-formed, it cannot be formally interpreted: the syntactic parser would crash before the semantic interpretation stage can even be reached.

> It is the idea that linguistic *communication* takes place in virtue of shared knowledge of the particular inventory of form-meaning correlations that constitutes the language in use. Communicating is a matter of encoding and decoding messages in terms of the shared code. In fact, these two ideas form a closed circle: the fixed-code concept of a language explains how communication is possible, while if this is what communicating is, then languages have to be fixed codes to enable communication to take place. This, in a nutshell, is what Roy Harris calls the 'language myth' (see e.g. Harris, 1981).

Even if the communication of meanings (in the narrow sense of the exchange of messages) is what language is for, it is, or should be, a truism that the practical import of a message — its effect on the listener (and/or the speaker), which is a reasonable way of operationalizing meaning — is fully contained neither in the sequence of words that comprise an utterance, nor in its combination with a putative grammar that assigns to it some other, perhaps hierarchical, structure (see Ramscar and Baayen, 2013). In Section 6.2, I sketch an alternative view of language, which does not take it to be a code.

4 What does it mean to know language?

At this point, it should be unsurprising that both formalist and functionalist theories equate the knowledge of language with the possession of grammar. Still, for symmetry and completeness' sake, I shall proceed to state the obvious.

4.1 The formalist approach

The formalist accounts, with their postulates of discrete infinity and hidden structure of language, are naturally centered on the notion of grammar — a formal system that generates all and only well-formed sentences and is also used in parsing (recovering the structure of a sentence). Stabler (2013a), paraphrasing an expression from (Bever, 1970), called grammar "the epicenter of linguistic behavior." More recently, Lau et al. (2016) noted that "[...] the view of a formal grammar as a binary decision procedure has been dominant in theoretical linguistics for the past 60 years." The centrality of grammar and the presumed "autonomy of syntax" (Chomsky, 2004, p.138), are among the foundations of the most recent incarnation of Chomsky's theory: the Minimalist Program (Chomsky, 1995), which holds that grammar — a formal recursive system for building hierarchical structures — is in charge over the other components of the language faculty: "syntax creates structures that are interpreted at the interfaces with the Articularory-Perceptual [*sic*] and Conceptual-Intentional [meaning] systems" (Irurtzun, 2009, p.141).

4.2 The functionalist approach

The functionalists may disagree among themselves as to what precise form grammar takes, but they are nearly unanimous in endorsing the notion of grammar itself: witness titles such as "Functionalist approaches to grammar" (Bates and MacWhinney, 1982), "Grammar and conceptualization" (Langacker, 1999), "Radical construction grammar" (Croft, 2001), or "Grammar as architecture for function" (Du Bois et al., 2003). To the extent that modern functionalist linguistic approaches arise out of opposition to, and are motivated by the perceived failures of, formalist linguistics, one wonders whether anything short of complete repudiation of the foundational tenets of the latter would ever suffice. In what follows, I argue that it would not.

5 Where has this gotten us?

The short answer to this question, in my opinion, is: "Not too damn far."[13] Because the formalist and the functionalist approaches hardly differ in their conceptual foundations, in the brief critique of their achievements that I offer in Section 5.1 I lump them together. I then evaluate, in the equally brief Section 5.2, a selection of empirical methods that are light on linguistic theory, a category that includes most of the work in applied natural language processing or NLP. As we shall see, while some of the empirical successes have been very impressive, they have little bearing on key issues in real natural language learning and use.

5.1 The formalist/functionalist approaches

My present case for the explanatory barrenness of grammar rests on two sets of considerations: the nature of evidence required to substantiate linguistic theories; and computational, psychological, and neurobiological findings regarding the reality of syntactic structures posited by these theories.

5.1.1 On the required evidence in linguistics

What kind of evidence should we require when evaluating a theory involving grammar? If linguistics were merely a branch of mathematics (as is formal language theory, to which Chomsky made seminal contributions; Hopcroft and Ullman, 1979), the question of evidence would have been moot: mathematicians are free to chose their axioms and to use them to derive whatever theorems that follow. Grammarians do, however, explicitly claim to be doing science, as indicated for instance by Chomsky's long-standing insistence on calling his program "Galilean linguistics" (critiqued in detail by Behme, 2014b) and by the recent ascendance of biolinguistics. Thus, evidence *is* required for claims about the reality (or at least relevance) of posited syntactic structures, over and above the possibility of deriving such structures from "axioms" (which would have sufficed in mathematics).

Grumbling about the scarcity of such evidence has been going on for as long as formalist claims have been made. It tends to intensify periodically, as linguistic theories are abandoned or mutate beyond recognition.[14] Examples range from complaints by outsiders about the apparent lack of empirical support for Minimalism (Edelman and Christiansen, 2003) to a wholesale labeling by an eminent linguist of the entire Chomskian enterprise as "junk linguistics" (Postal, 2004a). The problem of evidence in linguistics has also attracted the attention of philosophers of science (e.g., Behme, 2014a).

In the interests of brevity, I shall focus here exclusively on the famous metatheoretical criterion due to Laplace (1812): "The weight of evidence for an extraordinary claim must be proportioned to its strangeness." Are the structures posited by grammar-based theories of language extraordinary? The "linguistic wars" of the 1970s, which revealed major conceptual fault lines and left linguistics fractured, were brought about by the perception on part of a large contingent of linguists that syntactic complexity was getting out of hand and out of touch with psychological reality: "The underlying structures of the Generative semanticists became more and more abstract, often resembling first-order logic, and those structures plus the syntactic rules to

[13] This view is not very common among linguists, but it is occasionally encountered. One variant is due to Sampson (2007, p.29): "[. . .] Over the half-century during which the generative conception of grammar has been influential, it does not appear that the possibility in principle that grammars could tell us about minds has led to many specific discoveries about mental functioning or mental structure." Similarly, Walenski and Ullman (2005, p.328) state: "What has *not* emerged is a true science of language."

[14] E.g., Townsend and Bever (2001): "the rapid changes in syntactic theories have left psychologists in large part baffled as to how to integrate grammatical knowledge and behavior in rigorous models."

get from there to surface structure often seemed 'wild'. In one famous example, the underlying structure for 'Floyd broke the glass' had 8 clauses" (Partee, 2014, p.8).

Partee (2014) proceeds to remark that "What seemed 'wild' then [in early 1970s] might not now: the shocking number of clauses (7 or 8) in Ross's deep structure for 'Floyd broke the glass' does not come close to the number of functional projections that now intervene between various pairs of 'familiar' syntactic categories in respected generative analyses such as Cinque (1999)." Linguists working within the Minimalist framework routinely debate alternative analyses which all tend to be that complex, without ever questioning the reasonableness of this complexity. For instance, the syntactic analysis of the sentence fragment "A picture I like," discussed by Stabler (2001, p.331), is a tree consisting of 30 nodes. Now, the number of tree nodes between successive words has traditionally been used as a measure of syntactic complexity. Brennan et al. (2016), who use this measure in their search for brain activity evidence in support of syntax (more about which below), consider a Minimalist parse in which 18 nodes intervene between the words "fallen" and "by" in the sentence "I wonder how many miles I have fallen by this time."

Even if we set aside the question of how plausible syntactic theory is from the standpoint of neurobiology,[15] a strong sense of unease remains. When the syntactic tree purporting to describe the structure of a four-word phrase does so in terms of categories most of which have no lexical counterparts and is too deep to fit on a journal page, something is out of joint. Whether or not the claim of the reality of such structures is true, it comes across, to me, as pretty extraordinary.

5.1.2 On the available evidence in linguistics

Are any of the historical or modern contenders for a theory of syntax supported by evidence that is commensurate with the extraordinary claims that are being made? It may seem reasonable to require that linguists who propose to explain natural language by positing the existence of a formal grammar that generates it take observable data — a corpus of real language — and infer from it the grammar in question. Unfortunately, from the standpoint of computational complexity, formal language theory is a mixed bag: many interesting problems, including grammatical inference for potentially relevant classes of grammars, are intractable (Clark and Lappin, 2013; Heinz et al., 2015). In any case, even when positive results in learnability become available (e.g., Clark, 2013), they are more likely to be argued away rather than adopted by those syntacticians who follow Chomsky's "argument from the poverty of the stimulus" (POS; Chomsky, 1986) in holding grammar to be unlearnable and therefore necessarily essentially innate (Berwick et al., 2011), as per the hypothesis of Universal Grammar.[16]

It should be noted that the denial of learnability of grammar undermines the very theoretical enterprise that has engendered it: if grammar is algorithmically unlearnable, how reliable can the grammarians' intuitions about it be? The standard POS reply to this concern is that "positive data" such as grammaticality judgments that are relied upon by theorists (often to the exclusion of any other data) are not available to developing infants. The POS stance does not, however, withstand empirical scrutiny by fellow linguists

[15] Questions of neurobiological plausibility arise, for instance, in connection with the claim that the brain harbors symbolic representations of dozens of "functional categories" posited by Rizzi and Cinque (2016) or that it implements the complex, logically constrained string rewriting (Stabler, 2013b), which is required for most types of syntactic derivations, notably the ones postulated by Minimalists, to work.

[16] The POS argument (see Pullum and Scholz, 2002 for a critical analysis) proposes that language must be innate because overt data never contain enough information for the proper generalizations to be learned from experience; a typical claim is that "A person might go through much or all of his life without ever having been exposed" to relevant information (Piattelli-Palmarini, 1980, p.40). On the POS account, structural generalization is possible despite being unlearnable because it is supported by an innate "Universal Grammar"; this notion is discussed and critiqued in references listed in the next paragraph.

