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Applicative Phrases Hosting Accusative Clitics

LUIS SÁEZ
Universidad Complutense de Madrid

IN THIS CHAPTER I offer an explanation for the puzzling behavior exhibited in certain environments by a particular class of standard Spanish “little words”: accusative pronominal clitics. Those environments derive from the presence of a special sort of Spanish verbs that I will call “ayudar-verbs”; they are illustrated in (1):

(1) Ana ayudó / perjudicó / molestó a la chica.
   “Ana helped / harmed / bothered the girl.”

Ayudar-verbs resemble standard dyadic monotransitives in the sense that they manifest a single internal object bearing accusative case. Accusative case assignment is evidenced in (2), where the object of (1) is substituted for by the accusative pronominal clitic la.¹

(2) Ana la ayudó.
  Ana 3.sg.fem.AccCL helped.3.sg.
  “Ana helped her.”

Therefore, at first glance, any standard configuration for monotransitives might also be considered to be adequate for ayudar-verbs. In spite of this, in this chapter I will offer several pieces of evidence showing that a double object construction (DOC) underlies these verbs. This proposal will eventually explain the puzzling behavior exhibited by accusative pronominal clitics in these environments.

Puzzling Behavior of Accusative Clitics in Ayudar-Verb Environments

The problem I will focus on here has to do with the so-called me-lui constraint (Perlmutter 1971). As is well known, this constraint dictates that a dative pronominal clitic cannot co-occur with a first-/second-person accusative clitic, as illustrated in (3) for Spanish:

(3) Tú se la/*me/*te enviaste a Juan.
    you 3.sg.DatCL 3/1/2.sg.AccCL sent.2.sg. to Juan
    “You sent it/her/me/you to Juan.”
Romero (1997) and Ormazábal and Romero (1998a, 1998b) offer an account of this phenomenon centered around the [+animate] feature. First, they assume Demonte’s (1995) proposal showing that Spanish sentences containing a triadic verb with a dative clitic are the correlates of English DOCs, where, as is well known, the dative (a goal) tends to be animacy related. The parallelism with English DOCs can be checked by comparing the grammatical English glosses in (4a) (“you sent a book to Ana/you sent a book to Madrid”) with the ungrammatical English gloss (“*you sent Madrid a book”) appearing in (4b):

(4) a. Tú enviaste un libro a Ana /Madrid.
    you sent.2.sg. a book to Ana/Madrid
    “You sent a book to Ana/Madrid.”

   b. Tú le enviaste un libro a Ana / *Madrid.
    you 3.sg.DatCL sent.2.sg. a book to Ana/Madrid
    “You sent Ana/*Madrid a book.”

Further facts lead Ormazábal and Romero to proposing an exhaustive featural characterization of pronominal elements centered around the [+animate] feature: As previously observed, dative clitics are [+animate]; however, direct-object strong pronouns in verb-related argumental positions are [+animate] too. First-/second-person accusative clitics are also marked for [+animate], as they refer to the human protagonists of discourse (speaker and hearer). By contrast, third-person accusative clitics are [-animate]. Once provided with this featural characterization, Ormazábal and Romero explain the ungrammaticality in (3) as the result of two pronouns (the dative se and the first/second accusative me/te) competing for checking their [+animate] feature with one single animacy-related functional head.

A relevant feature of this approach concerns the fact that ungrammaticality arises when the competing [+animate] pronouns are co-arguments. For instance, let us consider the analytical causative constructions in (5), where two [+animate] pronouns co-occur: a dative clitic me, “me,” referring to the first-person causee subject, and an accusative strong pronoun, ella, “her,” interpreted as the patient role of the causee verb conocer, “to know.” In such a situation, ungrammaticality results only when restructuring has taken place, that is, when a monoclausal configuration has been obtained. Such restructuring is not necessary in (5a), where the accusative clitic la, “her,” doubling the strong pronoun undergoes enclisis to the causee verb; however, restructuring is necessary in (5b), where the accusative clitic has undergone clitic climbing. As shown in (5c), the grammaticality is restored if the strong pronoun is removed; as previously stated, direct object strong pronouns are characterized by Ormazábal and Romero as [+animate], thus differing from third-person accusative clitics in this respect:

(5) a. Tú me hiciste conocer la a ella. (biclausal)
    you 1.sg.AccCl made.2.sg. know.INFIN-3.sg.fem.AccCL to her
    “You made me know her.”

   b. *Tú me la hiciste conocer a ella.
    (restructuring)

   c. Tú me la hiciste conocer. (restructuring)
I propose that it is in these particular constructions, analytical causatives, that *ayudar*-verbs reveal significant peculiarities that distinguish them from other transitive verbs. Let us consider the examples in (6) and compare them to the ones in (5).

