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STYLISTIC CONVENTIONS

Throughout this work, I will employ the following conventions to identify technical terms, the source of corpus data, standard pinyin, glosses, etc. in the main text.

(1) The first uses of technical terms in either English or Mandarin Chinese in this work will be in double underscoring; for example, cognitive grammar, subjectification, 處置式 chūzhì shì ‘disposal form’, and etc.

(2) The Mandarin Chinese colloquial corpus data cited in this text will be transcribed with traditional characters\(^1\), standard pinyin, word or morpheme glosses, and translation into English. As appropriate, I provide contextual cues, such as setting and participants in a situation in a box. For instance,

他把我們三個畫得好快樂哦！

*tā bā wǒ-men sān-ge huà de hǎo kuài-lè e*

‘He draws the three of us as/to the degree of being very happy [in the picture].’

\[ \rightarrow \text{He performed the event of drawing the three people.} \]

\[ \leftarrow \text{The result of this event shows three happy people in the picture.} \]

*(Quartet 2003)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting: on the grass in the country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants: Miss Chen, and her admirer are talking about her nephew’s picture of the three of them</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Two types of Chinese characters are used for writing Chinese communities: traditional characters and simplified characters. Mainland China uses simplified characters, and Taiwan uses traditional characters. The uses of either character font in the U.S. vary depending on the communities.
(3) I utilize standard pinyin in italics with tone marks above main vowels, for example, 把 bā ‘to take, to hold’. There are basic four basic tones in Mandarin Chinese: (1) the flat tone 八 bā ‘eight’, (2) the rising tone 拔 bá ‘to pull’, (3) the falling-rising tone 把 bā ‘to take, to hold’, (4) the falling tone 爸 bà ‘father’.

The absence of a tone diacritic indicates a light tone; most occurrences of light tone are restricted to discourse final particles, like 吧 ba PRT.

(4) Aspectual markers and grammatical functions of certain morphemes will glossed into the following abbreviations.

- adverb marker ADV
- aspectual marker ASP
- classifier CL
- directional marker DIR
- extential marker EXT
- locative marker LOC
- particle PRT
- progressive PROG
- transitive TNS

(5) Glosses of linguistic forms and the translation will be indicated by single quotation marks, e.g., the meaning of the lexical verb 把 bā is ‘to take, to hold’.

‘If you see raising a child as running a business, I guarantee you that it must be a losing proposition.’
(6) Several conventions for representing categories and roles.

Centering theory:

\[ C_b = \text{backward-looking center} \]
\[ C_f = \text{forward-looking center} \]
\[ C_p = \text{preferred center} \]
\[ U_A = A's \text{ utterance} \]

Discourse participants:

\[ O = \text{older sister;} \quad M = \text{middle sister;} \quad Y = \text{younger sister} \]

Grammatical segments:

\[ X = \text{segment } X, \quad Y = \text{segment } Y, \quad Z = \text{segment } Z \]

(7) Brackets are utilized to identify the group segment \( X, Y \) or \( Z \) in the \textit{bā} construction.

(8) Capital letters within brackets are used to indicate the conceptual frame of a verb, for example, [BUY]. The same convention is applied to identify the conceptual substrate of the morpheme \textit{bā}, for instance, [DO] and [CAUSE].

(9) Capital letters are used in Talmy’s notion of motion event, for example, MANNER and PATH.

(10) Italization of words in English, such as \textit{upstairs} or \textit{platform} indicates that they are used as examples.
ABSTRACT

This work adopts Langacker’s cognitive grammar approach and addresses the cognitive significance of result in Mandarin Chinese, as expressed in resultant construals in the Mandarin Chinese bǎ construction: X bǎ Y Z. I identify the semantic prime of result in Mandarin Chinese, and discuss its role in the resultative verbal compound construction, the V-de-EXT resultative construction, and the bèi construction, with particular focus on the bǎ construction. I provide evidence for the resultant nature of segment Z in the bǎ construction in (1) aspectual markers, (2) resultative suffixes, (3) resultative verbal compounds, (4) locative complements, (5) directional complements, (6) the double object gěi ‘give’ construction, (7) inalienable possession; (8) durative and frequentative markers; and (9) the regard predicate. I consider the semantic category of result in the Mandarin Chinese bǎ construction to be grounded in the conceptualization of the morpheme bǎ ‘to take, to hold.’ The manipulative sense of holding an object is transformed into a metaphorical resultative sense of holding a grammatical event. Comparisons with the English “get/have + p.p. construction” and the German inseparable prefixes reveal the shared cross-linguistic nature of agency and result.

I utilize Grosz, Joshi, and Weinstein’s (1995) centering discourse approach to analyze the Mandarin Chinese bǎ construction X bǎ Y Z, and determine that segment Y is the backward-looking center. Prince’s assumed familiarity accounts for the cognitive constraints of segment Y. I ascribe the cognitive significance of result to the claim of construal differences. I apply cognitive relativism to pedagogical implications for SLA instruction of the Mandarin Chinese bǎ construction.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION AND THEORETICAL PRELIMINARIES

1.1 Motivation

The main direction of this work grew from my desire to explicate the semantic nature of the Mandarin Chinese bā construction. Pedagogic experience convinced me of the importance of using authentic texts. Examination of colloquial spoken data allowed me to discover several different types of bā sentences and other related grammatical features. I found a structure similar to the Mandarin Chinese bā construction: German inseparable prefixes. Both the German and Mandarin Chinese structures involve similar kinds of semantic relationships, which can be best explicated through the model of Cognitive Grammar (hereafter as CG, Langacker 1987, 1990). I also find the notion of construal in CG to be helpful in distinguishing different patterns of conceptualization among speakers of different languages. The context of construal also creates a useful pedagogical tool for instructing non-native speakers learning Mandarin Chinese.

1.2 Aim of the Study

This study aims to explicate the phenomena of conceptualization and result in Mandarin Chinese, exemplified by a thorough analysis of the bā construction. First, I will discuss conceptual disparities between Chinese and English. These differences in conception are articulated in linguistic structures: in Mandarin Chinese, the construal of scenes/things is based on a result; in English, construal is based on process (Tai 2003). Second, I compare the bā construction to the English get/have + p.p. (past participle) construction and to the German inseparable prefixes (Blumenfiled 2001, Sprang 2003). These comparative studies are intended to present a clear account of the semantic category of result in the
three languages, with special focus on Mandarin Chinese. Third, I introduce the issue of cognitive relativism in order to examine the result/process distinction between Chinese and English. Knowing and understanding this cognitive conceptual difference enhances second language pedagogy and suggests further research directions in cognitive linguistics.

This study attempts to demonstrate that different construals of conceptualization operate for speakers of Chinese and English, based on a distinction between result and process. Understanding these differences in conceptualizations can greatly enhance instruction in the fields of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) and Foreign Language Acquisition (FLA).

1.3 Chapter Outlines

Chapter 1 introduces theoretical preliminaries of cognitive grammar, grammaticalization, and cognition-based Chinese grammar, as well as the methodology applied throughout this work. Chapter 2 addresses the semantic category of result in Mandarin Chinese. Chapter 3 examines conceptualizations of the morpheme bā, constructs a lexical network for bā, and discusses the relationship between conceptualization and grammaticalization with respect to the morpheme bā. Chapter 4 looks into the elements of resultant construals in the Mandarin Chinese bā construction, establishes its status as a constructional device that incorporates the element of result, and provides comparative analysis of the bā construction to the English get/have + p.p. construction and the German inseparable prefixes. Chapter 5 introduces the notion of cognitive relativism, argues that my analysis of the bā construction supports this relativism, and then links cognitive linguistics to the enhancement of SLA pedagogy. Chapter 6 presents a conclusion, and points out further research directions.
1.4 Phenomenology and Cognitive Linguistics

The enterprise of cognitive linguistics is represented in the work of Lakoff (1987), Langacker (1987, 1990), Talmy (2000) in different terms: Lakoff’s Idealized Cognitive Model (ICM), Langacker’s Cognitive Grammar (CG), and Talmy’s Cognitive Semantics. Throughout this work, I will use these terms interchangeably when referring to the general theory. Cognitive semantics is the study of “qualitative mental phenomena as they exist in awareness” (Talmy 2000: 4). The subject of awareness is also important within the field of phenomenology. This shared focus offers the insight: cognitive semantics can be understood as including the phenomenological investigation of conceptual content and structure in language. The methodology common to phenomenology and cognitive linguistics is that of introspection based on native speakers’ intuition (Sokolowski 2000, Talmy 2000). As Talmy (ibid.) suggests, this method can be justified based on the nature of the scientific fields being explored. If we study geology, we go to where the data are, which may contain “physical travel to terrestrial sites” (5). If we study linguistics, then we go to where meaning is located. To locate this meaning, we explore and study human conscious experience and perception. Applying cognitive linguistics approaches the study site of language data via the method of introspection.

Sokolowski (2000: 17-21) presents a paradigm of conscious experience, using the perception of a cube as an example. He posits that there are three layers involved when we view an object like a cube: sides, aspects, and profiles. Viewing a material object involves “a mixture of presence and absence” (17). That is, our perception of an object involves a blend of both what is present and absent. In the case of observing a cube, not all of the layers are simultaneously visible; e.g., the side of the cube facing away from the receiver is
invisible. This description of the conscious experience of perceiving a cube serves as an analogy to the viewing arrangement posited in CG (Langacker 2001). Just as the perception of a cube can be both subjective and objective, a linguistic utterance can also involve a subjective and an objective construal.

Cognitive linguistics is a complementary approach to the phenomenology of how that human beings construe conceptualization based on conscious perceptual experiences. Its method depends on the introspection and intuition of native speakers.

1.4.1 Fillmore’s Frame Semantics

To introduce Fillmore’s notion of frame semantics (Fillmore 1975, 1977), I will start with Austin’s explication of the game of cricket.

Take the sense in which I talk of a cricket bat and a cricket ball and a cricket umpire. The reason that all are called by the same name is perhaps that each has its part – its own special part – to play in the activity of cricketing: it is no good to say that cricket simply means “used in cricket”: for we cannot explain what we mean by “cricket” except by explaining the special parts played in cricketing by the bat, ball, etc. (Austin 1940: 73)

This example introduces the notion of a special part within a complex activity; this is analogous to Fillmore’s notion of perspective within a frame (1975, 1977). Fillmore proposes the notions of frame and perspective to describe linguistic phenomena; a frame is:

any system of linguistic choices – the easiest cases being collections of words, but also including choices of grammatical rules or linguistic categories – that can get associated with prototypical instances of scenes. (Fillmore 1975: 124)

Fillmore defines frame in terms of the linguistic options associated with scenes, which are similar to “situation” in Ungerer and Schmid’s terminology (1996). Fillmore later refined his characterization of frame as a “specific unified framework of knowledge, or coherent schematizations of experience” (1985: 223), which yields a cognitive reading. In subsequent development of the concept, he describes frames as “cognitive structures …
knowledge of which is presupposed for the concepts encoded by words” (Fillmore and Atkins 1992: 75). The shift of Fillmore’s definition of frames through time moves from one based on “linguistic choices” to a cognitive interpretation of frames.