(Pullum and Scholz, 2002; Clark and Lappin, 2011) and is generally rejected by developmental psychologists and neuroscientists (Bates, 1994; Bates and Goodman, 1999; Tomasello, 2003; Goldstein et al., 2010; Edelman and Waterfall, 2007; Syal and Finlay, 2010). The same goes for Universal Grammar (Jacobson, 1966; McCawley, 1982; Comrie, 1988; Bouchard, 2012; Evans and Levinson, 2009; Ambridge et al., 2015).

Be it as it may, none of the syntacticians' efforts so far has led to the formulation of a sizeable-coverage (let alone complete) grammar for any language.[17] Instead, explanations are offered for selected syntactic phenomena, which themselves are invariably formulated exclusively in terms of abstract, and therefore not directly observable, constructs of syntactic theory. When an account clashes with new "data" (that is, binary judgments of grammaticality, typically produced by the theorists themselves), the contradiction is ignored (following Chomsky's principle of "epistemological tolerance"; Kertész, 2012), or else the assumptions underlying the original analysis are modified or withdrawn in favor of new ones.[18] The theoretical discourse in the study of grammar is thus markedly self-contained, with little or no input from empirical methodologies[19] or from neighboring disciplines.

Meanwhile, in the neighboring disciplines of psycholinguistics and neurolinguistics (not to be confused with "biolinguistics"), attempts to glean relevant evidence have been under way all along. The results do not bode well for grammar-based accounts. Two of the fronts the news from which have been consistently bad are: (1) investigations into the nature of grammaticality judgments and (2) studies that probe the reality of various theoretical constructs advanced by grammarians.

That grammaticality (or "grammaticalness"; Chomsky, 1957) is graded has been known to psycholinguists for a long time (e.g., Kess, 1976),[20] and has even been discussed by Chomsky (1964). The full extent of the problem that grammaticality judgments pose for formalist linguistics became a major topic of discussion only relatively recently (Schütze, 1996). Grammaticality judgments are the primary source of data for students of grammar (a methodological choice that depends entirely on the acceptance of the grammar dogma). Nevertheless, the problems surrounding grammaticality have had little effect on syntactic theorizing, which traditionally isolates itself from psycholinguistics by claiming a distinction between linguistic *competence* — hypothetically, perfect in all native speakers, but unobserved — and "mere" *performance*, whose imperfections mask the perfect competence, making it unobservable in principle (Chomsky, 1965). Given the immunity to falsification of this distinction, in psycholinguistics the concept of grammaticality has been all but displaced by acceptability. Nevertheless, the weight of the accumulated evidence regarding its gradedness has attained such proportions (Lau et al., 2016) that even the impregnable competence/performance wall is beginning to show cracks.[21]

Considering how central the existence of a brain basis for syntax is to Chomskian (bio)linguistics, the scarcity of behavioral and brain evidence for syntactic structures is striking. One relatively uncontroversial set of findings has to do with the "phrase structure" hypothesis, common to most theories of syntax, according to which sentences possess hierarchical, in addition to linear, structure. In an early study, Johnson

[17] While hand-constructed or automatically learned grammars may be good at parsing, they are typically very bad at generation. State of the art natural language generation systems (e.g., Sharma et al., 2016) shun grammar-based approaches (relying instead on "neural networks") and report human evaluations based on "appropriateness" instead of grammaticality; still, their performance, even in highly constrained domains, is middling at best.

[18] "[...] How can anyone maintain the hypothesis of a universal grammar? The answer is to make the concept immune to falsification." — M. Tomasello, commenting on (Everett, 2005).

[19] Even those rooted in formal language theory (e.g., Kornai, 1998).

[20] And so has been also the dependency of grammaticality on context (Langacker, 1998) — which shows that considering language one "sentence" at a time is a mistake.

[21] Yet, the wall still stands: Lau et al. (2016) make a point of noting that "We are not of course denying the distinction between competence and performance."

(1965) showed that the error rates of subjects who had memorized a set of multi-clause sentences spiked at the boundaries between clauses posited by a structural analysis and were higher, the higher in the syntactic tree the boundary was supposed to reside. Half a century later, little has been added to that finding: results obtained using state of the art magnetoencephalography (MEG) brain imaging showed that, in subjects listening to connected speech, "cortical activity of different timescales concurrently tracked the time course of abstract linguistic structures at different hierarchical levels, such as words, phrases and sentences" (Ding et al., 2016).

In comparison to the basic phrase structure, evidence supporting the reality of more far-fetched theoretical constructs, such as movement, traces/copies, etc., remains elusive. The endemic problem is the possibility of alternative explanations of response time or brain activity differences: not in terms of the targeted syntactic distinction, but rather in terms of some other distinction (pragmatic, semantic, etc.) that had not been, and in many experimental designs could not have been, controlled. It must be particularly disappointing when a sophisticated syntactic account is overshadowed by a glaringly primitive one, as seems to have happened in the impeccably conceived and executed study of (Brennan et al., 2016), mentioned earlier.

In that experiment, the time course of brain activity of subjects listening to natural speech was regressed on several predictors, including running estimates of syntactic complexity calculated from several sources: node-counting approximations to Minimalist parses and to parses generated by a context-free phrase structure grammar, as well as Markov or n-gram language models with $n = 2, 3$. In the regression, the magnitude of the β coefficients of predictors derived from Markov models and from the phrase structure grammar exceeded those derived from the Minimalist grammar. While a step-wise analysis suggested that the latter did make a distinct contribution, it could easily have been due to some other neurocomputational phenomenon that masqueraded as an increase in node count in the parse tree. As with other attempts to prove that syntax is real (e.g., is represented and processed as such in the brain), this pattern of findings is not quite the extraordinary body of evidence that is called for.

5.2 Empirical work and NLP

The chronic lack of independent empirical support for theories of syntax has prompted many engineers and (in cognitive psychology) modelers interested in language to adopt a theory-neutral stance while mounting algorithmic attacks on problems such as language acquisition, parsing, and understanding. In natural language processing (NLP), this approach is associated with the famous engineer's quip "Whenever I fire a linguist, our system performance improves" (Jelinek, 1988). While NLP has made great progress in certain applied tasks (for instance, achieving human parity on a natural speech transcription benchmark; Xiong et al., 2016), all these tasks share the same common characteristic: they reduce to mapping inputs to outputs, which makes them amenable to supervised learning (particularly with state of the art "deep network" technology, combined with massive amounts of training data), yet mostly irrelevant to natural language behavior. As I wrote elsewhere, deep networks "can serve as a good model of behavior only if we pretend that behavior amounts to one Google (or Watson) query after another" (Edelman, 2015).

If it turned out to be possible to learn a decent-coverage grammar from realistic data, the empirical approach would have justified itself (in which case syntactic theory would at least have something to look up to). At present, however, this possibility seems remote: frontal attacks, algorithmic or heuristic, on language acquisition either do not scale up, or result in precision/recall performance that barely exceeds that of Markov models. Pretending that this is just fine — because the competition performs even worse, or perhaps because the resulting model replicates certain features of human performance — exemplifies a kind "soft bigotry of reduced expectations," which characterized some of my own work on language acquisition

(Solan et al., 2005; Kolodny et al., 2015).[22]

This deplorable state of affairs is of course not specific to language acquisition: it characterizes all linguistic endeavors that accept the dogma, spelled out in Section 1, at the core of which are the concepts of syntactic well-formedness and of grammar. For as long as this dogma stands, all attempts to learn and use language, or to understand how it works — theory-neutral or theory-laden, evidence-driven or "Galilean" — will fail.

6 Where should we go from here?

In light of the scope and the pervasiveness of the problem of grammar, nothing short of a series of radical changes in the basic assumptions, the theoretical stance, and the empirical methodology of linguistics will suffice to set things straight. In this section, I sketch an alternative view of language, motivated by the above diagnosis, and outline a four-strand research plan that aims to elucidate the psychology of language, its computational basis, its evolution, and its brain mechanisms.

6.1 How radical?

How radical should our collective conceptual change of heart be? Some writers in formalist linguistics (e.g., Phillips, 2011) do consider alternative explanations for syntax (usually ones that are rooted in "performance" constraints). Others, who are particularly impressed by psycholinguistic findings on language use, relegate grammar to a role that is secondary to pragmatics (Horn and Ward, 2004), as in the "syntax last" hypothesis (Bever et al., 1998) or in the idea of "opportunistic processing" (Jackendoff, 2011; Acuña-Fariña, 2016).

On a more fundamental level, there are linguists who call for a reevaluation of the basic methodology of linguistics, while retaining the concept of grammar (e.g., Postal, 2004b; Haider, 2016).[23] Approaches that are more strongly revisionist reject certain key formalist (Minimalist) tenets, such as the role of recursion, while retaining the core dogma: according to Everett (2017, p.54), grammar is still there, as "a set of organizing principles for constructing complex utterances out of symbols."

My feeling is that even such relatively far-reaching measures will not do: a more radical change is needed. Rejecting the grammar dogma and its corollaries does have some precedents in the science of language. For instance, Sampson (2007) writes, "I believe that the concept of 'ungrammatical' or 'ill-formed' word-sequences is a delusion, based on a false conception of the kind of thing a human language is." A better conception of grammar and of communication that it ultimately serves is offered by LaPolla (2015), who views communication "not as coding and decoding, but as ostension and inference."[24] This process is dynamic and distributed across the participants in a conversation (Ramscar and Baayen, 2013; Linell, 2013, 2016; this is a key observation, which underlies also Du Bois' (2014) notion of "dialogic" syntax).