(6) a. Tú me hiciste ayudar *la* a ella. (biclausal)
   “You made me help her”

b. *Tú me la hiciste ayudar* a ella. (restructuring)

c. *Tú me la hiciste ayudar.* (restructuring)

(6a) is predictably grammatical, because, although there are two [+animate] pronouns, they belong to different clauses, hence competition between them does not take place. (6b) is predictably ungrammatical, because both pronouns belong to the same clause and, as a consequence, compete for checking. Surprisingly, (6c) shows that, unlike (5c), the grammaticality of the monoclausal configuration cannot be restored by simply omitting the offending strong pronoun. This is a very striking fact that, as far as I know, has been totally bypassed in the theoretical literature concerning DOCs. Of course, such ungrammaticality means that a second offending [+animate] element still remains after omitting the strong pronoun. The only conceivable candidate for carrying this offending feature must be another pronominal element, obviously the third-person accusative clitic itself (*la*). However, recall that (5c) clearly showed that third-person accusative clitics cannot be inherently marked as [+animate]. As a way out of this puzzle, I propose that the third-person accusative clitic of *ayudar*-verbs inherits that feature from the particular configuration displayed by these verbs.

**The Configuration Displayed by Ayudar-Verbs**

I propose that *ayudar*-verbs display the DOC configuration represented in (7):

(7) 

According to such a configuration, in *ayudar*-verbs a Vº is selecting an ApplP, and *ayudar*-verbs are the result of “conflating” a nominal head (a kind of cognate theme), the null applicative head and Vº. “Conflation” is a process that has figured prominently in Hale and Keyser’s work on argument structure (see Hale and Keyser...
2002, chap. 3, for details). They define it as a “fusion of syntactic nuclei,” that is, a process according to which the phonological matrix of the head of a complement, say \( n \), ends up located in the head \( X \) governing such a complement. The process may involve more than two heads: Given a sequence of heads \( <X, \ldots, n-1, n> \), each one governing the complement headed by the next, the phonological content of the most embedded one (say \( n \)) may end up under the highest one (\( X \)) provided that \( <X, \ldots, n-1> \) lack phonological content. In (5), \( X = V^o \) governs the complement headed by \( n-1 = \text{Appl}^o \), and \( n-1 = \text{Appl}^o \) governs the complement headed by \( n = N^o \). As a consequence, the phonological matrix of the cognate theme \( N^o \), for instance \( \text{ayuda}, \) “help,” ends up in \( V^o \), giving rise to the verb \( \text{ayudar}, \) “to help.”

As for the location of the ApplP in (7), proper justification can be provided. Pylkkänen (2002) distinguishes two sorts of ApplPs: high ApplPs and low ApplPs. Low ApplPs are selected by \( V^o \) [as in (7)]; high ApplPs are higher than VP, as in the configuration represented in (8):

(8) ApplP
    
    dative object Appl’
    
    Appl VP

In high ApplPs, \( \text{Appl}^o \) selects a VP, that is, an event; therefore they are compatible with both transitive and intransitive verbs and may host a dative pronoun referring to the benefactive of the event. This is illustrated in (9) for Albanian.

(9) I vrapova.
3.sg.Dat.CL run.1.sg.
“I ran for him.”

High ApplPs do not exist in Spanish, as shown by (10), the Spanish correlate of (9).

(10) *le corrió yo.
3.sg.Dat.CL ran.1.sg. I

In low ApplPs, \( \text{Appl}^o \) obligatorily selects a theme object; therefore they are only compatible with transitive verbs. Spanish only has low ApplPs (although see Cuervo 2003 for a different view), as shown by the fact that once the verb \( \text{correr}, \) “run,” in (10) is transitivized by adding \( \text{los cien metros}, \) “the hundred meters,” the dative \( le \) is possible.

(11) Le corrió yo los cien metros.
3.sg.Dat.CL ran.1.sg. I the hundred meters
“I ran the hundred meters for him.”

