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A reformulation of last year's report Tables I & II confirms previous findings. The total number of patients was increased to 102.

### TABLE I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural level:</th>
<th>Evidence:</th>
<th>Evidence:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clinical</td>
<td>Clinical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pathologic</td>
<td>Pathologic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completely Illiterate</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barely alphabet.</td>
<td>17 (63%)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schooling, up to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st. grade</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd. grade</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd. grade</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th. grade</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th. grade</td>
<td>1 (37%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cases s/encephalic lesion, by:

Clinical evidence Pathologic evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Level</th>
<th>Language:</th>
<th>Language:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>normal</td>
<td>abnormal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completely illiterate</td>
<td>2 (3.2%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barely alphabetized</td>
<td>8 (34%)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schooling, up to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st grade</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd grade</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd grade</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th grade</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th grade</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above</td>
<td>0 (66%)</td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of these, only 18 (18%) had clinical or pathologic evidence of encephalic lesion, while as much as 66 patients produced abnormal language test results: 51 (61%) out of the 84 patients without brain lesion committed mistakes which would be of pathological meaning if measured by current standards. Sixty-eight per cent of the patients were grossly illiterate. Forty-four (79%) out of 56 illiterate patients showed abnormalities in the language test results, while only 7 (26%) out of 27 patients with some scholarly showed such abnormalities.

Illiteracy, then, leads to poor language, and probably is related to the low I.Q. evident in these patients. These findings lead one to suspect that oligophrenia may be widely distributed among low cultural and socio-economic level populations.

As regards the number of mistakes committed in each individual test, the same trend noted in the previous report was maintained.

In 2 patients showing abnormal language, brain lesions were demonstrated on post-mortem examination. One of these had been examined before and after development of clinical manifestations of the lesion.
The findings are described below:

CASE REPORT

A 68-year-old, illiterate, right-handed, negro male, suffering from Chagas' disease and atrial fibrillation, had his language examined on June 1965. No neurological abnormalities were found on both history and physical examination. On October 5, he was admitted to the ward, due to right hemiplegia of sudden onset 12 days previously. Language was reexamined on October 6 to 9. On October 20, 1965, the patient died suddenly. Massive pulmonary embolism was demonstrated as the cause of death, at autopsy.

Language test results obtained were as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before hemiplegia</th>
<th>After hemiplegia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SECTION A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 &amp; 2: No significant mistakes</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECTION B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 &amp; 2: Not done, due to illiteracy</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. a &amp; b: No mistakes</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECTION C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Suppression of 6 words on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>period no. 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2) Wrong: "I don't know"... a correct answer would be "no, he didn't" | Wrong - "he was a great poet"
| 3) Right: "yes, he did" |                 |
| 4) Right: "no, they didn't" | Wrong - "I mean to say: to verify"
| 5) Right: "yes, they came" | Wrong - "was he the one who discovered Brazil?"
| 6) Wrong: "yes, he did" | Wrong - "it was an argument among the great poets"
| 7: Right | Right |
| 4: Right | Right |
| 5: Right | Totally wrong |
SECTION D

1. a, b & c: No mistakes
2. a: No mistakes
   b: No mistakes
3. a: No mistakes
   b: No mistakes
   c: No mistakes

SECTION E

1. a: Distortion of letters b & a
   b: Direct series - erred on nos. 9 & 10
   Reverse series - erred from no.4
2. a to f: Not done, due to illiteracy
3. a: Correct answers to 1, 4, 6 & 9
   b & c: Not done, due to illiteracy
   d: Correct answers to 1, 2 & 3
4. a & b: Slight distortion (see Fig.1)

SECTION F

1. a & b: Not done, due to illiteracy
2. a: 1) Right
   2) Right
   3) Wrong - "I don't know"
   4) Right
   5) Wrong - "courage to do"
Before

6) Wrong - "to repair old things; to become new again"
   b: 1) Wrong - "I don't know"
   2) Wrong - "I don't know; I have heard this before, but I don't understand"
   3) Right

After

Wrong - "may be it is useful"
   Wrong - "nothing"
   Wrong - "it is a pitfall"
   Wrong - "he who walks exists, works"

SECTION G

1: Right
2: Right
3. a & b: Right

SECTION H

1. a: Right, 1 to 6
   Wrong, 7
   b: Right, 3 to 6
   Wrong, 1 & 2
   c: Right
2. a: Moderate distortion (see Fig.2)
   b: Slight distortion (see Fig.2)

SECTION I

1. a: Right
   b: Right
2: Right

SECTION J

Although illiterate, the patient was able to cut 36 out of 56 letters (missed 20)

Entirely unable to accomplish the test
In summary, the following was observed after the development of a large cerebral lesion:

- Perseveration
- Lowered comprehension of spoken language
- Possible chromatoagnosia
- Apraxia, including constructional apraxia
- Acalculia
- Loss of space perception
- Somatognosia
- Inattention
- Preservation of memory, as well as of the capacity of sounds identification and expression

Extensive brain softenings were found at autopsy, grossly corresponding to the area of distribution of the left middle cerebral artery, as demonstrated by the enclosed diagrams (Fig. 3 to 5).

Although obviously not conclusive in relation to the localization of language functions on the forebrain, the case above presented corroborates some of the existing knowledge and shows a research line to be followed for the clarification of the seat of such functions.
Continuation of a long term study to correlate focal brain lesions resulting from Chagas disease with changes in speech functions.

Patient group expanded to 102.

Two died during period and were autopsied. Lesion in one case with extensive softening in area of left cerebral artery.

Insufficient data at this stage to discuss correlations.
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