An entirely unorthodox conception of language, which incorporates many of the ideas just mentioned, but also decidedly rejects the grammar dogma, motivates the "integrational" linguistics of Roy Harris, who

[22] This memorable phrase was coined by a speechwriter to the 43rd president of the United States. The idea that it may be applicable to the present case is not necessarily shared by my coauthors.

[23] Albeit perhaps a model-theoretic, or descriptive, rather than a generative one (Postal, 2008).

[24] "That is, one person doing something to show the intention to communicate, and then another person using abductive inference to infer the reason for the person's ostensive act, creating a context of interpretation in which the communicator's ostensive act "makes sense", and thereby inferring the communicative and informative intention of the person" (LaPolla, 2015, p.31).

wrote that "From an integrational perspective, there are no 'rules of grammar'."[25] However, empirical work within the integrationist framework is typically descriptive rather than explanatory, while some of its theoretical strands (e.g., Mendoza, 2011) amount to a return to Skinner's behaviorism.

The framework that I outline next takes a similar stance on grammar, pragmatics, ostension and inference, and dynamic interaction among speakers/listeners, while insisting on the need for a computational account for the postulated synthesis.

6.2 An alternative conception of language

I introduce the proposed framework via answers to the series of questions posed in the beginning of this paper.

- **What language is for.** Language has emerged, and continues to evolve, under evolutionary pressure to serve as a set of tools for dynamically and occasionally strategically influencing the behavior of others — that is, for communication, construed not as the exchange of coded messages but as intervening in the others' thought processes — and of self.[26] A related view is that

  > Language works by presenting and manipulating cultural affordances that will cause one's dialog partner(s) to see and do what the speaker intends to be seen and done (Anderson, 2016).

- **What language is like.** Language is situated, incremental, dynamically constrained, concurrent, multimodal social behavior that is subject to interpretation:

  > A language is a second-order cultural construct, perpetually open-ended and incomplete, arising out of the first-order activity of making and interpreting linguistic signs, which in turn is a real-time, contextually determined process of investing behaviour or the products of behaviour (vocal, gestural or other) with semiotic significance (Love, 2004, p.530).

  As any other behavior, it is both structured and constrained in its structure, albeit to a greater extent than in other task domains. Importantly, its structure is "open-ended and incomplete" — a key characteristic, which alone rules out the grammar dogma. Compare (Sampson, 2007, p.10):

  > [...] The grammatical possibilities of a language are like a network of paths in open grassland. There are a number of heavily used, wide and well-beaten tracks. Other, less popular routes are narrower, and the variation extends smoothly down to routes used only very occasionally, which are barely distinguishable furrows or, if they are used rarely enough, perhaps not even visible as permanent marks in the grass; but there are no fences anywhere preventing any particular route being used, and there is no sharp discontinuity akin to the contrast between metalled roads and foot-made paths.

  I shall return to discuss this metaphor later.

[25] Quoted from `http://www.royharrisonline.com/integrational_linguistics/integrationism_introduction.html`. For a sample of the body of work produced within the integrational framework, see the special issue of Language Sciences for July 2011 (vol. 33(4):475-724).

[26] Interestingly, even verbal reasoning seems to fall under this rubric (Mercier and Sperber, 2011).

- **What it means to know language.** To know language is to have a set of skills for intentionally influencing behavior and thought.[27]

6.3 A work plan

I shall now outline the four key components of a research program intended to substantiate the proffered working hypotheses about language. The four themes are the ecological and ethological characteristics of language, the computational processes that support it, the evolutionary roots of language, and its brain basis.

6.3.1 Ecology and ethology of language

Although explaining language will require coordinated understanding on all four fronts, priority may be given to the study of linguistic behavior, because it can serve as a rich source of constraints on computational theory and neurobiology. The new psycholinguistics should recognize the multiple factors that shape language, including human nature, culture, and the external environment (Steffensen and Fill, 2014) and develop a methodology that would do justice to the socially situated, multidimensional data generated by language use in realistic settings (Weigand, 2011, p.546). Both these challenges are not yet widely recognized, let alone addressed.

The notion that language should be studied as a dialogic, social phenomenon (which requires dropping the pretense that isolated sentences or monologues will do) is gaining recognition in psycholinguistics. Publications in this area are still mostly programmatic (e.g., Pickering and Garrod, 2004; Linell, 2013; Steffensen and Fill, 2014; Du Bois, 2014), in part because not much realistic dialogue-derived data are available (a prominent exception is Du Bois's Santa Barbara Corpus).[28] Typically, these works describe theoretical frameworks centered around rather abstract principles and concepts such as interactive alignment in production and comprehension (Pickering and Garrod, 2004), the "non-locality" (Steffensen, 2015) and the distributed nature of "languaging" (Linell, 2013), or even just the dialogicity of syntax (Du Bois, 2014).

Both the collection and the use of empirical data in the dialogic/distributed approaches to language face unique difficulties. First, naturalistic language behavior is necessarily multidimensional: conversations involve multiple, parallel, asynchronously unfolding strands of information (Kolodny and Edelman, 2015) and may be conducted in complex ecological (physical and social) settings, which all lead to a flood of data. Second, conversations often depend on the speakers' shared and/or unique personal history (Steffensen, 2015), which makes a corpus that neglects to somehow take it into account necessarily incomplete. Third, the overwhelming combinatorics of all these factors, which conspire to make every conversation unique, necessitates supplementing the popular "big data" approaches in empirical science and engineering with ones that work for particulars or isolated case studies, an approach that Steffensen (2016) has dubbed "cognitive probatonics."[29]

[27] Clearly, this requires that some prior knowledge be shared among the users of language. The form that such knowledge may take, the computational processes that make use of it, and their possible brain basis are discussed in (Edelman, 2017).

[28] While Pickering and Garrod (2004) call their proposal a "model," their coverage of the architecture of the language system (section 7.2) consists of three paragraphs, which are devoted entirely to an argument in favor of Jackendoff's (2011, fig.6) "parallel architecture" and against Chomskian "syntacticocentrism" (Jackendoff's term).

[29] From the Greek *próbatón*, "a single sheep" (Luke 15,4–6).

6.3.2 Computational modeling

Having discarded the notions of syntactic well-formedness and "strong generativity" along with the grammar dogma, we are not obligated to seek models that would reproduce precisely some hypothetical hidden structure of the utterances encountered in what will be necessarily extremely complex corpus data. What alternative theoretical considerations should then guide computational modeling and what should be its goal?

Because in the brain language comprehension seems to be intimately interrelated with production (Silbert et al., 2014), a good model should cover both. A possible goal here is "weak generativity": modeling the production "merely" of the surface form of utterances, preferably ranked by their probabilities relative to some reference or training corpus (Waterfall et al., 2010). According to this approach, which has been called the "new Empiricism" (Goldsmith, 2007), a weakly generative model is evaluated on its perplexity, or the reciprocal average per-word probability that it assigns to sentences in a withheld test corpus.

On a closer look, however, this formulation is seen to be as detached from the reality of naturalistic language use as the formalist fictions. A weakly generative modeling framework typically takes the form of a probabilistic grammar, uses sentences as units of evaluation, and sneaks in through the back door (a graded version of) well-formedness by pretending that the probabilities of sentences are fixed over time and independent of context.

Some recent developments in computational linguistics attempt to bring language modeling a little closer to reality. One way of doing that is to model the pragmatics of conversation, for instance by endowing the model with a set of beliefs about the state of affairs being discussed (as in game theory), the beliefs being modified after each exchange according to the Bayes rule (Goodman and Frank, 2016). This formalism may, however, be too restrictive: as Sampson (2007, p.23) points out, "a natural language does not embody fixed inference relationships between its statements, such that from a given set of N natural-language premisses (whether N is zero or a larger number) there is some definite set of conclusions which can be validly drawn from them."

An antidote to such over-formalization is to try to keep logic out of it as far as possible. Thus, Paperno et al. (2016) observe that "[word prediction] is a much simpler setup than the one required, say, to determine whether two sentences entail each other" and propose an evaluation task in which the model is given a paragraph or so of context and a target sentence from which one word is omitted; the goal is to guess the omitted word. State of the art models are "effectively unable" to solve this task, yielding a 0 percent correct performance.

The realization that slavishly generating "likely" sequences of words is not a useful approach to modeling language requires a reevaluation of Lashley's (1951) celebrated notion of the problem of serial order in behavior. Traditional solutions to the problem as it has been originally formulated can be classified as associative (based on response chaining between successive elements), positional (based on coding the absolute order of elements in the sequence), and hierarchical (based on multiple levels of abstraction in representing sequential order), Lashley himself favoring the latter. Given that linguistic behavior is multimodal, socially situated, and dynamically controlled, these solutions are all fundamentally inadequate (Kolodny and Edelman, 2015).

A rather different approach to modeling language emerges when the *problem* of serial order is recast in light of these observations. This approach, competitive queuing (CQ), aims to show that serial order can arise out of a parallel representation through a series of winner-take-all steps, in each of which the next element in the would-be sequence is selected via competition (Houghton and Hartley, 1996; Bullock, 2004). Notably, the basic elements can be quite sizeable themselves, as in formulaic (set) expressions or partially lexicalized constructions, which are known to play a key role in natural language learning and use (Gross,

1994; Tomasello, 2003).

Different model architectures may be particularly good at addressing distinct aspects of the control problem that underlies language behavior. For instance, the simple two-layer competitive queuing (CQ) network (Bohland et al., 2010, fig.1) is effective in integrating multiple constraints that join forces in generating a sequence of actions from a parallel representation, while recurrent (folded) networks offer representational savings, and transition (unfolded) networks are easier to learn and control. These considerations motivate a hybrid, division-of-labor approach to modeling language.