However, the benefactive interpretation of \( le \) in (11), coupled with my claim that Spanish only has low ApplPs, might seem to conflict with Pylkkänen’s typology for ApplPs, because she relates the benefactive interpretation to high ApplPs and a source (possessive)/recipient interpretation to low ApplPs. I claim, though, that there is no
actual conflict, as the benefactive interpretation of (11) is a mere inference obtained from a more basic source/possessive interpretation. According to this interpretation, the hundred meters are initially “related to” (or “belong to”) a person as a task, and the task ends up transferred to a different person [in (11), the speaker]. This new way of looking at the interpretation of sentences like (11) explains that, as shown in (12), the direct object of (11) must be definite, that is, conceived as a distance previously assumed to “belong to” somebody else (the referent of the pronominal clitic le) as a task to be performed:

(12) *Le corrió yo cien metros.
    3.sg.Dat.CL ran.1.sg. hundred meters
    “I ran hundred meters for him.”

Moreover, the task to be transferred might be of a static nature, which makes the prediction, borne out by (13a), that Spanish low ApplPs could also be compatible with static predicates. This fact apparently escapes Pylkkänen’s second test distinguishing high and low ApplPs. According to this test, low ApplPs are incompatible with static predicates, as in (13b), as they convey a transfer-of-possession interpretation incompatible with static predicates. I propose instead that (13b) is ungrammatical because, as has been commonly observed, English lacks source ApplPs.

(13) a. Le sostuve yo la bolsa.
    him.Dat.CL.3.sg. held I the bag
    “I held the bag for him.”

b. *I held him the bag. (Pylkkänen 2002, 24)

I conclude, then, that Spanish ApplPs in ayudar-verb environments are also selected by Vº, that is, they are low ApplPs too. As shown in (7), the accusative clitic of ayudar-verbs is generated in the specifier of the low ApplP. In this position it obtains the goal interpretation in the conceptual-intentional interface, according to a configurational interpretation of theta-roles à la Hale and Keyser (1993). Therefore, in order to derive the ungrammaticality of (6c) by relying on Ormazábal and Romero’s (1998a, 1998b) approach, it may be proposed that the feature [+animate] is part of the bundle of features forming the applicative head and that, as a consequence, the pronominal clitic located in the specifier of the ApplP must inherit such a feature in some way, thus giving rise to animacy competition in monoclausal causative environments.

Further Arguments in Support of the Configuration in (7)

One piece of evidence supporting the idea that the object of ayudar-verbs is actually the goal argument of a masked DOC is the fact that they never co-occur with a dative element. (14) shows their incompatibility with a possessor dative (al equipo, “to the team”):

(14) Juan (*le) ayudó a los miembros del / *al equipo.
    Juan 3.sg.DatCl helped.3.sg. to the members of the/ to the team
    “Juan helped the team members.”
The fact that ayudar-verbs are never possible with a dative constituent can be derived from my proposal that the internal object of these verbs is a DOC goal, because, as is well known, indirect objects can never coexist with further datives. For instance, (15) shows the incompatibility of the indirect object al niño, “to the child,” with a possessor dative like a Ana:

(15) *Juan le dio un beso al niño a Ana.

Juan 3.sg.DatCl gave.3.sg. a kiss to the child to Ana

“Juan kissed Ana’s child.”

A new argument in support of the configuration in (6) relies on research by Bosque and Masullo (1997) focusing on a particular interpretation of quantificational adverbs such as mucho, “very much.” With intransitive verbs, adverbs like mucho may have three main interpretations: the eventive one, the durative one, and the inherent one. I illustrate these three interpretations with the example in (16):

(16) Llueve mucho.

“It is raining very much.”

In this example, the eventive interpretation of mucho conveys the existence of many events of raining; that is, the sentence would mean that it rains very often. According to the durative interpretation, there is an event of raining, and that event is lasting for a very long time. The inherent interpretation conveys an evaluation of the amount of fallen rain (there is a lot of water). Bosque and Masullo (1997) propose that this interpretation results from a structure similar to (17).

(17) In this structure, the unergative verb lllover, “rain,” is the result of conflating a nominal head meaning “rain” and a light verb. This process also involves a quantificational head providing a variable for the VP modifier mucho, thus enabling the inherent reading.