This shift toward a cognitive orientation is also evidenced in Fillmore’s concept of perspective. Fillmore’s initial definition of perspective was at first oriented toward syntactic constructs (1985). More recently, he has shifted toward a cognitive perspective. In cognitive linguistics, a sentence “evokes a certain cognitive perspective on a situation by the choice of the verb and the particular syntactic pattern that it governs” (Ungerer and Schmid 1996: 209). Ungerer and Schmid propose that perspective is cognitive instead of syntactic, in that it represents the “cognitive ability of directing our attention” (209; bold emphasis is original). Take buy for example: the speaker uses buy to direct the hearer’s attention to the participants BUYER and GOODS. Two more examples of framing are listen and hear, instantiated in (1).

(1) Did you LISTEN to me or did you just HEAR what I said?

The frame of [LISTEN] perspectivizes the hearer’s volition and will to actively incorporate what the speaker says, while that of [HEAR] does not necessarily involve the volition and will of the speaker. When the two words are contrasted in (1), [HEAR] involves only passive reception: perception as fast, encapsulated and not under conscious control. By uttering (1), the speaker tries to direct the hearer’s attention toward his or her volition and will to actively listen to what the speaker says.

One of Fillmore’s classic early examples of frame semantics is the [COMMERCIAL EVENT] frame alluded to above (1977: 104-9). He understands the frame of [BUY] in (2)
to include the following participants: a BUYER (Harry), a SELLER (Mr. Smith), MONEY ($60) and GOODS (the puppy).

(2) [BUY]

Harry bought the puppy (from Mr. Smith).

(example from Fillmore 1977: 103)

He employs the same notion of perspective for the related [COMMERCIAL EVENT] components: [SELL], [CHARGE] and [PAY]. The frame of [SELL] in (3) demands a SELLER and GOODS in the perspective of subject and object. As exemplified in (4), the frame of [CHARGE] introduces SELLER and BUYER into perspective as subject and object. The frame of [PAY] in (5a) perspectivizes the BUYER and MONEY as subject and object; it allows the SELLER as indirect object, and optionally allow MONEY as direct object in (5b). However, we notice the low prominence of the participant SELLER in the linguistic surface structure, in (5b), and also in the frames of [SPEND] (6) and [COST] (7). All involve a SELLER, but the SELLER cannot appear within the same clause, or without use of an imbedded in linguistic surface structure. In the [COMMERCIAL EVENT] examples, the focus of attention is directed to the BUYER and MONEY when the speaker chooses to invoke the [SPEND] frame in (6), while attention is directed to the GOODS when the frame of [COST] is chosen in (7).

(3) [SELL]

Mr. Smith sold the puppy (to Harry).

(4) [CHARGE]

Mr. Smith charged (Harry) $60 for the puppy.
(5a) [PAY]
Harry paid $60 for the puppy.

(5b) [PAY]
Harry paid Mr. Smith ($60) for the puppy.

(6) [SPEND]
Harry spent $60 on the puppy.

(7) [COST]
The puppy (from Mr. Smith) cost (Harry) $60.

(examples from Fillmore 1977: 103; (6) is mine)

Fillmore’s [COMMERCIAL EVENT] frame involves at least four participants: BUYER (A), GOODS (B), MONEY (C), and SELLER (D), and the aforementioned six verbs: [BUY], [SELL], [CHARGE], [PAY], [SPEND] and [COST]. The frames these six verbs evoke put the four participants A, B, C, and D into different perspectives in relation to one another, shown in Figure 1.1

Figure 1.1: [COMMERCIAL EVENT] Frame
(adapted from Fillmore 1977: 106-9)
(figure cont’d)
The frames of [BUY] and [PAY] perspectivize from the point of view of the BUYER, and those of [SELL] and [CHARGE] are oriented from the SELLER’s point of view. The frames of [SPEND] and [COST] both involve an implicit SELLER, although this role is not overtly expressed. When the attention is directed to the BUYER and MONEY, the frame of [SPEND] is preferred. If the attention is shifted to the GOODS, then the frame of [COST] is chosen.

To sum up, the above examples demonstrate that the difference among these six verbs involves a change of perspective within the same frame. In other words, the notion of frames describes “the cognitive context which provides the background for and is
associated with cognitive categories” (Ungerer and Schmid 1996:210). Fillmore’s concept of frames can be related to the concept of domain in the cognitive grammar Langacker (1987) proposes.

1.4.2 Langacker’s Cognitive Grammar

Cognitive Grammar (Langacker 1987, 1990, 2000; CG) describes language as a conceptual organization that is symbolic in nature. Langacker (1987) claims that there are three major kinds of structures in this conceptual organization: semantic, phonological, and symbolic. He indicates that the configurations of a symbolic relationship reside in the relationship between semantic and phonological structures. The symbolic units can be simple, such as lexical items, or highly semantically schematic, such as grammatical morphemes. Conventional expressions, idioms, and clichés, belong to the former group, while basic grammatical classes, such as noun and verb, are in the latter group.

To explain the nature of CG, Langacker uses the metaphor of the billiard-ball model (Langacker 1987, 1991) to describe a world. Within this model there are four elements: space, time, material substance, and energy. Physical objects move through the space within the conceived time and participate in energetic interactions (1991: 283). This conception of energy transmission, which is similar to Talmy’s notion of force dynamics (1988), constitutes the action chain (1991). In the billiard-ball model, one initial object is the head of the energy source (the billiard cue), which, via forceful contact by the player’s physiological efforts, transfers its energy to the final object (the ball), where the energy sinks. The metaphor involves a moving ball that makes physical contact with a second ball, which hits either a third ball or the cushioned edge, with the result that one ball is hit into one of the pockets on the billiard table. During the course of the pool table action chain,
partial energy is initiated by the cue and transmitted via the interactions of the balls, and
the remaining energy is absorbed by the cushioned edge or pockets (Ungerer and Schmid
1996: 174-76). Another metaphor Langacker uses to describe the notion of energy flow is
that of a river to elucidate the way that energy is transferred.

Langacker’s explanatory metaphor is exemplified in the Mandarin Chinese sentence in
(8). In application of an action chain, one object tā ‘s/he’ (shown as a circle) makes a
forceful physical contact with another wǒ ‘I/me,’ resulting in a transfer of energy
(indicated as double arrows). The initial object in an action chain is referred to as its head,
and the final object as its tail. To employ this notion, we can arrive at either of the two
interpretations ([a] and [b]). The interpretation of 8[a] is the simplest action chain without
any intermediary, while that of 8[b] involves an intermediary, hand, which is manipulated
by the agent to affect the patient. The squiggly arrow inside the circle indicates a patient or
a theme that undergoes an internal change of state.

\[
\text{8 [a] } \quad \text{<dā> } \quad \text{tā} \quad \text{wǒ} \\
\text{‘s/he’} \quad \text{‘I/me’} \\
\text{他打我} \quad \text{tā} \quad \text{dā} \quad \text{wǒ} \\
\text{s/he} \quad \text{hit} \quad \text{I/me} \\
\text{‘S/He hit me.’}
\]

**Figure 1.2: Energy Transmission of 打 dā ‘hit’ in Langacker’s Action Chain**

(figure cont’d.)
The interpretation in 8[b] involves the comprehensive cognitive sequence of

他打我 tā dǎ wǒ  ‘he struck me’, since hand as instrument is not only semantically implied in the physical action verb 打 dǎ “hit” in Mandarin Chinese but is also explicitly indicated in the semantic radical of the character with which this verb is written, a hand radical.

In addition to the physical action contact, a cognitive energy flow can be traced in the sentence in (9), illustrated in Figure 1.3.

(9) 他打坐 tā dǎ zuò  ‘s/he-hit-sit’ ‘S/He sits in meditation.’

Figure 1.3  打坐 dǎ zuò ‘hit-sit: sit in meditation’
(Gao 2001: 31)

According to Gao (2001: 29-31), the essential aspect of the mental activity of sitting in meditation involves energy that comes from the universe into the body and mind of the
meditator. This energy flow is conceived as an impact that enables the agent to focus his/her mind to meditate. Such an impact can also be perceived as the by-product of a prototypical act of 打 dà ‘hit.’ In contrast to the physical energy transfer sent in (8) above, the static state that dà zuò ‘sit in meditation’ portrays demonstrates another type of force-dynamic relation, which Gao terms “cause-static” (2001: 31). I will utilize this notion of “cause-static” action chain to analyze the bā construction in Mandarin Chinese in Chapter 4.

Another concept Langacker proposes is the stage model (1987, 1990), a concept which is also found in Tesnière’s work (1959 in Ungerer and Schmid 1996). Tesnière compares the formation of the constituents in a sentence to a play enacted on stage. The background is analogous to the setting or the props, and the prominence is what the actors say, act, and do on the stage. In this model, Langacker emphasizes perceptual experiences. He considers the perceiver to be like the audience watching a play. The speakers construe scenes as setting, with participants interacting within the setting, just as the stage includes scenery, props, and actors. What happens within the conceived time on the stage is perceived as events. The audience will focus their attention on the stage, just as the perceiver will focus on the onstage region (1990: 286). The onstage region is also called the locus of attention (Langacker 2000: 205; 2001: 9).

1.4.2.1 Conceptualization

Based on the assertion that mental experience is real, Langacker claims that “semantic structure is conceptualization tailored to the specifications of linguistic convention” (1987: 99). Conceptualization is one of the most fundamental and essential element in CG. It is inherently dynamic in nature, and encompasses “novel conceptions, sensory and emotive
experience, and apprehension of the physical, linguistic, social and cultural context” (Langacker 2000: 361). In Langacker’s semantic analysis, **conceptualization** consists of diverse stimuli imported from cognitive intakes. **CG** claims that all grammatical constructs are meaningful, and that “meaning is equated with conceptualization … in terms of cognitive processing” (Langacker 1988: 6).

Another important concept in **CG** is that of **domains**, i.e., “contexts for the characterization of a semantic unit” (147). I will exemplify **domains** with Langacker’s examples of [CIRCLE] and [ARC] in Figure 1.4.

![CIRCLE and ARC domains](Langacker 1987: 184)

In the **domain** of space, the circle is **profiled**, while in the **domain** of a circle, the arc is **profiled**. Furthermore, when the designation of [ARC] is **profiled**, two **domains** are involved: the overall **domain** of space and the **entrenched domain** of circle. [CIRCLE] is entrenched in space, and [ARC] is entrenched in the circle. The domain of space is thus termed **primary domain** due to its immediate relevance.