One such hybrid approach is exemplified by the model of speech production of (Bohland et al., 2010), which reaches up to the level of the phonology of isolated words, stopping short of sentence construction. This model, which is capable of generating hierarchically and contextually constrained sequences of categorical elements of speech, integrates CQ into a transition network architecture. Bohland et al. (2010, p.1522) note explicitly that their model "combines elements of both CQ and positional models," as well as "'serial chain' representations." The model is not learned; instead, the network weights that determine its dynamics are "hand-wired" — manually set to values that guarantee the desired outcomes when the differential equations describing the network are integrated (Bohland et al., 2010, p.1516).

The second example is a model of machine translation developed and tested by Edelman and Solan (2009). This model, which incorporates the ADIOS algorithm (Solan et al., 2005), learns structured transition networks for the source and target languages, then uses the activation pattern induced by the input utterance in the source network to selectively activate elements (constructions) in the target network. The resulting spread of activation in the target network is subject to the patterns of usage in the target language. This process generates a probability-ranked list of competing outputs, which is then reranked so as to take into account any additional thematic or contextual constraints. As a result, this model produces utterances that are both structurally tractable and semantically apt, insofar as they combine familiar constructions with abstract meaning (captured by the many-to-many source-to-target concept map) and on-the-fly context-specific control.

6.3.3 Evolution of language

As a natural biological phenomenon, language can only be understood in the light of evolution (Dobzhansky, 1973). In the absence of a fossil record such as corpora that predate writing,[30] theorizing about language evolution has long been considered futile. On the kind of integral account propounded here, this task would seem to be even more hopeless: even a real, naturalistic corpus of language may be of little use, because the original import of utterances that comprise it is lost when taken out of situational context and disconnected from the shared knowledge and individual experiential histories of the participants.

Despite the scarcity of data, a lively debate has been under way for a while now about the nature of language evolution and its relationship to the evolution of other behaviors and of the brain (for a sample of the literature, see Pinker and Bloom, 1990; Lieberman, 2002b; Hauser et al., 2002; Christiansen and Kirby, 2003; Jackendoff and Pinker, 2005; Fitch et al., 2005; Merker and Okanoya, 2007; Christiansen and Chater, 2008; Tallerman, 2014; Bolhuis et al., 2014). Progress on this front depends on conceptual "triangulation": bringing to bear on each other all conceivable sources of constraints regarding the nature and interaction of potentially relevant traits, along with the task contexts in which these traits could have been applicable. Unlike the formalist postulate of a point mutation (which supposedly created the Merge operation and thereby immediately made recursive grammar possible; Bolhuis et al., 2014), which exists in a conceptual vacuum,

[30] Note that in any case written language differs from spoken language in register and much of its structure (Sampson, 2007).

the idea of a multiply constrained combination of reusable traits and of gradual build-up of language-related skills is both more plausible and more promising methodologically.

One of the directions that this latter approach can pursue has to do with the multimodal nature of language (Kolodny and Edelman, 2015), which is only reducible to sequences of symbols when confined to a dead corpus. Thus, Dale et al. (2016) propose "what may be a crucial ingredient in language evolution: multimodal synergy." Another potentially rich source of constraints is the social context in language operates (Cangelosi, 2001; Catani and Bambini, 2014; Kirby et al., 2015). Furthermore, language acquisition and evolution can and should be addressed together (Locke and Bogin, 2006; Chater and Christiansen, 2010; Pinker, 2010), along with the role of the brain in shaping language (Christiansen and Chater, 2008). Finally, a careful analysis of the social dynamics of language use may explain the "major transition" (Szathmáry and Maynard Smith, 1995, p.231) in human behavior from costly to conventional signaling by increasing reliance on social enforcement of honesty and by the relegation of meanings from unitary to combinatorial/composite signals (Lachmann et al., 2001, p.13193).

6.3.4 The brain mechanisms of language

To really understand the place of language in the brain, and thereby extend the science of language to include the implementation level of the Mayr/Tinbergen/Marr explanatory framework, we must do more than list the putative brain areas involved and offer verbal descriptions of their respective roles (as, for instance, when mere identification of lexical memory and sequential processing with different brain areas is called a "model"; Ullman, 2001). The model must be explicit in spelling out the linking principles (Poeppel et al., 2012) between behavioral data and neural computation and must map the posited computations, not vaguely, to areas (as in Ullman, 2001; Hagoort, 2014; Fedorenko and Thompson Schill, 2014), but specifically, to brain *circuit-and-synapse* diagrams (Kolodny and Edelman, 2015, p.262).

When viable models start to emerge, they will transcend the textbook corticocentric view of the brain basis of language (e.g., Bornkessel-Schlesewsky and Schlesewsky, 2013; van der Lely and Pinker, 2014), with its exclusive focus on the Broca and Wernicke areas. The narrow focus on the cortex in language is no longer tenable (Lieberman, 2002a), especially in the light of new data (e.g., Silbert et al., 2014) documenting the extensive spread of language production and comprehension over the brain.[31] Furthermore, on the emerging understanding of the ubiquity of neural reuse in brain function (Anderson, 2010), the question that any model should address is not where in the brain is the "language center," but rather how the major circuits implicated in other behaviors contribute to language. All these circuits involve (in addition to premotor and motor cortical areas) other brain structures, notably the basal ganglia, the hippocampus, and the thalamus.

Basal ganglia. Among the most prominent circuits involving the basal ganglia is the set of loops that connect the striatum, globus pallidus, substantia nigra, and subthalamic nucleus to the thalamus, all of the cortex, and back to the striatum (Wickens, 1997). This circuit is anatomically intricately structured: there are four major subdivisions (Alexander et al., 1986), which are further differentiated into many "stripes" (O'Reilly and Frank, 2006; Botvinick, 2008). Their functions in composing behavior include the inhibition of competing alternatives (e.g., Botvinick, 2008), the sequencing of elementary actions (e.g., Aldridge and Berridge, 1998; Nakahara et al., 2001; Aldridge and Berridge, 2003), and parsing and concatenation of subsequences (Jin et al., 2014). All these functions are central to language generation and processing, as, for instance, when a choice must be made from among several constructions (a likely role of the striatum in the language system; cf. Longworth et al., 2005) or a construction is abandoned in favor of another (which may be

[31] Nor is corticocentrism a tenable approach to any other behavior (Edelman, 2015).

supported by " split circuits" in the cortical-basal-thalamic-cortical loops; Joel and Weiner, 1994, Fig.5).[32] Moreover, these functions are exactly what it takes to implement competitive queuing (Bullock et al., 2009; Bohland et al., 2010).

Hippocampus. The classical view of one function of the hippocampus having to do with memory is certainly compatible with its documented role in lexical and referential aspects of language (Breitenstein et al., 2005; Kurczek et al., 2013). Since at least (Levy, 1996), the notion has been entertained that the other function classically attributed to the hippocampus, navigation, can be of critical importance to sequence learning and replay (e.g., Agster et al., 2002; Fortin et al., 2002; Rodriguez et al., 2004; Gheysen et al., 2010; DeVito and Eichenbaum, 2011; Albouy et al., 2013), and therefore to language, which the hippocampus orchestrates in coordination with the striatum (Albouy et al., 2008, 2013). Neurological case studies show that hippocampus lesions in early childhood interfere with language acquisition (DeLong and Heinz, 1997; Weber et al., 2006). Some of the plausible language-related specializations of the hippocampus are construction learning (Seger and Cincotta, 2006) and their flexible use in generation (Duff and Brown-Schmidt, 2012; Pezzulo et al., 2014), especially sequence composition and hierarchical organization and control (by extrapolation from rodent data; Davidson et al., 2009; Gupta et al., 2010; Dezfouli and Balleine, 2013; see Allen et al., 2014). Not only there is a functional link between navigation and language (as indicated by the verbal shadowing task interfering with wayfinding; Meilinger et al., 2008; see also Arsenijević, 2008): the hippocampus also supports navigation in abstract spaces, as in sequential olfactory decision task of (Agster et al., 2002); see (Fried et al., 1997, p.760) for an early insight and (Dabaghian et al., 2014) for a recent synthesis. Finally, the autoassociative dynamics of some hippocampal circuits (Pfeiffer and Foster, 2015) is compatible with the use of multiscale dynamics for organizing sequential behavior (Huys et al., 2014), in a manner that resembles competitive queuing.

Thalamus. No cortical function is, or can be, carried out without a deep involvement of the thalamus (Sherman and Guillery, 2002; Sherman, 2012). Being an integral part of the cortico-basal-ganglia loops (Haber and Calzavara, 2009, fig.2), the thalamus is indispensable for the shaping of sequential behavior, including language (Crosson, 2013; Hebb and Ojemann, 2013; Klostermann et al., 2013; Barbas et al., 2013); (see also Bullock et al., 2009, p.763).

Premotor and motor areas. While the returning projections from the thalamus reach all of the cortex, the cortical areas commonly termed motor play a special role in the structuring of language, over and above its physical articulation and timing (Mendoza and Merchant, 2014). In particular, the neural mechanisms in premotor and supplementary motor areas (Ohbayashi et al., 2003; Tanji and Shima, 1994) appear well-suited for such language-related functions as chunking (needed for learning constructions) and sequential planning (Graybiel, 1998, p.127). Because sequential learning in the basal ganglia is slow (Graybiel, 1998, p.131), sequences may first be captured by the supplementary motor area (SMA; Tanji and Shima, 1994), then consolidated in the basal ganglia.