Leaving aside the technical details, the interesting point for this chapter of Bosque and Masullo’s proposal is that the inherent reading of mucho reveals the existence of a nominal element in the syntax performing as the complement of a light verb. This proposal correctly predicts that transitive verbs should prevent the inherent interpretation for adverbs like mucho, as these verbs already have an overt object, and as a consequence, there is no room for the quantified nominal complement. This incompatibility is illustrated in (18).
(18) Autorizaron (*mucho) una manifestación
authorized.3.pl very much a demonstration
“They authorized a demonstration (*very much).”

However, Bosque and Masullo point out that certain transitive verbs, such as ayudar; “to help,” do admit the inherent interpretation of mucho; this compatibility is illustrated in (19).

(19) Ana ayudó a la chica mucho.
“Ana helped the girl very much.”

Bosque and Masullo relate the exceptional behavior of verbs like ayudar to the fact that they alternate with light verb constructions; for instance, ayudar alternates with the equivalent expression dar ayuda, “provide help.” As represented in (20), my proposal for ayudar-verbs provides room for both the overt accusative object (the goal) and the abstract correlate of the light verb constructions pointed out by Bosque and Masullo, that is, an abstract noun meaning “help.” This abstract noun may now be selected by a quantifier head, which explains the exceptional availability of the inherent reading of mucho with these transitive verbs.

(20)

A third argument in support of the configuration in (7) has to do with depictives. Pylkkänen (2002) points out that depictive secondary predicates are incompatible with indirect objects in English. For instance, (21), where the depictive hungry tries to attribute a property to Mary, is completely ungrammatical:

(21) *I gave Mary the meat hungry.

Pylkkänen derives this impossibility from the incompatibility between the semantic type of depictives and the semantic type of the low ApplP hosting indirect objects (see Pylkkänen 2002 for details). Therefore the ungrammatical result triggered by the presence of a depictive constitutes a test for the presence of low ApplPs.

Ayudar-verbs are incompatible with depictives, as illustrated in (22):

(22) *Juan ayudó a María enfadada.
“Juan helped Mary angry.”
As a consequence, it is reasonable to conclude that the transitivity of these verbs hides a low ApplP hosting the accusative constituent in its specifier.

Case Assignment
I have proposed that *ayudar*-verbs display a DOC configuration with a low ApplP. As represented in (7), this explains that their complement must be taken into consideration for animacy competition in analytical causative environments, as ApplPs convey a [+animate] feature. However, this hypothesis must deal with a case-related problem that immediately arises. Demonte (1995) and Romero (1997) show that sentences such as (23a), where the clitic *le* is doubling the goal *a María, “to María,” are the Spanish correlates of English DOCs. However, such a clitic exhibits dative case, and, moreover, the goal cannot become a subject under passivization, as illustrated in (23b):

(23) a. Juan le dio a María el libro.
   "J. gave M. the book."

   b. *María fue dada un libro.
      "M. was given a book."

Consequently it must be concluded that, in Spanish DOCs, goals exhibit dative case. However, recall that the goal of constructions with *ayudar*-verbs exhibits accusative case, as it may be replaced by an accusative clitic, as illustrated in (2). Moreover, it may become a subject under passivization, as illustrated in (24):

(24) Ella fue ayudada.
   "She was helped."

It seems, then, that the goals of *ayudar*-verbs are the faithful counterpart of English DOC goals as far as case properties are concerned; indeed, the grammaticality of the English gloss of (23b) shows that English DOCs may passivize with no problem and that, as a consequence, their goal is invariably marked with accusative case.

Of course, the two phenomena observed with regard to *ayudar*-verb environments—the existence of theme conflation and the availability of accusative case and raising-to-subject for goals—cannot be two independent facts unrelated to each other. Informally speaking, it seems as if, when theme conflation takes place, the accusative case usually assigned to the theme can now be “transferred” to the goal argument.

I will derive the apparently exceptional behavior of these goals from the principle in (25), a version of the one proposed by Alsina (1997) in relation to Romance causatives:

(25) Dative case can only be assigned to the (thematically) more prominent of two internal arguments.

According to (25), structural dative case cannot be assigned if there is only one internal argument in the predicate. I will assume that (25) is a severe case restriction holding for case assignment in Spanish. As an effect of (25), a constituent in the spec-
ifier of an ApplP must regularly receive dative case, because it normally co-occurs with a theme argument. However, in certain instances where the theme does not structurally manifest itself, as in the conflation cases analyzed here, the goal must receive accusative case.