Another set of examples, [ENTER] and [INTO] in Figure 1.5, elucidates the CG concept of the **trajector/landmark** relationship, shown in different word classes, in this case, verb and preposition. The term **scanning** describes the information accumulated via
cognitive processing. Langacker suggests that our cognitive ability to scan a cognized intake determines the distinction of word classes (Ungerer and Schmid 1996). Langacker identifies two types of cognitive processing: summary scanning and sequential scanning. The major difference between them is that the former reflects the result of the scanning process, and the latter highlights the scanning process as it unfolds through the conceived time. The example of [ENTER] in sequential scanning and that of [INTO] in summary scanning are illustrated in (a) and (b) in Figure 1.5.

(a)  **sequential scanning**: [ENTER]

(b)  **summary scanning**: [INTO]

**Figure 1.5: Sequential Scanning and Summary Scanning: [ENTER] and [INTO]**

(Langacker 1987: 144 and 245; Ungerer and Schmid 1996: 194)

The third core concept in Langacker’s CG model is that of imagery or image (1987: 110-3), which describes “the occurrence of a perceptual sensation in the absence of the
corresponding perceptual input” (110). Take the Mandarin Chinese word in (10) for example.

(10) 吃苦  

chī-kǜ  

eat – bitterness  

‘suffer’

The sensory imagery of the cognitive event of eating bitterness is conceptualized to express the hardships and sufferings in real life. This metaphorical usage reflects the value of eating in Chinese culture. This word has been entrenched and conventionalized through repetitions to achieve its current unit status.

Another example, (11), demonstrates the bodily experiential domain in Chinese culture through the word used to express apology.

(11) 對不起  

duì-bù-qǐ  

to face-not-up  

‘sorry’

The literal meaning of the word in (11) is to not be able to face the addressee in apologizing due to physical orientation of one’s body as bowed down, to show one’s sincerity in apologizing. The mental experience of feeling sorry is metaphorically expressed in the bodily domain. This conventionalized word use reflects an entrenched manner of showing apology in Chinese culture.

An example of visual imagery that is well entrenched in Chinese is the metaphorical conceptualization of a mountain as a person, shown in the words in (12a-c).

(12) a. 山頭 shān-tóu  

mountain-head  

‘the head/top of a mountain/mountain top’

b. 山腰 shān-yāo  

mountain-waist  

‘the middle part/side of a mountain/mountain side’

c. 山腳 shān-jǐao  

mountain-foot  

‘the foot of a mountain’
In these words, the image of a person is reflected onto a mountain. The mirroring image of a person’s body part is reflected in the unit statuses of (12a-c) to describe those parts of a mountain.

1.4.2.2 Types of Profile

Within Langacker’s CG model (1987), the array of conceptual content evoked by an expression is called its base, and the designated conceptual referent is a profile. Meaning varies by profiling different facets of the expressions with the same base. For example, the concept of [HYPOTENUSE] evokes a conceptual base of a right triangle, and designates a substructure within this conceptual base, as in Figure 1.6.

![Figure 1.6 Profile of [HYPOTENUSE]](Langacker 1987, 1999)

In terms of the discussion in 1.4.2.1 above, [HYPOTENUSE] is entrenched within the domain of [TRIANGLE].

The Chinese concept of 隱陽 yīnyáng ‘Yin-Yang,’ shown in Figure 1.7, incorporates the complementary concepts of dark and bright, and female and male, which have the same base. Phrases incorporating Yin include 隱暗 yīn-àn ‘yin-dark/gloomy dark’, and 陰道 yīn-dào ‘Yin-path/vagina’. Phrases built upon Yang include 陽光 yáng-guāng ‘Yang-
light/sunshine’, and 阳具 yángjù ‘Yang-instrument/penis’. The Mandarin Chinese expression 阴阳人 yīnyángrén ‘Yin-Yang person’ indicates a transgendered person who, in the conception of Chinese, is neither a female nor a male. The ancient symbol for Yin-Yang expresses the conceptual base of 阴阳 yīnyáng ‘Yin-Yang’ in (a), which symbolizes the complementary complexity through a dark half circle and a bright half circle. The dark side represents the conceptual content of 阴 yīn ‘Yin,’ while the bright side refers to that of 阳 yáng ‘Yang.’ With a different profile imposed onto Yin-Yang conceptual base, the semantic domain shifts (see (b) and (c)). Profiling is indicated in heavy red lines.

(a) base  (b) female  (c) male

![Figure 1.7: Profile of female and male in 阴阳 yīnyáng ‘Yin-Yang’](image)

In (b), [FEMALE] is entrenched in the domain of the Yin side of the circle, while in (c) [MALE] is designated in the domain of the Yang side of the circle.

There are three types of profiles in Langacker’s cognitive grammar: thing, relation, and process. A thing refers to the predications of a noun designating a region that abstractly depicts a set of interconnected entities. A relation illustrates the interconnections between these participating entities. In contrast to these atemporal profiles, a process is a temporal profile which designates a sequence of states that unfolds through time, when each interconnected state resides between the trajector and landmark (see section 1.4.2.1). In
terms of word classes, a noun designates a kind or type of thing, while a verb refers to a process that consists of continuous relations between trajector and landmark.

The trajector and landmark are two of the most prominent relation profiles. These concepts are similar to the concepts of figure and ground in Talmy’s work (1985, 2000). The trajector (or figure) is the primary focus and the most prominent participant, which is “construed as the entity being located, evaluated, or described” (Langacker 2003: 254). The landmark (or ground) is the secondary focus within the profiled relationship.

Take the uses of platform for example: this word functions both as a noun and a verb in the speech of an NJ Transit system conductor in (24a) and (24b).

(24) a. … the train will not be on the platform. (NJ Transit 2004)
    b. At Linden, the last car will not platform. (NJ Transit 11/12/2004)

These two uses of platform have a shared conceptual content; both evoke a trajector and a landmark. The use of platform in (24a) profiles on the landmark, since the train will be the trajector in this usage, while in (24b) platform designates a processual relation as the expression evokes its imagery. These two uses of platform evince different construals of the same conceptual content in American English, as sketched in Figure 1.8.

This example demonstrates that the word platform as used in the context of a transit system announcement categorizes two kinds of construal, both of which involve a trajector and a landmark, i.e., a train and a platform. The profile of different dimensions in a conceptual construal determines the meaning of the evoked expression, and sometimes creates a novel expression, like (24b), with respect to the designated dimension. The phenomenon of construal is richly productive in CG.
The notion of construal (Langacker 1993, 2001), i.e., the ability to conceive of or describe the same situation in different ways, is a pivotal concept in CG. Langacker defines a construal relationship as “the relationship between a speaker (or hearer) and a situation that he conceptualizes and portrays, involving focal adjustments and imagery” (1987: 487-8). It is this aspect of the CG model that allows us to understand that all grammatical constructs are meaningful. It is also the primacy of construal that distinguishes CG from other linguistic theories.

The component facets of construal are described as a visual phenomenon (Langacker 2001) in relation to a viewing arrangement. Verhagen (2004) illustrates this notion with a diagram, reproduced here as Figure 1.9, which illustrates two kinds of conceptualizations: the object of conceptualization and subject of conceptualization. Both are on the horizontal level, based on a Figure/ Ground organization; the upper level is construed as Figure, and the bottom level is Ground.
The Figure level represents different structures imposed in a construal relationship, for example, attentional and force dynamic, while the vertical relation demonstrates different relations in a communicative situation, for example, deixis and viewpoint (Verhagen 2004: 17). The Ground level is what Langacker (1987:126) indicates as the speech event, its participants and its setting. Verhagen notes that there is not only a singular viewer involved in the Ground level, and further provides a more complex configuration that incorporates Tomasello’s notation of cognitive differences between human children and non-human primates. Tomasello states,

> There is just one major difference, and that is the fact that human beings ‘identify’ with conspecifics more deeply than do other primates. This identification is [...] simply the process by which the human child understands that other persons are beings like herself [...] and so she tries to understand things from their point of view. [...] For purpose of exposition I refer to this process generally as ‘understanding others as intentional (or mental) agents (like the self). (Tomasello 1999: 14-5)

Verhagen incorporates Tomasello’s notation of mutually shared knowledge, recognized by the two Construers, into the viewing arrangement. This construal configuration is diagrammed in Figure 1.10.
Construer 1 could be the speaker, then Construer 2 is the addressee. A linguistic utterance by the speaker invites the addressee to “jointly attend to an object of conceptualization in some specific way, and to update the common ground by doing so” (Verhagen 2004: 18). I will discuss viewing arrangement and elaborate Figure 1.10 further in section 1.4.2.3.3.

1.4.2.3.1 Construal Exemplified: 小姑姑 xiǎo gūgu

The Construer’s construals of scenes always involves a choice between alternates. I utilize this concept of choice, as constrained by the worldview of the Chinese speech community to analyze the multiple construals of the kinship term in (13).

(13) 小姑姑 xiǎo gūgu little – aunt ‘youngest auntie on paternal side’

The relational kinship term, [GUGU] ‘aunt on paternal side,’ presupposes a network of paternal kinship relations as Ground. The modified term [XIAO GUGU] profiles and foregrounds ego’s Father’s youngest female sibling. Another profile component in this example is that [XIAO] ‘little’ is diminutive profiled in the domain of age. It is a modifier that indicates both endearment towards the relative on the part of the speaker, as well as
lower rank in relation both to ego’s father’s age and to the patriarchal societal relational hierarchy. This usage is productive, as the compound noun in (14).

(14) 小姐 xià-ojiě little –sister ‘Miss (term of address)’

In (15), the use of 小開 xiăo-kāi ‘little boss’ presupposes a higher position above the referent, i.e., that his parents own the company.

(15) 他是這家公司的小開。

\[
\text{tā shì zhè jiā gōng-sī de xiăo-kāi}
\]

he is this CL company POSS little boss

‘He is the son of the owner of this company.’

Yet another profile of [XIAO] is that it may also denote negative qualities of a particular type of person, as exemplified in (16), (17a) and (17b).

(16) 小人 xiăo-rén little-person ‘mean person; villain; a person with low position’

(17) a. 小鼻子 xiăo bí-zi little-nose ‘short-sighted, narrow-minded person’

b. 小眼睛 xiăo yăn-jīng ‘little-eyes ‘short-sighted, narrow-minded person’

The examples in (17a) and (17b) describe people who are short-sighted, narrow-minded, lacking no insight and vision.

In other words, the construal scenes of [XIAO] are related to (1) physically small size, (2) relatively young age, (3) triviality in terms of a measurable matrix, (4) relatively low position in a hierarchy, (5) negative quality. The literal meaning of 小 xiăo construes an object which specifically refers to physically small size, as in the word in (18), which could describes a child’s hand.