[32] A useful mental image for such switching, usually branded as "disfluency," is the mining cart chase scene in the film *Indiana Jones and the Temple of Doom* (Edelman, 2008, p.301). On this view, constraints on language production are more like those on traffic in a railroad yard or a subway system (Edelman, 2008, p.274) than on the traversal of the "open grassland" of (Sampson, 2007, p.10), mentioned earlier.

7 Concluding remarks

Two of the phrases that I drafted to serve in the title of the present paper — *Verbal Behavior* (as in Skinner, 1957) and *Syntactic Structures* (as in Chomsky, 1957) — stand for two big ideas, whose clash happened so long ago that the victory of the latter and its subsequent turning into an orthodoxy are rarely questioned anymore. This is too bad: while most of Chomsky's (1959) arguments against Skinner stand, the alternative that he promoted turned out to be fatally flawed. Its failure stems from its being founded on the dogma of grammar; and the occasional rebellions against it fall short because they fail to completely reject the dogma.

In trying to formulate a real alternative, we must not be discouraged by the overwhelming complexity of language that becomes apparent once the virtual reality show generated by the grammar dogma is shut down. It does seem that language, not consciousness, is *the* "hard problem"[33] of the cognitive and brain sciences, but at least as long as we attack the real problem and not an imaginary one, we may attain real progress.

Acknowledgments

I thank Barbara Finlay and Oren Kolodny for their comments on some of the views stated and defended here and Christina Behme for helpful editorial remarks. The ideas developed in this paper were first presented at the 2nd Conference on Usage-Based Linguistics, Tel Aviv University, June 2016. The poem that serves as the epigraph accompanies Warren McCulloch's (1965) remarks on Freud (*The Past of a Delusion*), whose impact on psychology and the humanities is often compared to that of Chomsky.

Notes

[A] What follows is a very partial list of references to the long reach of the concept of grammar, ordered by publication year and focusing, where possible, on critical reviews:

- *Psychology* — according to Miller (2003), the roots of the "cognitive revolution" can be traced back to his reading of Chomsky's *Syntactic Structures* (1957).
- *Music* — for instance, *In search of a generative grammar for music* (Laske, 1974).
- *Literary theory* — for instance, *Linguistic models and recent criticism: transformational-generative grammar as literary metaphor* (Henkel, 1990).
- *History* — "In a recent chapter on the post-Westphalian development of sovereign states, Krasner denies that a deep generative grammar shaped European state formation [. . .]" (Reus-Smit, 1999, p.121).
- *Archaeology* — for instance, (Hodder and Hutson, 2003).
- *Anthropology* — "*Every culture is generated within a certain frame; cultures are the concrete actualizations of civilization, which they turn into an applied worldview* – a bit like the transformations in generative grammar" (François, 2007, p.30).
- *Philosophy and psychology of morality* — for instance, *Universal moral grammar: a critical appraisal* (Jacob and Dupoux, 2007).
- *Cultural analysis* — for instance, (Born, 2010).
- *Philosophy of science* — as in the concept of "Galilean linguistics" (Kertész, 2012; Behme, 2013).
- *Ethology* — here is a typical argument in favor of adopting Chomsky's framework in the study of monkey vocalizations: "We would argue that even in the case of human language, where the existence of sophisticated cognitive abilities is uncontroversial, a precise characterization of the formal properties of a language is a good first step towards an analysis of its cognitive implementation. In syntax, various approaches broadly inspired by Chomsky's work (e.g. 1957, 1965) developed a formal and a cognitive approach in tandem" (Schlenker et al., 2016, p.13).

[33] In consciousness research, this problem — explaining phenomenality or qualia (Chalmers, 1995) — may not be hard at all, if it is indeed boils down to a simply statable informational (Oizumi et al., 2014) or dynamical/geometric (Fekete and Edelman, 2011) principle.

References

Acuña-Fariña, J. C. (2016). Opportunistic processing of language. *Language Sciences 57*, 34–48.

Agster, K. L., N. J. Fortin, and H. Eichenbaum (2002). The hippocampus and disambiguation of overlapping sequences. *The Journal of Neuroscience 22*, 5760–5768.

Albouy, G., B. R. King, P. Maquet, and J. Doyon (2013). Hippocampus and striatum: dynamics and interaction during acquisition and sleep-related motor sequence memory consolidation. *Hippocampus 23*, 985–1004.

Albouy, G., V. Sterpenich, E. Balteau, G. Vandewalle, M. Desseilles, T. Dang-Vu, A. Darsaud, P. Ruby, P.-H. Luppi, C. Degueldre, P. Peigneux, A. Luxen, and P. Maquet (2008). Both the hippocampus and striatum are involved in consolidation of motor sequence memory. *Neuron 58*, 261–272.

Aldridge, J. W. and K. C. Berridge (1998). Coding of serial order by neostriatal neurons: a 'natural action' approach to movement sequence. *Journal of Neuroscience 18*, 2777–2787.

Aldridge, J. W. and K. C. Berridge (2003). Basal ganglia neural coding of natural action sequences. In A. M. Graybiel, M. R. Delong, and S. T. Kitai (Eds.), *The Basal Ganglia VI*, Volume 54 of *Advances in Behavioral Biology*. New York: Springer.

Alexander, G. E., M. R. DeLong, and P. L. Strick (1986). Parallel organization of functionally segregated circuits linking basal ganglia and cortex. *Annual Review of Neuroscience 9*, 357–381.

Allen, T. A., A. M. Morris, A. T. Mattfeld, C. E. Stark, and N. J. Fortin (2014). A sequence of events model of episodic memory shows parallels in rats and humans. *Hippocampus 24*, 1178–1188.

Aloimonos, J. Y., I. Weiss, and A. Bandopadhay (1988). Active vision. *Intl. J. Computer Vision 2*, 333–356.

Ambridge, B., J. M. Pine, and E. V. M. Lieven (2015). Explanatory adequacy is not enough: responses to commentators on 'child language acquisition: why universal grammar doesn't help'. *Language 91*, e116–e126.

Anderson, M. L. (2010). Neural re-use as a fundamental organizational principle of the brain. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences 34*, 245–266.

Anderson, M. L. (2016). Prècis of After Phrenology: Neural Reuse and the Interactive Brain. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences 39*, e120.

Apothèloz, D., P.-Y. Brandt, and G. Quiroz (1993). The function of negation in argumentation. *Journal of Pragmatics 19*, 23–38.

Arbib, M. A. and J. Lee (2008). Describing visual scenes: Towards a neurolinguistics based on construction grammar. *Brain Research 1225*, 146–162.

Arsenijević, B. (2008). From spatial cognition to language. *Biolinguistics 2*, 3–23.

Ballard, D. H. (1991). Animate vision. *Artificial Intelligence 48*, 57–86.

Barbas, H., M. Á. García-Cabezas, and B. Zikopoulos (2013). Frontal-thalamic circuits associated with language. *Brain & Language 126*, 49–61.

Barrow, H. G. and J. M. Tenenbaum (1993). Retrospective on "Interpreting line drawings as three-dimensional surfaces". *Artificial Intelligence 59*, 71–80.

Bates, E. (1994). Modularity, domain specificity and the development of language. *Discussions in Neuroscience 10*, 136–149.

Bates, E. and J. C. Goodman (1999). On the emergence of grammar from the lexicon. In B. MacWhinney (Ed.), *Emergence of Language*, pp. 29–79. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.

Bates, E. and B. MacWhinney (1982). Functionalist approaches to grammar. In E. Wanner and L. Gleitman (Eds.), *Language acquisition: The state of the art*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Behme, C. (2013). Review of *Noam Chomsky: The Science of Language — Interviews with James McGilvray*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2012. *Philosophy in Review XXXIII*, 100–104.

Behme, C. (2014a). Assessing direct and indirect evidence in linguistic research. *Topoi 33*, 373–383.

Behme, C. (2014b). A 'Galilean' science of language. *Journal of Linguistics 50*, 671–704.

Berwick, R. C., P. Pietroski, B. Yankama, and N. Chomsky (2011). Poverty of the stimulus revisited. *Cognitive Science 35*, 1207–12042.

Bever, T. G. (1970). The cognitive basis for linguistic structures. In J. R. Hayes (Ed.), *Cognition and the Development of Language*. New York, NY: Wiley.

Bever, T. G., M. Sanz, and D. J. Townsend (1998). The Emperor's psycholinguistics. *J. of Psycholinguistic Research 27*, 261–284.

Bohland, J. W., D. Bullock, and F. H. Guenther (2010). Neural representations and mechanisms for the performance of simple speech sequences. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience 22*, 1504–1529.

Bolhuis, J. J., I. Tattersall, N. Chomsky, and R. C. Berwick (2014). How could language have evolved? *PLoS Biology 12*, e1001934.

Born, G. (2010). The social and the aesthetic: for a post-Bourdieuian theory of cultural production. *Cultural Sociology 4*, 171–208.

Bornkessel-Schlesewsky, I. and M. Schlesewsky (2013). Reconciling time, space and function: A new dorsal-ventral stream model of sentence comprehension. *Brain & Language 125*, 60–76.

Botvinick, M. M. (2008). Hierarchical models of behavior and prefrontal function. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences 12*, 201–208.

Bouchard, D. (2012). Solving the UG problem. *Biolinguistics 6*, 1–31.

Brady, T. F., V. S. Störmer, and G. A. Alvarez (2016). Working memory is not fixed-capacity: More active storage capacity for real-world objects than for simple stimuli. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science*.

Breazeal, C., A. Edsinger, P. Fitzpatrick, and B. Scassellati (2001). Active vision for sociable robots. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics, Part A: Systems and Humans 31*, 443–453.