One piece of evidence supporting (25) concerns, of course, the case behavior of causee subjects in causative constructions; recall that it is in connection to causative constructions that Alsina puts forth a principle similar to (25).

Under restructuring, the clitic corresponding to the causee subject in Spanish causative constructions exhibits dative case if the causee verb selects an object represented by an accusative clitic undergoing clitic climbing; by contrast, if no accusative clitic is selected by the causee verb, the clitic corresponding to the subject of the causee verb manifests itself as accusative. I illustrate these contrasting facts with the examples in (26)/(27). We have obtained (26b) from (26a) through substitution for the low argumental phrases of (26a) by a clitic, plus a restructuring process (notice that clitic climbing has taken place). As a result, we observe that the causee subject in (26a) must be replaced by a dative pronominal clitic se, because it co-occurs with a predicate-mate accusative clitic replacing the theme object la canción, “the song.” By contrast, the causee subject in (27a) may only be replaced by an accusative clitic la in (27b), as the causee verb is intransitive.

(26) a. Juan hizo cantar la canción a María.
   Juan made.3.sg to.sing the song to María
b. Juan se la hizo cantar.
   Juan 3.sg.DatCL. 3.sg. AccCL made.3.sg to.sing
   “Juan made Mary/her sing the song/it.”

(27) a. Juan hizo cantar a María.
   Juan made.3.sg to.sing to María
b. Juan la hizo cantar.
   Juan 3.sg.AccCL. made.3.sg to.sing
   “Juan made Mary/her sing.”

In these examples it is possible to see that the same restriction holding for the specifier of an ApplP also holds for subjects of causee verbs when they become internal arguments of the causer verb, provided that a theme predicate-mate is present. Therefore we can say that (25) is a general principle holding for case assignment to internal arguments.

A further piece of evidence supporting (25) concerns the behavior of Spanish verbs like pagar, “pay”/servir, “serve.” These verbs must assign dative case to their goals if the theme object is present, as shown in (28a); by contrast, when the theme is absent, as in (28b), the goal must obtain accusative case.

(28) a. le/*la serví a ella el café.
   3.sg.DatCL/3.sg.fem.AccCL served.1.sg. to her the coffee
   “I served her a coffee.”
Therefore, it seems reasonable to conclude that a principle like (25) is constraining structural case assignment in Spanish.

**Inanimate Objects**

The presence of an animacy-feature in the ApplP selected by ayudar-verbs seems to be seriously compromised by the fact that those verbs are sometimes able to appear with nonanimate complements, as illustrated in (29).

(29) Esas cosas perjudican la salud.

“Those things harm the health.”

Consequently a modification of my original hypothesis relying on a concept different from “animacy” but preserving the fundamental role of ApplP would be highly desirable. Luckily, this new perspective is provided by Ormazábal and Romero (2007) in their updated account for the me-lui constraint. Ormazábal and Romero (2007) notice that ApplPs are not inherently related to animacy; they illustrate this fact with the example in (30):

(30) Le pongo la pata a la mesa.

3.sg.DatCL put.1.sg. the leg to the table

“I will assemble the leg on the table.”

Importantly, even though the clitic le in environments like (30) is not related to animacy, it triggers me-lui constraint effects, as illustrated in (31b) [which contrasts with (31a)]:

(31) CONTEXT: I’m fed up; if you mention that the table is missing a leg once again and do nothing to fix it . . .

a. . . . te pongo a ti (de pata) en la mesa.

2.sg.AccCL put.1.sg you as leg in the table

b. * . . . te le pongo a ti (de pata) a la mesa.