(18) 小手 xiăo-shŏu little-hand ‘little hand’
In utterance (19), [XIAO] construes in the domain of age, and means “young.”

(19) 她比我小。

tā bǐ wǒ xiǎo

‘She is younger than I.’

The conception of [XIAO] in (20a) evokes a similar meaning compared to that of the catch phrase in English in (20b).

(20) a. 別為了小事煩心。

bié wèi-le xiǎo-shì fán-xīn

don’t for small-thing bother

‘Don’t be bothered by small stuff!’

b. Don’t sweat the small stuff. (catch phrase, slogan)

Both ‘xiǎo’ in (20a) and ‘small’ in (20b) mean ‘trivial’ and their construal is from the perspective of a larger scale of a measurable matrix of all other things, from unimportant to important.

To develop the construal of [XIAO GUGU] ‘youngest auntie on paternal side,’ I adopt Langacker’s depiction of [AUNT] (Langacker 2000: 7) and modify it to apply to the Chinese kinship term. The paternal kinship configuration serves as the base, and [XIAO GUGU] profiles the youngest female sibling of ego’s father, sketched as in Figure 1.11. The construal scene in Figure 1.11 involves a paternal kinship system, including ego, ego’s parents, and ego’s father’s parents and siblings. I use different sizes of circle to represent the difference in age. The bigger circles represent elder females, and the smallest circle represents the youngest.
This kinship relation of [XIAO GUGU] constitutes a conceptual arrangement (Langacker 2000: 205), in which we perceive ego’s paternal kin as the maximal scope (all roles in Figure 1.11 except for ego’s mother), ego’s father’s sisters as the immediate scope, and the youngest sister (indicated in smallest, bolded circle in Figure 1.11) as the profile, i.e., [XIAO GUGU].

1.4.2.3.2 Viewing Arrangement and Conceptual Arrangement

Langacker’s CG model distinguishes between a viewing arrangement and a conceptual arrangement. The role of vision in perception provides the analogy to characterize the construal scene in conception (Langacker 2000: 203-6). Taking the words view and see for examples, both words demonstrate facets of observational experience from the visual perspective of an observer or a speaker. According to Langacker (2000: 204), view applies to judgment and opinion, and see to vision and comprehension. This application pertains to the assumption that speakers share the basic mental capacity to understand extentionality, especially in terms of spatial configurations. Vision provides the means to
apprehend spatial configurations. A concomitant working concept is the relation between
conception and perception, which is based on Talmy’s concept of ception (Talmy 2000: 102). Langacker proposes viewing analogies (2001: 9) to address the relation between a
viewing arrangement and a conceptual arrangement (2000: 205).

Figure 1.12: Viewing Analogies
(Langacker 2001: 9)

On the left hand side of the diagram, he describes a viewing arrangement. The subject
of the perception, i.e., the viewer, determines a maximal field of view when s/he observes
in that orientation. Using the “theatre” metaphor (described in section 1.4.2 above), he
identifies the locus of attention as the onstage region. Within the locus of attention, the
specific target of the object of our perception, i.e., the focus, is distinguishable. The
dashed lines in Figure 1.12 indicate the perceptual relationship profiled between the viewer
and the focus.

On the right hand side of Figure 1.12 are Langacker’s terms for conceptual arrangement.
This profiles a construal relationship within the realm of conception. A given
conceptualization resides in the “full array of conceptual content an expression evokes”
(2001: 9), i.e., the maximal scope, correspondent to the notion of maximal field of view.
The subject of conception, i.e., the Construer, construes the specific focus of attention as profile within the conceptual analogy of the onstage region, as the immediate scope.

In general, some aspects of a construal scene in conception can be compared to those of visual perception. These aspects are termed viewing effects (Langacker: 2001: 206). Since construal is a multifaceted viewing phenomenon and involves several dimensions of viewing effects, we will now turn to one of the dimensions that also reflects cognitive abilities: perspective.

1.4.2.3.3 Construal and Perspectives

For Langacker (2001), there are five dimensions of a construal phenomenon, each reflecting general cognitive abilities: specificity, background, perspective, scope, and prominence. In this section, I will focus on the notion of perspective in terms of construal.

Perspective subsumes various aspects of a construal phenomenon (Langacker 1987, 1990, 2000), including lexicon and grammatical constructions. The location from which a viewer observes a situation, is the vantage point or viewpoint. The particular location of the speaker is one factor that determines the perspective from which a scene is construed. A second factor that affects the perspective is mental scanning. Depending on how the Construer scans the scene, resultant expressions may evoke different meanings. The third factor involves the subject or the object of the conceptualization, since the perspectival construal is related to whether the Construer is profiled as subject or object.

Lexical items, like upstairs and soon, both inherently demonstrate aspects of a construal scene. The former incorporates a spatial vantage point, and the latter a temporal viewpoint (Langacker 2000: 5-6). Grammatical constructs, like X is above Y and Y is below X, elucidate that the semantic difference of these two constructs involves an element of
perspectival construal. Verhagen (2004: 23-4) proposes two kinds of grounding with respect to **perspectivization**: general grounding and specific grounding. Regarding general grounding, he further suggests that the Figure/ Ground configuration can distinguish cases like the following two examples.

(21) My email address and phone number are above. (Verhagen 2004: 24)

In (21), the location of the email and phone number are **constructed** from their position on an inferred document. The positioning of information in a document is an element of the **Ground**. This example presupposes a **profiled** relation between the **Ground** and the object of the conceptualization. According to Verhagen (2004), this **profiled** relationship referring to the **Ground** is not always involved in the usage of terms, like *above* or *below*; however, it is necessary for constructions where the Ground is not rendered linguistically. Such usage is considered as conventional. A similar conventional use of *below*, comparable to (21b) is instantiated in (22), in the context of a letter of application for employment.

(22) My C.V. is below. (constructed example)

In this context, the conventional perspectival construal is allowed.

Langacker states that various dimensions of construal are contingent upon *perspective*, e.g., whether the vantage point is the local or global. For example, the orientational terms *left* and *right* exemplify the phenomenon of vantage point and orientation. Example (23) profiles not only two overtly expressed participants, e.g., Jack and Jill, on the Figure Level, but also an implicit viewer on the Ground level.

(23) Jack was sitting to the left of Jill. (Langacker 2005)
Examples (24a-b) pertain to different perspective-taking on a scene construed by a Construer.

(24) a. The trail rises very quickly.

b. The trail is rising very quickly.  
(Langacker 2005)

According to Langacker (2005), example (24a) demonstrates a global view of a scene by a Construer on an airplane or viewing a roadmap, while (24b) reflects a local view, where the Construer is hiking on the trail. The verb “rise” in (24a-b) invokes the sense of fictive motion because the trail itself does not rise at all, what rises is the mental scanning trace of the Construer or the viewer in his/her conceptualization space. The viewer scans the fictive motion along the trail, and the notion of fictivity is realized in the verbal expressions of the utterances.

The following example illustrates a distinct construal phenomenon in a very neat way. The scene the viewer construes is from the perspective of a moving viewer.

(25) There is a house every now and then through the valley. 

(Talmy 1988 in Langacker 1993: 452)

The key elements are the adverb every now and then and the prepositional phrase through the valley. According to Langacker (1993), the Construer imagines what the viewer sees when s/he moves through the valley, i.e., non-fixed vantage point. The house does not move through the valley, but the viewer of the scene does. It evokes a covert scenario that the Construer, who is the viewer, is moving through the valley; some portion of the world is perceived by the viewer, and as the viewer moves, the view changes. The viewer’s “field of view comprises only a limited portion of the valley at any one instant, the sentence correctly describes what is actually perceived: within the immediate scope
defined by the moving field of view, a house does indeed appear *every now and then*” (Langacker 1993: 452). In other words, the temporal adverb *every now and then* modifies every intermittent given viewing encounter as the viewer perceives it while moving through the valley.

The next example reveals that the locative deictic *here* and the temporal deictic *right now* involve a special viewing arrangement requiring elaborate details of mental space.

(26) I am not here right now. [recorded message heard on the telephone]

Briefly, the utterance involves a blended situation of an original situation and an imagined one. The deictics *here* and *right now* correspond to two input spaces in the blended space, which simultaneously indicate and define that the speaker is not present when the caller hears the recorded message.

Verhagen uses Janssen’s (2002) doctor/patient example to indicate specific grounding in terms of *perspectives*. A doctor examining a patient might ask *Is this where it hurts?* And the patient might answer *Yes, that is where it hurts*, as instantiated in (27).

(27) Doctor: Is *this* where it hurts?

Patient: Yes, *that* is where it hurts. (Janssen 2002: 172-3)

Janssen argues that “this” and “that” in the conversation cannot be understood in terms of distance, such as “proximate” and “distal”. They refer to a spot located on the patient’s body, which is necessarily proximal to the speaker. In the answer of the patient, “*that*” is no longer understood in terms of distance, but indicates the spot referred is “not as much in his/her focus of attention [the patient] as it is in somebody else’s [the doctor]” (Verhagen 2004: 27). What is profiled in (27) is the construal relationship between the object of the conceptualization and the *Ground*. Janssen, building on Lyons (1999),
concludes that the difference between this and that can be associated with the category of person (Janssen 2002). In the situation given in (27), the doctor sees him/herself examine the patient’s injured spot via his/her hand; it is therefore in his/her “center of [his/her] mental field of vision” (Janssen 2002: 172-3). This viewing arrangement enables the doctor to refer to a spot on the patient’s body as “high-focal concern in a discourse organizational respect” (ibid). In contrast to the doctor’s use of this, the patient uses that to signal that the patient views the spot the doctor distinguished outside of the center of his/her own mental field of vision, and within that of the doctor the spot being referred is hence “of disfocal concern” (ibid.) for the patient. The difference in perspectival construal determines the meaning of that (Janssen 2002). The juxtaposed meaning of that in (27) can thus be interpreted as “the spot you are focusing on,” where the entity you refers to the doctor in the situation described. It can be sketched as Figure 1.13 (Verhagen 2004: 28).

![Figure 1.13: Construal Configuration of ‘that’ in Yes, that is where it hurts](Verhagen 2004: 28)

Verhagen refers to Figure 1.13 as a “second person deixis” (2004: 28) construal configuration since it involves the shared attention of Construer 2, i.e., the doctor. In the utterance Yes, that is where it hurts, the patient, identified as Construer 1, invites the doctor, Construer 2, to jointly attend to an object of conceptualization, the spot that the patient
referred to as *that*, identified as *this* in the doctor’s question, as a focal concern for the doctor. It is such a relation of joint attention between Construer 2 and object of conceptualization that is profiled in such an utterance. Therefore, the factor that determines the referential value of *this* and *that* in (27) is “whether [he/] she sees the entity in the region of [his/] her focal (high-focal or central) or disfocal (low-focal or noncentral)” in discourse (Janssen 2002: 173). The subjective attention in the mental field of vision of the speaker, i.e., the patient, is channeled through discourse into the mental space of the interlocutor, i.e., the doctor. In this way, **subjective mental scanning** is **construed** according to **subjective** speaker/hearer interaction.