Breitenstein, C., A. Jansen, M. Deppe, A.-F. Foerster, J. Sommer, T. Wolbers, and S. Knecht (2005). Hippocampus activity differentiates good from poor learners of a novel lexicon. *NeuroImage 25*, 958–968.

Brennan, J. R., E. P. Stabler, S. E. Van Wagenen, W.-M. Luh, and J. Hale (2016). Abstract linguistic structure correlates with temporal activity during naturalistic comprehension. *Brain and Language 157-158*, 81–94.

Bruner, J. S. (1975). From communication to language – A psychological perspective. *Cognition 3*, 255–287.

Bullock, D. (2004). Adaptive neural models of queuing and timing in fluent action. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences 8*, 426–433.

Bullock, D., C. O. Tan, and Y. J. John (2009). Computational perspectives on forebrain microcircuits implicated in reinforcement learning, action selection, and cognitive control. *Neural Networks 22*, 757–765.

Cangelosi, A. (2001). Evolution of communication and language: using signals, symbols, and words. *IEEE Transactions in Evolution Computation 5*, 93–101.

Catani, M. and V. Bambini (2014). A model for social communication and language evolution and development (SCALED). *Current Opinion in Neurobiology 28*, 165–171.

Chalmers, D. J. (1995). Facing up to the problem of consciousness. *Journal of Consciousness Studies 2*, 200–219.

Chater, N. and M. H. Christiansen (2010). Language acquisition meets language evolution. *Cognitive Science 34*, 1131–1157.

Chomsky, N. (1957). *Syntactic Structures*. the Hague: Mouton.

Chomsky, N. (1959). A review of B. F. Skinner's Verbal Behavior. *Language 35*, 26–58.

Chomsky, N. (1964). Degrees of grammaticalness. In J. A. Fodor and J. J. Katz (Eds.), *The structure of language*, pp. 384–389. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, N. (1986). *Knowledge of language: its nature, origin, and use*. New York: Praeger.

Chomsky, N. (1995). *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, N. (2004). *The Generative Enterprise Revisited*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. Discussions with Riny Huybregts, Henk van Riemsdijk, Naoki Fukui and Mihoko Zushi.

Christiansen, M. H. and N. Chater (2008). Language as shaped by the brain. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences 31*, 489–509.

Christiansen, M. H. and S. Kirby (2003). Language evolution: Consensus and controversies. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences 7*, 300–307.

Clark, A. (1998). Magic words: How language augments human computation. In P. Carruthers and J. Boucher (Eds.), *Language and thought: Interdisciplinary themes*, pp. 162–183. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clark, A. (2013). Learning trees from strings: a strong learning algorithm for some context-free grammars. *Journal of Machine Learning Research 14*, 3537–3559.

Clark, A. and S. Lappin (2011). *Linguistic Nativism and the Poverty of the Stimulus*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Clark, A. and S. Lappin (2013). Complexity in language acquisition. *Topics in Cognitive Science 5*, 89–110.

Clark, H. H. (1996). Communities, commonalities, and communication. In J. J. Gumperz (Ed.), *Rethinking Linguistic Relativity*, pp. 324–355. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Comrie, B. (1988). *Language universals and linguistic typology* (2 ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Croft, W. (2001). *Radical Construction Grammar: syntactic theory in typological perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Crosson, B. (2013). Thalamic mechanisms in language: A reconsideration based on recent findings and concepts. *Brain & Language 126*, 73–88.

Dabaghian, Y., V. L. Brandt, and L. M. Frank (2014). Reconceiving the hippocampal map as a topological template. *eLife 3*, e03476.

Dale, R., C. T. Kello, and P. T. Schoenemann (2016). Seeking synthesis: the integrative problem in understanding language and its evolution. *Topics in Cognitive Science*.

Davidson, T. J., F. Kloosterman, and M. A. Wilson (2009). Hippocampal replay of extended experience. *Neuron 63*, 497–507.

DeLong, G. R. and E. R. Heinz (1997). The clinical syndrome of early-life bilateral hippocampal sclerosis. *Annals of Neurology 42*, 11–17.

DeVito, L. M. and H. Eichenbaum (2011). Memory for the order of events in specific sequences: contributions of the hippocampus and medial prefrontal cortex. *The Journal of Neuroscience 31*, 3169–3175.

Dezfouli, A. and B. W. Balleine (2013). Actions, action sequences and habits: evidence that goal-directed and habitual action control are hierarchically organized. *PLoS Comput. Biol. 9*(12), e1003364.

Dickinson, S., R. Bergevin, I. Biederman, J. Eklundh, R. Munck-Fairwood, A. Jain, and A. Pentland (1997). Panel report: The potential of geons for generic 3-d object recognition. *Image and Vision Computing 15*, 277–292.

Ding, N., L. Melloni, H. Zhang, X. Tian, and D. Poeppel (2016). Cortical tracking of hierarchical linguistic structures in connected speech. *Nature Neuroscience 19*, 158–164.

Dobzhansky, T. (1973). Nothing in biology makes sense except in the light of evolution. *The American Biology Teacher 35*, 125–129.

Du Bois, J. W. (2014). Towards a dialogic syntax. *Cognitive Linguistics 25*, 359–410.

Du Bois, J. W., L. E. Kumpf, and W. J. Ashby (Eds.) (2003). *Preferred Argument Structure. Grammar as Architecture for Function*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Duff, M. C. and S. Brown-Schmidt (2012). The hippocampus and the flexible use and processing of language. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience 6*, 69.

Edelman, S. (2002). Constraining the neural representation of the visual world. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences 6*, 125–131.

Edelman, S. (2006). Mostly harmless: review of *Action in Perception* by Alva Noë. *Artificial Life 12*, 183–186.

Edelman, S. (2008). *Computing the mind: how the mind really works*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Edelman, S. (2009). On what it means to see, and what we can do about it. In S. Dickinson, A. Leonardis, B. Schiele, and M. J. Tarr (Eds.), *Object Categorization: Computer and Human Vision Perspectives*, Chapter 4, pp. 69–86. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Edelman, S. (2012). Vision, reanimated and reimagined. *Perception 41*, 1116–1127. Special issue on Marr's *Vision*.

Edelman, S. (2015). The minority report: some common assumptions to reconsider in the modeling of the brain and behavior. *Journal of Experimental and Theoretical Artificial Intelligence 27*, 1–26.

Edelman, S. (2016). Perception of object shapes. In S. Gepshtein and L. Maloney (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Computational Perceptual Organization*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. In press.

Edelman, S. (2017). Language and other complex behaviors: unifying characteristics, computational models, neural mechanisms. Under review.

Edelman, S. and M. H. Christiansen (2003). How seriously should we take Minimalist syntax? A comment on Lasnik. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences 7*, 60–61.

Edelman, S. and Z. Solan (2009). Machine translation using automatically inferred construction-based correspondence and language models. In B. T'sou and C. Huang (Eds.), *Proc. 23rd Pacific Asia Conference on Language, Information, and Computation (PACLIC)*, Hong Kong.

Edelman, S. and H. R. Waterfall (2007). Behavioral and computational aspects of language and its acquisition. *Physics of Life Reviews 4*, 253–277.

Evans, N. and S. Levinson (2009). The myth of language universals: Language diversity and its importance for cognitive science. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences 32*, 429–492.

Everaert, M. B. H., M. A. C. Huybregts, N. Chomsky, R. C. Berwick, and J. J. Bolhuis (2015). Structures, not strings: linguistics as part of the cognitives sciences. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences 19*, 729–743.

Everett, D. L. (2005). Cultural constraints on grammar and cognition in Pirahã. *Current Anthropology 46*, 621–646.

Everett, D. L. (2017). Grammar came later: triality of patterning in language evolution. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*. In press.

Fedorenko, E. and S. L. Thompson Schill (2014). Reworking the language network. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences 18*, 120–126.

Fekete, T. and S. Edelman (2011). Towards a computational theory of experience. *Consciousness and Cognition 20*, 807–827.

Fitch, W. T. (2009). Prolegomena to a future science of biolinguistics. *Biolinguistics 3*, 283–320.

Fitch, W. T., M. D. Hauser, and N. Chomsky (2005). The evolution of the language faculty: Clarifications and implications. *Cognition 97*, 211–225.

Fortin, N. J., K. L. Agster, and H. B. Eichenbaum (2002). Critical role of the hippocampus in memory for sequences of events. *Nature Neuroscience 5*, 458–462.

François, D. (2007). *The Self-destruction of the West: Critical Cultural Anthropology*. Paris: Editions Publibook.

Fried, I., K. A. MacDonald, and C. L. Wilson (1997). Single neuron activity in human hippocampus and amygdala during recognition of faces and objects. *Neuron 18*, 753–765.

Gheysen, F., F. Van Opstal, C. Roggeman, H. Van Waelvelde, and W. Fias (2010). Hippocampal contribution to early and later stages of implicit motor sequence learning. *Exp. Brain Res. 202*, 795–807.

Gilbert, D. T. and T. D. Wilson (2007). Prospection: experiencing the future. *Science 317*, 1351–1354.

Glenberg, A. M. (1997). What memory is for. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences 20*, 1–55.

Goldberg, A. E. (2003). Constructions: a new theoretical approach to language. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences 7*, 219–224.

Goldsmith, J. A. (2007). Towards a new empiricism. In J. B. de Carvalho (Ed.), *Recherches linguistiques à Vincennes*, Volume 36.

Goldstein, M. H., H. R. Waterfall, A. Lotem, J. Halpern, J. Schwade, L. Onnis, and S. Edelman (2010). General cognitive principles for learning structure in time and space. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences 14*, 249–258.

