Cross-linguistic studies on clitic production have shown that clitic omission rates are prominent in agrammatic aphasia (Neubauer et al., 1988; Reinzl et al., 1995; Rossit, 2007), among others. Taking into account Armutlic’s (1999) Syntax-Discurso model (SDM), Sanchez-Alcon et al. (2003) attributed the erroneous production of clitics to their referential properties.

- SDM predicts that clitics, as referential elements, would cause higher processing load to agnostic speakers as opposed to other pronoun elements, such as reflexives, which are interpreted locally.

Although several studies have shown that in clitic languages, clitics are typically well-interpreted (see Varlokosta and Edwards, 2002, Gawronski, 2004), Caselli (2009) reports errors in the comprehension of clitics in Italian, which are interpreted within the Relativized Minimality approach (RM) to locality in syntax.

- RM predicts that local relations cannot be established between two elements when an intervening element carries the same morphosyntactic features, since this element will be recognized as a possible candidate for the establishment of the local relation. Garda’s argues that since clitics involve a step in their derivation where they give rise to a crossed chain, this would lead to minimality effects.

Both SDM and RM make the same predictions regarding cloistic impairment in aphasia, although they provide different explanations. The present study aims at investigating whether the Greek agrammatic data can provide evidence in favor of these approaches.
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Due to the high accuracy scores observed in clitic comprehension in simple contexts, we conclude that the referential properties of clitics as such cannot account for the erroneous performance observed in clitic production. The observed dissociation across modalities cannot be interpreted within RM either (compare Caselli, 2009), since crossed chain and minimality effects would be predicted to arise across modalities.

We rather suggest that the aphasic participants employ explicit rules to judge the ungrammaticality of sentences, while automatic processes are more likely to emerge in production. On-line grammaticality judgment studies may shed light on this asymmetry since they will show whether the agrammatic speaker’s on-line comprehension is sensitive to ungrammaticalities related to clitics (cf. Chondrogianni et al., 2010).
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**Clitic elicitation task:** agnostic participants omit direct object clitics to a great extent (48.53%), while clitic comprehension with full DPs or agreement errors were also attested to a significantly lesser extent (31.8% and 8.7% respectively).

**Grammaticality judgment task:** clitics are on the whole well interpreted (88.53%). Participants were capable of correctly recognizing the ungrammaticality of the structures when the clitic was either omitted or misplaced.

**Picture selection task:** clitics are well interpreted in simple transitive clauses (94%), although chance level performance was obtained in ECM contexts (81%).
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