**1.4.2.3.4 Subjectivity and Subjectification**

Subjectivity is concerned with the perspective or point of view that a speaker or locutionary agent takes in discourse, i.e., a speaker’s imprint (Finegan 1995). It involves an emerging or dynamic speaker’s view, which is **construed** on the linguistic expression of self. Quoting Lyons (1982), Finegan (1995) defines subjectivity as “the way in which natural languages, […], provide for the locutionary agent’s expression of himself and his attitude and beliefs’’” (Lyons 1982: 102 in Finegan 1995: 2-3). Based on Lyons’ characterization of subjectivity, Traugott (1989) further relates subjectivity to grammaticalization from a diachronic perspective, which she terms **subjectification**. She defines subjectification as a pragmatic-semantic process, wherein “meanings become increasingly based in the speaker’s subjective belief state/ attitude toward the proposition” (1989: 35).

In contrast to Traugott’s diachronic perspective, Langacker (1985) takes a synchronic approach to **subjectivity** with regard to a central claim of CG, that meanings equate with
conceptualizations (109). He first observes that subjectivity is a notion that involves both ‘subtlety’ and ‘near ineffiability’ (1990: 34). Later, he defines subjectification as a process that distinguishes “a shift from a relatively objective construal of some entity to a more subjective one” (2001: 297). Attenuation is involved in the process of subjectification in terms of the degree of control exerted by the agent. Attenuation results from the involvement of the following four parameters:

1. status: [change] from actual to potential, or specific to generic
2. focus: profiling
3. domain: a shift from a physical interaction to a social or experiential one
4. locus of activity or potency: change in a mover from an onstage participant to an offstage one, or specific to a general one

(Langacker 2001: 301-2)

I will utilize the above notions in order to analyze perspectival shift and subjectivity invoked in one type of bâ construction in Mandarin Chinese in Chapter 4.

1.4.2.4 Conclusion

Cognitive Grammar is a usage-based model (Langacker 2000, 2001) employed to portray a comprehensive descriptive linguistic structure. CG shares many similarities with Goldberg’s (1995) construction approach discussed below. CG addresses the symbolic structure underlying semantic structure and phonological structure. This symbolic relationship is realized within the model in highly schematic characterizations based on imagery, conceptualizations, and symbols. It relates a sentence structure to a viewing arrangement which involves trajector and landmark, figure and ground, base and profile.
1.4.3 Goldberg’s Construction Grammar

Goldberg (1995) regards argument structures as a subtype of construction that exhibits the basic clausal expressions of a language. The basic tenets of Goldberg’s constructions are mostly derived from Fillmore’s frame semantics; he also draws upon Lakoff’s experiential based approach (1987), and the framework of cognitive grammar (Langacker 1987, 1990). Construction grammar emphasizes the notion of “speaker-centered ‘construals’ of situations” (Goldberg 1995: 7), as proposed by Langacker. Goldberg divides constructions into five types as follows (Goldberg 1995: Chapter 1).

(1) Ditransitive X CAUSES Y to RECEIVE Z I gave him five dollars.
(2) Caused Motion X CAUSES Y to MOVE Z May sneezed the tissue off the table.
(3) Resultative X CAUSES Y to BECOME Z She kissed him unconscious.
(4) Intrans. Motion X MOVES Y The fly buzzed into the room.
(5) Conative X DIRECTS ACTION at Y Sam kicked at Bill.

Of these five types, I will only highlight the English resultative construction (Goldberg 1995) in order to compare it to the bà construction in Mandarin Chinese in Chapter 4.

1.4.4 Talmy’s Cognitive Semantics

Talmy’s cognitive semantics involves what he calls a causal chain event frame. He divides this causal chain event into five stages: the intention, taking the initiative, immediate subevent, penultimate subevent, final result. These are illustrated in the utterance in (28).
(28) 他把我氣死了。

tā  bǎ wǒ qì sǐ le

he  BA  I (be) angry-death-ASP

‘He got me so mad (angry to extreme).’

‘He made me so mad.’

This sentence consists of the following sub-events.

(a) He did something in an earlier context.

(b) I am so mad right now.

(c) What he did or said got me so mad/ caused me to become mad.

This provides a cognitive analysis of a subjective causative event initiated by the agent in the speaker’s mind. The [agent-causation] event is construed in the speaker’s mental space in order to account for the current resultative state of the speaker being so mad. The causal chain event can provide a plausible account of causation in the speaker’s subjective construal, while the profile can be understood to be the final result of being mad.

The second notion I will introduce from Talmy’s cognitive semantics is the macro-event (1991). The conceptual structure of a macro-event involves a simplex event and a complex event. A simplex event is an event “that can be expressed by a single clause, and that cannot be further partitioned with the resulting subportions also able to be cognized as events and expressed by single clauses” (Talmy 1991: 481). A complex event is partitioned into a main event and a subordinate event; the relation that the subordinate event bears to the main event is also involved in the notion of a complex event. According to Talmy (1991, 2000), a macro-event, on one hand, is conceptualized as a simplex event; on the other hand, the conceptual structure of this single simplex event resembles that of a
complex event or can alternatively be expressed in a complex event. He addresses this issue using examples in (29a) and (29b).

(29)    a. The candle went out because something blew on it.

       b. The candle went out.                     (Talmy 1991: 482)

The difference between (29a) and (29b) is that (29a) consists of a main event (the candle went out), a subordinating relation (because) and a subordinate event of a complex event, while (29b) is a unified simplex event, presented as a macro-event, which shares the same content as (29a). In other words, Talmy defines a macro-event in cross-linguistic comparison as a conceptual conflated event that involves motion and state. The macro-event consists of three components: the agent and the clausal chain, the framing event, and the supporting event (1991: 481-4). There are five types of domain schematization that a framing event can represent: (1) an event of motion or location in space; (2) an event of contouring in time (aspect); (3) an event of change or constancy among states; (4) an event of correlation among actions; and (5) an event of fulfillment or confirmation in the domain of realization (Talmy 1991: 482). Among these five types, I will focus on the MOTION event. A supporting event, as the name suggests, bears a supporting relation, i.e., S-relation, to the framing event. These relations include: precursion, enablement, cause, manner, concomitance, purpose, and constituitiveness; I will discuss CAUSE and MANNER relations with reference to the MOTION event.

Talmy predicts that the existence of a macro-event as a cognitive unit may be universal and further categorizes the world’s languages into two types based on how they map a macro-event onto syntactic structure: The two are verb-framed languages, and satellite-framed languages. Verb-framed languages express the core schema in the main verb,
while satellite-framed languages do so in the satellite verb. Verb-framed languages include Romance, Semitic, Japanese, Tamil, Polynesian, most Maya, Nez Perce, and Caddo; satellite-framed language include most Indo-European except Romance, Finno-Ugric, Chinese, Ojibwa, and Warlpiri. To distinguish these two-category typology, Talmy compares the English and Spanish examples, to which I add a parallel Chinese example in (30).

(30)  a. The bottle floated into the cave. -- English

b. La botella entró flotando a la cueva. -- Spanish

\[\text{ART bottle enter floating in the cave (non-agentive S-relation: MANNER)}\]

[the bottle MOVED in to the cave] DURING-WHICH [it floated]

c. 瓶子漂进了洞裡。 -- Chinese

\[\text{pínzi piāo-jìn le dòng-lǐ}\]

bottle float-enter ASP cave-inside

V1-V2

‘The bottle entered (MOVED-in) floating into the cave.’

Four components are involved in a motion event: figure, ground, motion, and path. The notions of figure and ground are similar to Langacker’s trajector and landmark. The motion event is the framing event that involves physical motion or stationary state. The path is the route followed or “the site occupied by the [f]igure with respect to the selected ground elements” (ibid: 488). In (30), the figure is the bottle, and the ground is the cave. The motion in (30a) is \textit{floated} and the path is \textit{into}. In (30b) the Spanish example, however, the motion is \textit{entró flotando} ‘entered floating,’ and the path is also expressed in the motion verb \textit{entró} ‘enter.’ That is to say, in (30a), English main verb \textit{floated} conflates the motion
[MOVING] and the manner [FLOATING], and expresses the path in the satellite into, while in (30b), Spanish conflates path [INTO] into the main verb entró. In (30c), in my opinion, the main verb 进 jìn ‘enter’ also conflates the path [INTO], and the supporting verb 漂 piāo ‘float’ expresses the MANNER and MOTION of how the bottle moves into the cave. Except for the difference in the word order of “enter” and “float,” the Spanish and Chinese examples in (30b) and (30c) demonstrate a parallel main verb that conflates the path, i.e., the path verb. Here, this preliminary analysis seems to contradict Talmy’s prediction.

Another pair of examples in Mandarin Chinese that conflate path and motion are 上 shàng ‘go up, ascend’ and 下 xià ‘go down, descend’ in (31a-b).

(31)  a. 他上樓了。

\[ \text{他 go up-storey/floor} \ ASP \]

‘He went upstairs (MOVED UP to the upper floor).’

a’. 他走/跑/跳/衝上樓了。

\[ \text{他 walk/run/jump/rush-go up storey/floor} \ ASP \]

V1- V2

‘He walked/ ran/ jumped/ rushed upstairs.’

‘He MOVED up to the upper floor by walking/running/jumping/rushing.’
b. 他下車了。

\[ tā xià-chē le \]

he go down-car/bus ASP

‘He got off the car/ bus (MOVED DOWN from the car/ bus.’

b’. 他走/跑/跳/衝下車了。

\[ tā zǒu/pǎo/tiào/chōng-xià chē le \]

he walk/run/jump/rush-go down car/bus ASP

V1- V2

‘He walked/ ran/ jumped/ rushed off the car/ bus.’

‘He MOVED DOWN from the car/ bus by walking/ running/ jumping/ rushing.’

Both verbs in (31a) and (31b) conflate path [UP/ DOWN] and motion [MOVING]. I provide (31a’) and (31b’) to show that all the V1 express the MANNER and MOTION of how MOTION and PATH of V2 is conducted. The action-result schemata of V1-V2 in Mandarin Chinese demonstrate that the result element V2 is the main predicate that conflates the MOTION and PATH, and the action component V1 expresses the MANNER and MOTION. In other words, the core schema is expressed throughout the V2 rather than V1, and the supporting events of MANNER and MOTION are expressed in the V1. The set of examples in (31) indicates that Mandarin Chinese is neither a verb-framed nor a satellite-framed language. My analysis supports what Tai concludes: “it makes more sense to view Chinese as primarily a verb-framed language and only secondarily a satellite-framed language” (2003: 311).