Goodman, N. D. and M. C. Frank (2016). Pragmatic language interpretation as probabilistic inference. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences 20*, 818–829.

Graf, T. (2012). Locality and the complexity of minimalist derivation tree languages. In *Formal Grammar*, Volume 7395 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pp. 208–227. Springer.

Graybiel, A. M. (1998). The basal ganglia and chunking of action repertoires. *Neurobiology of Learning and Memory 70*, 119–136.

Gross, M. (1994). Lexicon-grammar: Application to French. In R. E. Asher (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, Volume 4, pp. 2195–2205. Pergamon Press.

Gupta, A. S., M. A. A. van der Meer, D. S. Touretzky, and A. D. Redish (2010). Hippocampal replay is not a simple function of experience. *Neuron 65*, 695–705.

Haber, S. N. and R. Calzavara (2009). The cortico-basal ganglia integrative network: The role of the thalamus. *Brain Research Bulletin 78*, 69–74.

Hagoort, P. (2014). Nodes and networks in the neural architecture for language: Broca's region and beyond. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology 28*, 136–141.

Haider, H. (2016). The chapter of incredible neglects. In *Incredible syntax — between cognitive science and imposture*. Unpublished manuscript.

Harris, R. (1981). *The Language Myth*. London: Duckworth.

Hauser, M., N. Chomsky, and T. Fitch (2002). The faculty of language: What is it, who has it, and how did it evolve? *Science 298*, 1569–1579.

Hebb, A. O. and G. A. Ojemann (2013). The thalamus and language revisited. *Brain & Language 126*, 99–108.

Heinz, J., C. de la Higuera, and M. van Zaanen (2015). *Grammatical Inference for Computational Linguistics: Synthesis Lectures on Human Language Technologies*. San Rafael, CA: Morgan & Claypool.

Henkel, J. (1990). Linguistic models and recent criticism: transformational-generative grammar as literary metaphor. *PMLA 105*, 448–463.

Hodder, I. and S. Hutson (2003). *Reading the past: Current approaches to interpretation in archaeology*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press. Third edition.

Hopcroft, J. E. and J. D. Ullman (1979). *Introduction to Automata Theory, Languages, and Computation*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Horn, L. R. and G. Ward (Eds.) (2004). *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Houghton, G. and T. Hartley (1996). Parallels models of serial behaviour: Lashley revisited. *Psyche 2(25)*. Symposium on Implicit Learning.

Huys, R., D. Perdikis, and V. K. Jirsa (2014). Functional architectures and structured flows on manifolds: a dynamical framework for motor behavior. *Psychological Review 121*, 302–336.

Irurtzun, A. (2009). Why Y: on the centrality of syntax in the architecture of grammar. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics 8*, 141–160.

Jackendoff, R. (2011). What is the human language faculty: two views. *Language 87*, 586–624.

Jackendoff, R. and S. Pinker (2005). The nature of the language faculty and its implications for evolution of language (reply to Fitch, Hauser, and Chomsky). *Cognition 97*, 211–225.

Jacob, P. and E. Dupoux (2007). Universal moral grammar: a critical appraisal. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences 11*, 373–378.

Jacobson, R. (1966). Implications of language universals for linguistics. In J. H. Greenberg (Ed.), *Universals of Language*, pp. 263–278. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Jelinek, F. (1988). Applying information theoretic methods: evaluation of grammar quality.

Jin, X., F. Tecuapetla, and R. M. Costa (2014). Basal ganglia subcircuits distinctively encode the parsing and concatenation of action sequences. *Nature Neuroscience 17*, 423–433.

Joel, D. and I. Weiner (1994). The organization of the basal ganglia-thalamocortical circuits: open interconnected rather than closed segregated. *Neuroscience 63*, 363–379.

Johnson, N. F. (1965). The psychological reality of phrase-structure rules. *J. of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior 4*, 469–475.

Kertész, A. (2012). The 'Galilean style in science' and the inconsistency of linguistic theorising. *Foundations of Science 17*, 91–108.

Kess, J. F. (1976). *Psycholinguistics*. New York: Academic Press.

Kirby, S., M. Tamariz, H. Cornish, and K. Smith (2015). Compression and communication in the cultural evolution of linguistic structure. *Cognition 141*, 87–102.

Klostermann, F., L. K. Krugel, and F. Ehlen (2013). Functional roles of the thalamus for language capacities. *Frontiers in Systems Neuroscience 7:32*, 1–8.

Kolodny, O. and S. Edelman (2015). The problem of multimodal concurrent serial order in behavior. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews 56*, 252–265.

Kolodny, O., A. Lotem, and S. Edelman (2015). Learning a generative probabilistic grammar of experience: a process-level model of language acquisition. *Cognitive Science 39*, 227–267.

Koriat, A. and M. Goldsmith (1996). Memory metaphors and the laboratory/real-life controversy: correspondence versus storehouse views of memory. *Behavior and Brain Sciences 19*, 167–188.

Kornai, A. (1998). Quantitative comparison of languages. *Grammars 1*, 155–165.

Krizhevsky, A., I. Sutskever, and G. E. Hinton (2012). ImageNet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. In *Proc. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Volume 25, pp. 1097–1105.

Kurczek, J., S. Brown-Schmidt, and M. Duff (2013). Hippocampal contributions to language: Evidence of referential processing deficits in amnesia. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General 142*, 1346–1354.

Lachmann, M., S. Számadó, and C. T. Bergstrom (2001). Cost and conflict in animal signals and human language. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science 98*, 13189–13194.

Lakoff, G. (1971). On generative semantics. In D. D. Steinberg and L. A. Jakobowitz (Eds.), *Semantics*, pp. 232–296. Cambridge University Press.

Laland, K. N., K. Sterelny, J. Odling-Smee, W. Hoppitt, and T. Uller (2011). Cause and effect in biology revisited: Is Mayr's proximate-ultimate dichotomy still useful? *Science 334*, 1512–1516.

Lamb, S. M. (2004). *Language and reality*. London: Continuum.

Langacker, R. W. (1998). Conceptualization, symbolization, and grammar. In M. Tomasello (Ed.), *The new psychology of language*, pp. 1–39. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Langacker, R. W. (1999). *Grammar and Conceptualization*. Amsterdam: Walter De Gruyter.

Laplace, P.-S. (1812). *Théorie analytique des probabilités*.

LaPolla, R. J. (2015). On the logical necessity of a cultural and cognitive connection for the origin of all aspects of linguistic structure. In R. De Busser and R. J. LaPolla (Eds.), *Language Structure and Environment: Social, cultural and natural factors*, pp. 31–44. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lashley, K. S. (1951). The problem of serial order in behavior. In L. A. Jeffress (Ed.), *Cerebral Mechanisms in Behavior*, pp. 112–146. New York: Wiley.

Laske, O. E. (Autumn, 1973 - Summer, 1974). In search of a generative grammar for music. *Perspectives of New Music 12*, 351–378.

Lau, J. H., A. Clark, and S. Lappin (2016). Grammaticality, acceptability, and probability: a probabilistic view of linguistic knowledge. *Cognitive Science*. In press.

Levy, W. B. (1996). A sequence predicting CA3 is a flexible associator that learns and uses context to solve hippocampal-like tasks. *Hippocampus 6*, 579–590.

Lieberman, P. (2002a). *Human language and our reptilian brain: the subcortical bases of speech, syntax, and thought*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lieberman, P. (2002b). On the nature and evolution of the neural bases of human language. *Yearbook of Physical Anthropology 45*, 36–62.

Linell, P. (2013). Distributed language theory, with or without dialogue. *Language Sciences 40*, 168–173.

Linell, P. (2016). On agency in situated languaging: Participatory agency and competing approaches. *New Ideas in Psychology 42*, 39e45.

Locke, J. L. and B. Bogin (2006). Language and life history: A new perspective on the development and evolution of human language. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences 29*, 259–280.

Longworth, C. E., S. E. Keenan, R. A. Barker, W. D. Marslen-Wilson, and L. K. Tyler (2005). The basal ganglia and rule-governed language use: evidence from vascular and degenerative conditions. *Brain 128*, 584–596.

Love, N. (2004). Cognition and the language myth. *Language Sciences 26*, 525–544.

Ma, W. J., M. Husain, and P. M. Bays (2014). Changing concepts of working memory. *Nature Neuroscience 17*, 347–356.

Marr, D. (1982). *Vision*. San Francisco, CA: W. H. Freeman.

Marr, D. and T. Poggio (1977). From understanding computation to understanding neural circuitry. *Neurosciences Res. Prog. Bull. 15*, 470–488.

Mayr, E. (1961). Cause and effect in biology. *Science 134*, 1501–1506.

McCawley, J. D. (1982). *Thirty million theories of grammar*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

McCulloch, W. S. (1965). The past of a delusion. In *Embodiments of mind*, pp. 276–306. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Presented to the Chicago Literary Club (January 28, 1952).

Meilinger, T., M. Knauff, and H. H. Bülthoff (2008). Working memory in wayfinding — a dual task experiment in a virtual city. *Cognitive Science 32*, 755–770.

Mendoza, G. and H. Merchant (2014). Motor system evolution and the emergence of high cognitive functions. *Progress in Neurobiology 122*, 73–93.

Mendoza, P. J. E. V. (2011). Integrational linguistics and the behavioral sciences. *Language Sciences 33*, 584–592.

Mercier, H. and D. Sperber (2011). Why do humans reason? Arguments for an argumentative theory. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences 34*, 57–111.