2.sg.AccCL 3.sg.DatCL put.1.sg you as leg to the table

“I assemble you as a leg in the table.” (Ormazábal and Romero 2007)

This means that an account of the me-lui constraint based on animacy competition cannot be true. Instead, Ormazábal and Romero propose the constraint in (32), coupled with the empirically (and cross-linguistically) well-supported claim that animacy always triggers object agreement and the reasonable assumption that indirect object clitics are a manifestation of applicative object agreement (2007; see their work for details):

(32) **Object Agreement Constraint (OAC):** If the verbal complex encodes object agreement, no other argument can be licensed through verbal agreement.
The reason why Spanish third-person accusative clitics do not trigger me-lui constraint effects [recall example (3)] is that they are instances of determiner cliticization, which explains that they cannot be doubled [see (33)]; instead, Spanish dative (and first-/second-person accusative) clitics necessarily trigger such effects, because, as evidenced by their availability to undergo doubling [see (34)], they are instances of agreement:

(33) *La vimos la casa.
3.fem.AccCL saw.1.sg the house
“We saw the house.” (Ormazábal and Romero 2007)

(34) Les compré un libro a los primos.
3.pl.DatCL bought.1.sg. a book to the cousins
“I bought my cousins a book.” (Ormazábal and Romero 2007)

Clearly, the accusative clitic located in the specifier of ayudar-verbs is not a manifestation of applicative object agreement, as no doubling is possible in these cases:

(35) *La ayudé a una chica.
3.sg.fem.AccCL helped to a girl
“I helped a girl.”

As a consequence, accusative clitics hosted by ApplPs are determiners undergoing cliticization. However, I also claim that this process simultaneously triggers obligatory abstract applicative object agreement. The abstract nature of this agreement is quite natural, given that the accusative clitic is cliticizing to the verbal head, thus preventing the overt manifestation of applicative agreement most probably due to morphological reasons.

It is the combination of abstract applicative agreement and animacy-related object agreement that explains the ungrammaticality of (6c) as a violation of the principle in (32).

The situation just described concerning accusative clitics with ayudar-verbs significantly resembles the behavior of goal clitics in Spanish “laísta” dialects. In these dialects, accusative clitics may be interpreted as goals, as illustrated in (36), where the feminine accusative clitic la is referring to the recipient of the book:

(36) Juan la dio un libro.
Juan 3.sg.AccCL gave a book
“Juan gave her a book.”

Romero (2001) offers several pieces of evidence supporting the proposal that sentences like (36) are the Spanish equivalent of English DOCs, where the goal exhibits accusative case too. If this is true, we could say that the accusative clitic in examples like (36) occupy the specifier of an ApplP in the same way that ayudar-verb goals do. Importantly, although it is located in the ApplP, the clitic cannot be doubled, a fact also pointed out by Romero.
(37) *Juan la dio un libro a una chica.
Juan 3.sg.AccCL gave a book to a girl
“Juan gave a girl a book.”

Moreover, no agreement clitic may show up co-occurring with the accusative clitic either:

(38) *Juan la le dio un libro.
“Juan gave her a book.”

As a consequence, it is reasonable to conclude that both “laísta” goal clitics and standard Spanish ayudar-verb goal clitics are instances of the same phenomenon: Determiner cliticization takes place in an ApplP environment, and, as a result, the applicative agreement morpheme heading the ApplP must remain silent, presumably due to morphological reasons.

NOTES
I thank the audience of GURT 2007, as well as Ignacio Bosque and Juan Romero. Of course, all errors are my own. This work has been financed by the Servicio de Investigación of the Universidad Complutense de Madrid as a result of the author’s taking part of the research group “Relations between Lexicon and Syntax in Spanish” (Departamento de Lengua Española y Teoría de la Literatura y Literatura Comparada, Facultad de Filología).

1. Spanish has a series of four third-person nonreflexive accusative clitics (neu./masc. sg. lo, fem.sg. la, masc.pl. los, fem.pl. las) and a series of two third-person nonreflexive dative clitics (sg. le, pl. les), plus one special third-person nonreflexive dative clitic, the “spurious” se, unmarked for gender/number and restricted to co-occurring with other clitics.

2. As for the descriptive literature, the contrast between cases like (4b) and (5b) has also been almost totally ignored. One exception is Cano (1987, 353), who points out the difference between his pair of examples in (1) [with innocuous restructuring in (1b)] and the pair in (2) [with restructuring triggering ungrammaticality in (2b)]:

(1) a. Lo vi manejarlo.
   b. Se lo vi manejar.
      3.DatCL 3.sg.masc.AccCL saw.1.sg drive.INFIN
      “I saw him drive it.”

(2) a. Lo vi castigarlo.
   b. *Se lo vi castigar.
      3.DatCL 3.sg.masc.AccCL saw.1.sg punish.INFIN
      “I saw him punish him.”
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