I compare an English example (32a) from Sprang (2003) to equivalents in Spanish (32b) and Mandarin Chinese in (32c).
(32)  a. He trudged down the road.

b. Él caminaba penosamente por el camino.

he walked laboriously on the road

‘He walked laboriously on the road.’

c. 他步履蹒跚地走在路上。

tā bù-lú pán-shān de zǒu zài lù-shàng

he step-tread heavily ADV MARKER walk on road-surface/up

‘He walked/treaded laboriously/heavily on the road.’

The English verb *trudge* in (32a) construes a scene of a person walking steadily and usually laboriously on the road. In other words, the verb *trudge* conflates manner and motion. In contrast, (32b) and (32c) show that both Spanish and Mandarin Chinese express manner in the adverbial adjuncts, *penosamente* ‘laboriously’ and *步履蹒跚地* *bù-lú pán-shān de* ‘walking laboriously and heavily,’ rather than incorporating manner into the verb. I want to make the distinction that the Chinese adverb *步履蹒跚地* *bù-lú pán-shān de* ‘walking laboriously and heavily’ consists of a static verb *步履蹒跚* *bù-lú pán-shān* ‘the way one walks is laboriously and heavily’ and an adverbial marker *地* *de*. The MOTION [WALKING] with foot is incorporated and overtly expressed in written Chinese: the foot radical on the left part of both characters *蹒跚* *pán-shān*. This example further supports that Mandarin Chinese is a verb-framed language, although it still demonstrates features of a satellite-framed language.

Since I rely mostly on Langacker’s notions of CG, I will not discuss Talmy’s cognitive semantics any further. The concepts I will use from Talmy are those of the *clausal chain event* and *motion-event*. 
1.4.5 Tyler and Evan’s Principled Polysemy

Tyler and Evans (2001, 2003) address the issue of principled polysemy, based on investigations into the English prepositions “in,” and “over.” They assert that the earlier accounts of polysemy theories (Brugman and Lakoff 1987, Lakoff 1987) have methodological problems with respect to the criteria used to distinguish the central sense from the distinct multiple senses of a polysemous word. In order to better account for the range of meanings, they propose principled polysemy, and claim “meaning-extension as a motivated phenomenon” (Tyler and Evans 2003: handout) to address polysemy, actuation, and modeling. According to their theory, the criteria to determine the central sense or proto-scene are (1) earlier attested meaning, (2) predominance in the semantic network, (3) use in a composite form, (4) relations to other contrast sets, and (5) predictability of other senses in the network (2003). The distinct senses are determined based upon non-spatial meanings, and are sometimes not predictable from the context.

Based on their notion of principled polysemy and proto-scene, I have also designed a lexical semantic network of the morpheme bā in different constructions in Chapter 3.

1.4.6 Conclusion

To fully characterize the semantic category of result in the bā construction in Mandarin Chinese, I adopt CG analysis, Talmy’s causal chain event and motion event, and Tyler and Evans’ principled polysemy. To serve the purpose of comparison, I use the analysis of the English resultative construction proposed by Goldberg. The explanation of these theoretical perspectives and their associated terminology provide background for my analysis of bā.
1.5 Grammaticalization

According to Hopper and Traugott (1993), two kinds of meanings are associated with the use of the term grammaticalization. They are: (1) a framework within a diachronic study of how grammatical forms or constructions arise and which accounts for how these forms and constructions are used, and (2) an actual semantic process of change that demonstrates what the framework of grammaticalization attempts to address. Here, I will use grammaticalization in the second sense.

The study of grammaticalization involves both diachronic and synchronic perspectives. The former typically addresses the issue of pathways of change, while the latter addresses syntactic, discourse and pragmatic phenomena within the use of a particular language. Since my purposes here are mainly synchronic, I will only briefly outline the diachronic aspect of grammaticalization that pertains to this study.

In order to have a better understanding of grammaticalization, we have to ask two questions: (1) what mechanisms lead to grammaticalization? (2) What actually motivates grammaticalization? To answer these two questions, I will first discuss the mechanisms, and motivations and later introduce a few relevant constructs of grammaticalization in the following subsections.

1.5.1 Mechanisms: Reanalysis and Analogy

The mechanisms of language change by which grammaticalization takes place are reanalysis and analogy. The former operates along the syntagmatic axis of linear linguistic structure, while the latter operates along the paradigmatic axis of choice. Reanalysis is defined as “change in the structure of an expression or class of expressions that does not involve any immediate or intrinsic modification of its surface manifestation” (Langacker
1977 in Hopper and Traugott 1933: 40). Take the English word *childhood* in (33) for example.

(33) childhood child –hood/child – condition ‘condition/ state of being a child’

This noun is compounded from the morphemes *child* and *–hood*; the latter originated with a lexical meaning, ‘condition,’ and is a productive morpheme. Therefore, *childhood* means ‘condition of a child’ (Hopper and Traugott 1993: 41). This example of compounding postulates a merger of two forms across word boundaries, i.e., *fusion*. Fusion is one type of reanalysis, and occurs frequently in grammaticalization. Reanalysis is rule change that usually involves linear reorganization.

The second mechanism, analogy, involves rule generalization. According to Meillet, analogy is a rule-generated process in which irregularities in grammar become regularized (Meillet, in Hopper and Traugott 1993). Examination of generalization offers the possibility to render indirectly-observed or unobservable reanalysis observable.

The development through the reanalysis of the English construction *be going to* is evidenced in the stages in Figure 1.14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State I: the stage of the progressive with directional verb and a purposive clause</th>
<th>syntagmatic axis</th>
<th>Mechanism: reanalysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>be PROG     going Vdir</td>
<td>[to visit Bill]</td>
<td>Purp. Clause</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Stage II: the stage of the future auxiliary with a verb of activity (result of reanalysis) | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| [be going to] visit Bill TNS    | Vact            |

**Figure 1.14: Schema of the Development of Auxiliary be going to**

(Hopper and Traugott 1993: 61)

(figure cont’d)
Stage III: the stage of the extension via analogy of the directional class of verbs to all verbs (analogy) 
[be going to] like Bill 
TNS V

Stage IV: the stage arising out of reanalysis of the complex auxiliary to gonna (reanalysis)
[gonna] like/ visit Bill paradigmatic axis 
Mechanism: analogy

1.5.2 Motivations for Grammaticalization

Hopper and Traugott (1993) argue that the claim made by Anttila (1988) and Shapiro (1991) (in Hopper and Traugott 1993) that language change is goal-oriented and occurs by means of the enabling factors of grammaticalization is teleological. The result of grammaticalization, for Anttila and Shapiro, is enhanced speaker-hearer interaction and facilitation of communicative strategies. This claim is parallel in viewpoint to that of functional approaches to language (Givón 1979). However, such claims are inherently impossible to empirically prove, and are challenged on those grounds by proponents of other approaches. For example, Hopper and Traugott (1993) and Vincent (1978) take an alternate position: language change is not goal-directed. They concur with the view which “ascribes language a will of its own, a sort of conscious control over its own future, seems to us gratuitous and untenable. It remains true, however, that language is a communicative tool at the disposal of its speakers, to whom the attribution of an independent will and volition is considerably less controversial” (Vincent 1978: 414 in Hopper and Traugott 1993: 66).

The competing motivations that are involved in grammaticalization are economy, “informativeness” (Langacker 1977), efficiency, clarity, expressivity, and routinization
(Hopper and Traugott 1993: 63-7). These factors are related to pragmatic uses of language that involves speaker-hearer interaction (Traugott and König 1991). However, for some linguists, the motivation of language change is semantic; for example, Bybee and Pagliuca state that “semantic change leads to the development of grammatical meaning” (1985: 59). Sweetser (1990) relates motivations for grammaticalization to metaphorical processes, while Traugott and König (1991) ascribe semantic motivations to metonymic and metaphorical processes. Hopper and Traugott (1993) view the operations of enabling factors as occurring in the early stages of grammaticalization, and consider them to be “associative and pragmatic” (1993: 82), where meaning is derived from the context of speech.

1.5.3 Types of Pragmatic Inferences

Hopper and Traugott (1993: Chapter 4) distinguish two types of pragmatic inferences that can be recognized at the early stages of grammaticalization: metaphorical processes and metonymic processes. The first one is evidenced in one stanza from Gerard Manley Hopkins’ (1844-1889) poem, *Spring and Fall: To a Young Child* (Mackenzie 1967: 88-9)

MÁGARÉT, áre you gríeving,

Over Goldengrove unleaving?

The innovative lexical item *unleaving* undergoes a metaphorical transfer and produces the meaning of “leaves falling from a tree” to create the metaphorical image of leaves falling away from the tree, which can be understood through an analogical process as a person’s reluctance to enter a later stage in her life. The image of “un-leaving” of autumn trees
serves as a source domain and maps onto a target domain that yields a pragmatic inference: youth is passing.

Metonymic process arises out of contiguity that inspires change in “linguistic contexts are known as ‘associative’ or conceptual ‘metonymic’ changes” (Hopper and Traugott 1993: 81). According to Anttila, “metaphor is semantic transfer through a similarity of sense perceptions,” and thus iconic and analogical, while metonym is “indexical” (1989: 141-2 in ibid.: 82). That is to say, metonymic process refers to indexes instead of analogies. From this point of view, metaphor operates across conceptual domains, while metonym operates across morphosyntactic constituents (Hopper and Traugott 1993). Both processes are considered “problem-solving” strategies (ibid: 86). For one, metaphoric strategies solve the problem of representing one entity in one semantic domain in terms of another; for the other, metonymic change solves the problem of “expressing speaker’s attitude” (ibid: 87). They both serve the purpose of “informativeness” in terms of communication.

1.5.4 Persistence and Semantic Bleaching

There are two relevant constructs of semantic change I am going to put forth here: persistence and semantic bleaching. The italized am going to in the beginning of this paragraph indicates my plan or intention to introduce some concepts to address in the coming paragraph. The phrase can be replaced with will (I will put forth here) to bring out the intention for the (near/immediate) future. It demonstrates the combined uses of an older meaning of be going to, i.e., a purposive meaning, and an auxiliary be going to (Hopper and Traugott 1993, Heine and Kuteva 2002). This property of partial semantic and functional retention from an older meaning is called persistence.
The idea of (semantic) bleaching derives from an analogy proposed by the German neogrammarian, George von der Gabelentz (1891, cited in Hopper and Traugott 1993). He provides a metaphorical account that compares linguistic forms to state employees. He suggests that linguistic forms are like employees who will be hired, paid more or less, demoted or promoted, and eventually retire. Other forms will enter into a language, just as new applicants position themselves for a job. Forms “verblassen” (fade, grow pale), and the colors of these forms “verbleichen” (bleach), hence needing new paint. This metaphor generates the image bleaching. Meillet (1912, Hopper and Traugott 1993: 23-4) also notices a similar feature, i.e., “affaiblissement” (weakening), in the process of grammaticalization, which he attributes to “a loss of expressivity in frequently used collocations.”

