ERPs to Sentence-Final Words

In the 300-500 time window, there were no significant differences between the waveforms evoked by sentence-final words in the light and non-light sentences, or between the light and anomalous sentences (all *F*s<.85, all *p*s>.45, Figure 3). However, compared to the non-light constructions, waveforms to sentence-final words in the anomalous constructions were significantly more negative in some regions, as reflected by interactions between Construction and Region both in the mid-regions ($F(4,68)=5.96$, $p<.001$) and the peripheral regions ($F(3,51)=3.14$, $p=.05$) ANOVAs. Follow-ups localized these effects to parietal ($F(1,17)=6.66$, $p=.02$), occipital ($F(1,17)=14.88$, $p<.001$) and peripheral parietal ($F(1,17)=8.25$, $p=.01$) regions, with no effects in any other region (*F*s<1.46, *p*s>.24).

In the later 500-900ms time window, there were once again no significant difference between light and non-light constructions (*F*s<.47, *p*s>.58). Again, the negativity evoked by sentence-final words in the anomalous constructions was larger than that evoked in the non-light constructions: there was an interaction between Construction and Region in the mid-regions ANOVA ($F(4,68)=5.26$, $p=.01$), with follow-ups showing significant effects in all regions (*F*s>5.18, *p*s<.04) except for prefrontal, frontal, and frontal peripheral regions (*F*s<1.46, *p*s>.24). The direct contrast between the anomalous and light verb constructions also revealed a Construction by Region interaction ($F(4,68)=4.43$, $p=.02$), but follow-ups showed a

significant effect only in the occipital region ($F(1,17)=7.58$, $p=.01$; all other regions $Fs<2.09$, $ps>.17$).