Merker, B. and K. Okanoya (2007). The natural history of human language: Bridging the gaps without magic. In C. Lyon, C. L. Nehaniv, and A. Cangelosi (Eds.), *Emergence of Communication and Language*, pp. 403–420. London: Springer-Verlag.

Miller, G. A. (1956). The magical number seven, plus or minus two. *Psychological Review 63*, 81–97.

Miller, G. A. (2003). The cognitive revolution: a historical perspective. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences 7*, 141–144.

Nakahara, H., K. Doya, and O. Hikosaka (2001). Parallel cortico-basal ganglia mechanisms for acquisition and execution of visuomotor sequences — a computational approach. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience 13*, 626–647.

Newmeyer, F. J. (2016). Form and function in the evolution of grammar. *Cognitive Science*.

Noë, A. (2004). *Action in Perception*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Ohbayashi, M., K. Ohki, and Y. Miyashita (2003). Conversion of working memory to motor sequence in the monkey premotor cortex. *Science 301*, 233–237.

Oizumi, M., L. Albantakis, and G. Tononi (2014). From the phenomenology to the mechanisms of consciousness: Integrated Information Theory 3.0. *PLoS Computational Biology 10*(5), e1003588.

Oliva, A. (2013). Scene perception. In J. S. Werner and L. M. Chalupa (Eds.), *The New Visual Neurosciences*, Chapter 51, pp. 725–732. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

O'Reilly, R. C. and M. J. Frank (2006). Making working memory work: a computational model of learning in the frontal cortex and basal ganglia. *Neural Computation 18*, 283–328.

Paperno, C., G. Kruszewski, A. Lazaridou, Q. N. Phamy, R. Bernardi, S. Pezzelle, M. Baroni, G. Boleda, and R. Fernández (2016). The LAMBADA dataset: Word prediction requiring a broad discourse context. arXiv:1606.06031v1 [cs.CL] 20 Jun 2016.

Partee, B. H. (2014). A brief history of the syntax-semantics interface in Western formal linguistics. *Semantics-Syntax Interface 1*, 1–21.

Pezzulo, G., M. A. A. van der Meer, C. S. Lansink, and C. M. A. Pennartz (2014). Internally generated sequences in learning and executing goal-directed behavior. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences 18*, 647–657.

Pfeiffer, B. E. and D. J. Foster (2015). Autoassociative dynamics in the generation of sequences of hippocampal place cells. *Science 349*, 180–183.

Phillips, C. (2003). Syntax. In L. Nadel (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Cognitive Science*, Volume 4, pp. 319–329. London: Macmillan.

Phillips, C. (2011). Some arguments and non-arguments for reductionist accounts of syntactic phenomena. *Language and Cognitive Processes 26*, 156–187.

Piattelli-Palmarini, M. (Ed.) (1980). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Pickering, M. J. and S. Garrod (2004). Toward a mechanistic psychology of dialogue. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences 27*, 169–225.

Pinker, S. (2010). The cognitive niche: Coevolution of intelligence, sociality, and language. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science 107*(Suppl. 2), 8993–8999.

Pinker, S. and P. Bloom (1990). Natural language and natural selection. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences 13*, 707–784.

Pinker, S. and R. Jackendoff (2005). The faculty of language: What's special about it? *Cognition 95*, 201–236.

Poeppel, D., K. Emmorey, G. Hickok, and L. Pylkkäanen (2012). Towards a new neurobiology of language. *The Journal of Neuroscience 32*, 14125–14131.

Poggio, T. (2012). The levels of understanding framework, revised. *Perception 41*, 1017–1023.

Postal, P. (2008). Edge-based model-theoretic syntax. Unpublished ms.

Postal, P. M. (2004a). Junk linguistics. In *Skeptical linguistic essays*. New York: Oxford University Press. Part II.

Postal, P. M. (2004b). *Skeptical linguistic essays*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Pullum, G. K. and B. Scholz (2002). Empirical assessment of poverty of the stimulus arguments. *The Linguistic Review 19*, 9–50.

Ramscar, M. and H. Baayen (2013). Production, comprehension, and synthesis: a communicative perspective on language. *Frontiers in Psychology 4*, 233.

Ramscar, M. and R. F. Port (2016). How spoken languages work in the absence of an inventory of discrete units. *Language Sciences 53*, 58–74.

Reus-Smit, C. (1999). *The Moral Purpose of the State: Culture, Social Identity, and Institutional Rationality in International Relations*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rizzi, L. and G. Cinque (2016). Functional categories and syntactic theory. *Annual Review of Linguistics 2*, 139–163.

Rodriguez, A., J. Whitson, and R. Granger (2004). Derivation and analysis of basic computational operations of thalamocortical circuits. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience 16*, 856–877.

Sampson, G. R. (2007). Grammar without grammaticality. *Corpus Linguistics and Lingustic Theory 3*, 1–32.

Schlenker, P., E. Chemla, A. M. Schel, J. Fuller, J.-P. Gautier, J. Kuhn, D. Veselinović, K. Arnold, C. Cäsar, S. Keenan, A. Lemasson, K. Ouattara, R. Ryder, and K. Zuberbüller (2016). Formal monkey linguistics. *Theoretical Linguistics 42*, 1–90.

Schütze, C. T. (1996). *The empirical base of linguistics: grammaticality judgments and linguistic methodology*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Seger, C. A. and C. M. Cincotta (2006). Dynamics of frontal, striatal, and hippocampal systems in rule learning. *Cerebral Cortex 16*, 1546–1555.

Sharma, S., J. He, K. Suleman, H. Schulz, and P. Bachman (2016). Natural language generation in dialogue using lexicalized and delexicalized data. *arXiv cs.CL*, 1606:03632v2.

Sherman, S. M. (2012). Thalamocortical interactions. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology 22*, 575–579.

Sherman, S. M. and R. W. Guillery (2002). The role of the thalamus in the flow of information to the cortex. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B 357*, 1695–1708.

Shibatani, M. (2015). Syntax (general). In J. D. Wright (Ed.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences* (2nd ed.), Volume 23, pp. 885–894. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science.

Silbert, L. J., C. J. Honey, E. Simony, D. Poeppel, and U. Hasson (2014). Coupled neural systems underlie the production and comprehension of naturalistic narrative speech. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science 111*, E4687–E4696.

Solan, Z., D. Horn, E. Ruppin, and S. Edelman (2005). Unsupervised learning of natural languages. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science 102*, 11629–11634.

Stabler, E. (2013a). The epicenter of linguistic behavior. In M. Sanz, I. Laka, and M. K. Tanenhaus (Eds.), *Language Down the Garden Path: The Cognitive and Biological Basis of Linguistic Structures*, pp. 316–323. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Stabler, E. P. (2001). Minimalist grammars and recognition. In Rohrer, Rossdeutscher, and Kamp (Eds.), *Linguistic Form and its Computation*, pp. 327–352. CSLI.

Stabler, E. P. (2013b). Two models of Minimalist, incremental syntactic analysis. *Topics in Cognitive Science 5*, 611–633.

Steffensen, S. V. (2015). Distributed Language and Dialogism: notes on non-locality, sense-making and interactivity. *Language Sciences 50*, 105–119.

Steffensen, S. V. (2016). Cognitive probatonics: Towards an ecological psychology of cognitive particulars. *New Ideas in Psychology 42*, 29e38.

Steffensen, S. V. and A. Fill (2014). Ecolinguistics: the state of the art and future horizons. *Language Sciences 41*, 6–25.

Syal, S. and B. L. Finlay (2010). Thinking outside the cortex: Social motivation in the evolution and development of language. *Developmental Science 14*, 417–430.

Szathmáry, E. and J. Maynard Smith (1995). The major evolutionary transitions. *Nature 374*, 227–232.

Tallerman, M. (2014). No syntax saltation in language evolution. *Language Sciences 46*, 207–219.

Tanji, J. and K. Shima (1994). Role for supplementary motor area cells in planning several movements ahead. *Nature 371*, 413–416.

Tinbergen, N. (1963). On aims and methods in ethology. *Zeitschrift für Tierpsychologie 20*, 410–433.

Tomasello, M. (Ed.) (1998). *The new psychology of language*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Tomasello, M. (2003). *Constructing a language: a usage-based theory of language acquisition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Townsend, D. J. and T. G. Bever (2001). *Sentence comprehension*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Ullman, M. T. (2001). A neurocognitive perspective on language: the declarative/procedural model. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience 2*, 717–727.

van der Lely, H. K. J. and S. Pinker (2014). The biological basis of language: insight from developmental grammatical impairments. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences 18*, 586–595.

Walenski, M. and M. T. Ullman (2005). The science of language. *The Linguistic Review 22*, 327–346.

Waterfall, H. R., B. Sandbank, L. Onnis, and S. Edelman (2010). An empirical generative framework for computational modeling of language acquisition. *Journal of Child Language 37*(Special issue 03), 671–703.

Weber, B., J. Wellmer, M. Reuber, F. Mormann, S. Weis, H. Urbach, J. Ruhlmann, C. E. Elger, and G. Fernandez (2006). Left hippocampal pathology is associated with atypical language lateralization in patients with focal epilepsy. *Brain 129*, 346–351.

Weigand, E. (2011). Paradigm changes in linguistics: from reductionism to holism. *Language Sciences 33*, 544–549.

Wickens, J. (1997). Basal ganglia: structure and computations. *Network: Computation in Neural Systems 8*, R77–R109.

Xiong, W., J. Droppo, X. Huang, F. Seide, M. Seltzer, A. Stolcke, D. Yu, and G. Zweig (2016). Achieving human parity in conversational speech recognition. *ArXiv e-prints*.