This notion of desemanticization (Heine and Kuteva 2002: 3), i.e., semantic bleaching, is evidenced in the case of go and the subjectification of be going to in English. Sweetser indicates that “we lose the sense of physical motion. […] We gain, however, a new meaning of future prediction or intention – together with its likely background inferences” (1988: 392). Langacker (1990: 23) notes that the replacement of the objective locational construal of be going to\(^1\) is subjectively construed within the speaker’s temporal perspective.

The process of “demotion” of a lexical meaning and “promotion” of grammatical meanings is typical in grammaticalization. According to Hopper and Traugott (1993), those meanings that are promoted tend to become more abstract, and as a result, carry grammatical or pragmatic meaning.

---

\(^1\) It is similar to the expression in the southern American English fixin’ to.
1.6 Cognition and Chinese Grammar

To introduce discussion of Mandarin Chinese and cognition, I start with a quote from an English-speaking American student who studied Chinese in an intensive course. He expressed great satisfaction when he grasped the meaning of the Chinese compound word 城市 chéng-shì (city wall-market: city). What he said was related to how he conceptually processed the word 城市 chéng-shì (city wall-market: city).

“chéng… shì… OH! chéng-shì! Wall … market…

HEY! Chinese makes sense.”

The sense-making he referred to is the integrated mapping of two conceptual mechanisms. His construal or definition of a city is based on the prototype of a medieval city surrounded by a wall with the market in the center. This model reconsolidates his acquisition of the word 城市 chéng-shì in Mandarin Chinese. I think what he tried to express is that Chinese language “makes sense” to him because this word for city matches the concept of a city as he construes one. This type of interpretation suggests an iconic aspect to the conception of Chinese grammar.

Mandarin Chinese involves iconicity not only in nominal compounds, like 城市 chéng-shì, but also in classifiers, temporal and spatial conception, and compounds. Moreover, the iconic semantic nature is also found in some of the written Chinese characters. Tai (1985, 1989, 1993a, 1993b, 1994, 2001, 2002b, 2003) discusses the way that the symbolic representation of Chinese grammar reflects the embodiment of reality and results in its

---

2 He reported that he first associated with 長城 cháng-chéng (long-city wall: Great Wall), and then 市場 shì-chāng (market-place: market). He then mapped it onto his understanding of a fundamental construct of a city as he has in his mental lexicon repertoire.
cognition-based iconic nature. With respect to the iconic nature of Chinese word and clausal order, he proposes two principles that are independently-motivated: the Principle of Temporal Sequence (henceforth as PTS) and the Principle of Temporal Scope (hereafter PTSC). PTS is evidenced in two conjoined sentences, serial verb constructions, action-result patterns, and adverbial placement (Tai 1985, 2002b). The explanatory value of PTSC can be found in the order of information presentation in street addresses and temporal statements, the order of a verb and temporal adverbs, and that of a verb and adverbial clauses.

Using a cognition-based functional grammar approach (Tai 1989, 2001), Tai states that Chinese “semantic structures are equated with conceptual structures” (1989: 187). This claim is further evidenced in other works, such as Brian (1989) and Wu (1996). Tai demonstrates that Chinese grammar packages information based on the whole-before-part/background-foreground relation, and metaphorization of temporal/spatial expressions.

Tai also undertakes a systematic semantic analysis of Mandarin Chinese classifiers (Tai 1994, Tai and Chao 1994). He claims that categorization is fundamental in human cognition, and is reflected in the classifier system. Analysis of the Chinese classifier repertoire reveals the conceptual structures within.

In the following sections, I will demonstrate the characterization of human cognition reflected in Chinese written characters in 1.6.1, classifiers in 1.6.2, temporal and spatial expressions in 1.6.3, noun compounds in 1.6.4, resultative verbal compounds in 1.6.5, and the bā construction in 1.6.6. The following account provides powerful evidence for the systematic relation between cognition and Chinese grammar.
1.6.1 Semantic Cognition in Chinese Characters

(田 tián, 男 nán, 謝 xiè, 打 dǎ, 嫁 jià, and 娶 qǔ)

The study of Chinese characters is a fascinating field for non-native speakers to explore. What makes it fascinating is the meaning-based radical and the pictogram nature of the characters. This section aims to demonstrate the fact that cognitive processes are couched in some Chinese characters. I will present here six examples: 田 tián, 男 nán, 謝 xiè, 打 dǎ, 嫁 jià, and 娶 qǔ to this end.

The first character, 田 tián, depicts a (rice) field (Figure 1.15), and its meaning “field” is represented in this pictogram of a square, sectioned rice field, a fixture of the Chinese landscape for millennia.

![Figure 1.15: Illustration of a Prototypical Rice Field as Depicted in the Pictogram 田 tián 'rice field'](image)

With the pictogram 力 lì ‘strength, power’ below 田 tián, the composite character 男 nán means ‘a man.’ In a patriarchal society traditionally based in a rice farming, men are supposed to exert their physical strength and work hard in the rice field to support their family. The symbol 男 nán consists of two pictograms 田 tián ‘rice field’ and 力 lì ‘strength.’ The former illustrates the setting of the rice field, and the latter portrays the profile of a man is arm, a symbol of power and strength, as illustrated in Figure 1.16. The

---

3 田 tián also means ‘agrarian.’
horizontal line in 力 lì ‘strength’ represents the man’s shoulder, the vertical line with downward hook that symbolizes the arm. The vertical line on the left represents the man’s torso.

![Diagram of 力 lì ‘strength’](image)

**Figure 1.16: Representation of 力 lì ‘strength’**

The combination 男 nán reflects a conventionalized construed scene of a man working hard in the rice field, and as such, evinces the process of human cognition and cultural conceptualization for Chinese.

The third example, 謝 xiè ‘to thank, thanks’, comprises three elements: a ‘speech’ radical 言 yán, 身 shēn ‘body’, and 寸 cùn ‘propriety.’ The combination exemplifies the symbolic embodiment of cultural value, mental attitude and behavioral manner in the expression of gratitude for Chinese people. Chinese consider that demonstrations of gratitude should be verbally expressed with propriety and moderation, in that both too much or too little expression of gratitude are considered inappropriate.

The fourth example is a concept valued in Chinese culture with respect to educating children. The conventionalized saying in (34) is a typical concept rooted in the Chinese speech community involving the concept of 打 dǎ ‘to hit, to beat.’
不打不成器

*bù dǎ bù chéng  qì*

not hit not become (valuable) talent

‘Spare the rod, spoil the child.’

The concept for Chinese parents is that children need to be disciplined through corporal punishment in order to improve and become somebody one day. That is why children were traditionally struck by their parents or teachers if they made errors or behaved badly. The character 打 dǎ ‘to hit, to beat’ contains a “hand” radical on the left and 丁 dīng for the man on the right. According to the Chinese scholar Wu Zeng (1127-1279), the character 打 dǎ is “formed by the character shǒu [hand] and the character dīng [man], which means it is the hand that does things. As long as the hand has the contact of something, it is the act of dǎ. There is no doubt about the meaning of this word” (translated by Gao 2001: 157). This definition indicates that 打 dǎ is not only a physical action verb, but also a basic human hand action. This gives a reasonable account for why 打 dǎ is a metaphorical polysemic verb, based on the proto-scene invoked in the character.

For example, 打電話 dǎ diàn-huà ‘hit-telephone: dial, make a call,’ where we use our hand to dial numbers, and 打分數 dǎ fēn-shù ‘hit-grade: to grade (student), to grade (performance),’ which evokes a hand holding a pen to mark the student’s paper. Both expressions trace a basic metaphorical human hand action engaged in the activities of “making a call” and “grading students’ performance.”

---

4 丁 dīng ‘man’ is a different character from 男 nán ‘man.’
5 The definition of dǎ in Chinese by the scholar in Southern Song dynasty, Wu Zeng, is “打字從手從丁，以手當其事者也。觸事為之打，于意無嫌矣。”
The last two examples are also involved in the cultural conception of marriage in the traditional Chinese community: 嫁 jià ‘for a woman to marry’, and 娶 qù ‘for a man to marry.’ Both characters for “marry” in Chinese include the pictogram 女 nǚ ‘woman’ that iconically portrays the female body. Traditionally, a woman (女 nǚ) marries a man in order to make a home (家 jiā ‘home’) for him. The combination of the characters for ‘home’ and ‘woman’ results in the character and the conception of 嫁 jià ‘for a woman to marry.’ A man takes (取 qù ‘to take (away)’) a woman (女 nǚ ‘a woman’) away from her family when he marries her, and the combination of the character 娶 qù ‘for a man to marry’ contains this concept.

I chose these six characters 田 tián, 男 nán, 謝 xiè, 打 dǎ, 嫁 jià, and 娶 qù to provide a general example of how human cognition is reflected in written Chinese characters. I do not claim that the Chinese writing system constitutes a theory of cognition and conception, but I shall try to show that some characters do reveal how literate Chinese visualize and conceptualize the scene and action around us. Chinese speakers then present these conceptualizations in a symbolic writing system that provides a view of human cognition and concept-formation. This reflection of human cognition in Chinese writing can also be evidenced in the structure of the classifier system.

1.6.2 Classifiers

Categorization is a mental process of classification that is a fundamental to and reflective of human cognition. Here I discuss cognition categorization as revealed in the Chinese classifier system. Tai and Wang (1990), Tai (1992, 1994), and Tai and Chao (1994) have conducted detailed cognition-based semantic analyses of Chinese classifiers,
and have demonstrated that the system reflects human cognitive processes of
categorization in Chinese culture. I will use Tai and Chao’s analysis of 張 zhāng
“classifier for a piece of paper or a desk, etc.” in order to exemplify the relation between
cognition and the Chinese classifier.

Tai and Chao (1994) present the categorical structure of the classifier 張 zhāng
‘classifier for a piece of paper or a desk, etc’ and its family members 幅 fú ‘classifier for a
painting’, 面 miàn ‘classifier for a wall,’ and 片 piàn ‘classifier for a piece of bread’ based
on prototype theory. These four classifiers all identify objects that have a flat surface, such
as 一張紙 yī zhāng zhǐ (a piece of paper), 一幅畫 yī fú huà (a painting), 一面牆 yī miàn
qiáng (a wall), and 一片麵包 yī piàn miànbāo (a slice of bread). According to Tai and
Chao, there are certain salient cognitive features that distinguish 張 zhāng from the others.
It references two-dimensional, flat objects, like 紙 zhǐ (paper) or a three-dimensional entity
with a flat surface “that interacts closely with human body” (Tai and Chao 1994: 75), such
as 桌子 zhōu-zi (desk), 椅子 yǐ-zi (chair). The cognitive features of objects related to the
other three members of the classifier family are shown in Figure 1.17.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>classifier</th>
<th>examples</th>
<th>cognitive features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>幅 fú</td>
<td>畫 huà (painting)</td>
<td>two dimensional, flat thin entities that have an either a picture or some design on it surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>面 miàn</td>
<td>鏡子 jīngzi (mirror) 鼓 gǔ (drum)</td>
<td>two or three-dimensional entities with a flat surface that serves as the front side or “face” for its functional use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>片 piàn</td>
<td>麵包 miànbāo (bread) 草地 cǎodi (grassland)</td>
<td>two-dimensional, small, thin entities that can be construed as parts of a whole</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1.17: Classifier Family of 幅 fú, 面 miàn, and 片 piàn**
(Tai and Chao 1994: 72-6)
Semantic components, perceptual properties and functional features serve as essential elements to determine conceptual categorical structure in Chinese. The cognitive features displayed above are entrenched in the cognition of native Chinese speakers; based on these entrenched semantic features, native Chinese choose the appropriate collocated noun phrases.

1.6.3 Temporal and Spatial Expressions

The word/clausal order in Chinese demonstrates an iconic whole-before-part relation evidenced in the way of reporting physical address and time (Tai 1989). In contrast to Chinese, English displays the linearization in terms of part-before-whole. In Chinese, the linear sequence of a postal address is from whole to part as in (35). In contrast, the English postal address sequence postulates a relation from part to whole, shown in (36).

(35) 台灣台北縣永和市竹林路 38 巷 49 號 1 樓

tái-wān tái-běi xiàn yōng-hé shì zhú-líng lù sān-shí-bā xiàng sì-shí-jìù hào yī lóu
Taiwan Taipei county Yongho city Zhuling road 38 lane 49 no. 1 floor
1F, #49, LN38, Zhuling Road, Yungho City, Taipei County, Taiwan

(36) 301 Verano Dr., Santa Barbara, CA 93110, U.S.A.

(constructed example)

As exemplified in (35) and (36), Chinese and English demonstrate a fundamental difference in conceptualizations of the relation of whole-part (Tai 1989: 202-3).

The same concept of whole-before-part fits the profile of “spatially based temporal expression” (Tai 1989: 212) instantiated in (37). Again, the Chinese temporal expression follows the principle of a whole-part relation, while English views time in terms of part to whole.
It is now 7:00 p.m., February 24th, 2004’

A similar sequence of expressions in both space and time led to Tai’s (1985, 1989) proposal of PTSC. The common expression in (38) also evinces PTSC.

明天見 (tomorrow-see) ‘see you tomorrow’

明天 míng-tiān (tomorrow) delimits the temporal scope of the event of encountering 見 jiàn (see, meet).

Normal ways of thinking about time and space, shown in the common conventional expressions to report time and address location in (35), (37) and (38) demonstrate the iconic cognitive nature of the whole-part relation in Chinese grammar is distinguished from the presentation in English (36) and (37).

1.6.4 Nominal Compounds

Chinese nominal compounds demonstrate a high degree of visual imagery, and are based on analogical metaphors that may directly portray a picture or conception of the entities, and may also carry metaphorically embedded Chinese cultural or religious values. Following are some examples to illustrate how cognitive elements and cultural values are contained in Chinese nominal compounds.

I begin by returning to the nominal compounds that I mentioned earlier in section 1.5, here as (39a), (39b) and (39c).
The length of the Great Wall is entrenched in mental conception as shared knowledge among Chinese speakers. The meanings evoked in (39a) portray an actual image of the Great Wall as a long wall in 長城 (cháng-chéng). Medieval Chinese cities were surrounded by walls with a market at the center. This concept is depicted in the compound 城市 (chéng-shì) ‘city wall-market: city’ in (39b). A market is a place where people gather together for trade and business. It is this spatial image that constitutes the compound 市場 (shì-chāng) (market-place: market). The example in (39c) has a parallel compound effect in Marktplatz in German or marketplace in English. Ancient Chinese cities and medieval European cities have a similar spatial layout.

Standing in a city, one may look into the distance and see a mountain. In Chinese, a mountain is described through the metaphor of the upright human body; (12) above is repeated below as (40). The top of a mountain is its head in (40a), the middle part is portrayed as a mountain’s waist in (40b), and the base of a mountain is deemed as its foot in (40c). This set of images reflects a metaphorical mapping from a person onto a mountain. (40b) and (40c) can be seen in parallel metaphors in English.

(40)  a. 山頭 shān-tóu mountain-head ‘the top of a mountain/mountain top’

       b. 山腰 shān-yāo mountain-waist ‘mountainside’

       c. 山腳 shān-jīào mountain-foot ‘foothill’

In a Chinese drama or novel, a traditional school is usually located at or near the foot of a hill. Inside such an institution is a male teacher instructing students. Both “Mr.” and
“teacher” are expressed as 先生 xiān-shēng ‘ahead-born: Mr., teacher’ in Chinese.

According to Chu and Chi (1999), the cognitive processes underlying this expression are derived from the deeply embedded Confucian concept, 長幼有序 zhǎng-yòu yǒu xù ‘elder-children-have-order: respect for seniority.’ This association is applied to the usage 先生 xiān-shēng, which literally means “born first” as well as to its conventional meanings of “Mr.” and “teacher.” The fundamental cultural concept of respect toward elders, teachers, and males in traditional Chinese patriarchal society reinforces cultural and cognitive factors to result in the semantic form of the nominal compound 先生 xiān-shēng.

Another nominal compound example is 蓮蓬頭 lián-peng tóu ‘shower head’, an imported product from overseas in contemporary Chinese economy. The first element of the compound 蓮蓬 lián-peng is “seedpod of the lotus,” which a shower head abstractly resembles. The suffix 頭 - tóu ‘head’ may also be a calque in translation from English into Chinese. The Chinese name for the imported item ‘shower head’ is based on the physical resemblance of the product to a familiar and culturally significant entity. This manner of portraying resemblance can be also seen in the usage of different shapes to describe men’s or women’s underwear in Chinese, e.g. 三角褲 sān-jiào kù ‘triangle-pants: men’s briefs or women’s panties’ and 四角褲 sì-jiào kù ‘square-pants: boxer shorts.’

Another nominal compound conveys how Chinese view or consider “gossip.” The compound 閒話 xián-huà ‘leisure-talk’ means ‘idle chat’ or ‘gossip.’ The scene that 閒話 xián-huà evokes is a group of people talking about something idly during their free time. This example provides an illustration of the context for gossip activity: free or leisure time.
This term conveys a neutral social tone in the meaning of ‘idle chat’; the negative aspect of gossiping might be a later social development.

1.6.5 Resultative Verb Compound

The notion of action-result in resultative compounds is another important cognitive configuration in Chinese grammar. The English lexical item *procure* in (41) displays an action-result pattern that is similar to that articulated in Chinese resultative compounds, in that it focuses on the resultative nature of a particular event.

(41) I was unable to procure the required parts to complete the project.

我無法買到必備的零件完成這計劃。

*wǒ wú-fǎ mǎi-dào bìbèi de líng-jiàn wáng-chéng zhè jì-huà.*

I could not *procure* required DE parts finish this project

(constructed American English data; my translation into Chinese)

The schema of *procure* in (41), i.e., to obtain possession of (something), includes the action of obtaining an item by special effort and the result of gaining possession of the item. Like *買到 mǎi-dào* ‘buy-reach: procure, get’ in Chinese, this lexical item also involves an action-result pattern, parallel to the force dynamic relation of “cause-static” (Gao 2001) and Langacker’s notion of energy transmission. Another example of *procure* in English (42) is from an email of a LSU LINGGRAD in 2005.

(42) Also, if you can think of someone to invite to speak on March 2, please use whatever means necessary (within reason) to procure their services.

(LINGGRAD-L, 2/1/2005)

The phrase “to procure their services” in (42) can be translated into Mandarin Chinese as in (43).
The example of *procure* in (43) demonstrates an action of inviting the speaker’s service and the result of getting his/her service, in this case, to give a talk. The translation in (43) indicates a parallel action-result schema: to get and to obtain.

### 1.6.6 *Bā* Construction

I address the *bā* construction in Mandarin Chinese discourse context in terms of \( X \ bā \ Y \ Z \) (Li and Thompson 1981), and interpret this construction as:

1. \( X \) had/got \( Y \) done characterized in the state of \( Z \).
2. \( X \) causes/makes \( Y \) (to) become the state of \( Z \).
3. \( X \) has done something to the element in \( Y \), the action-result of which is described in \( Z \).

All three interpretations demonstrate a resultative state in the form of resultative complements or aspectual markers. Prior work that discusses the resultative nature of the *bā* construction includes Wang (1947), Chao (1968), F. Li (1977), Wang (1987), Sybesma (1992), Sun (1996), Ding (2001), and Li (2003). I consider that the *bā* construction includes the semantic category of *result*.

### 1.6.7 Tai’s Four Principles of Cognition in Chinese Language

Tai (1984, 1985, 1989, 2002, 2003) has conducted a systematic investigation into the relation of human cognition and Chinese grammar. Such fine-grained analysis has led to his unique cognition-based functional approach to Chinese grammar. He explores the phenomenon of Chinese word order in terms of the Principle of Temporal Sequence (PTS) and the Principle of Temporal Scope (PTSC) (introduced in section 1.6 above) as demonstrating a whole-before-part relation. He also distinguishes between the Saliency Principle (SP) and the Principle of ‘Information Center’ (PIC) in relation to focus and
information packaging. I will discuss these four principles respectively in the following sections.

1.6.7.1 Principle of Temporal Sequence (PTS)

According to Tai, PTS is independently motivated. He characterizes PTS as follows: “the relative word order between two syntactic units is determined by the temporal order of the states which they represent in the conceptual world” (1985: 50). Tai identifies several aspects of Chinese grammar that can be accounted for by PTS: (1) two temporally-conjoined sentences; (2) serial verb constructions; (3) action-result verbal compounds; (4) directional locatives; (5) comparative constructions; (6) prepositional phrases; (7) manner and instrumental adverbs; (8) the locative 在 zài; (9) frequency and duration adverbs; (10) resultative and extent complements/ adverbs. Based on Tai (1985), I will construct at least one example for each of Tai’s categories; examples (44) to (54) below correspond to (1) to (10) listed above.

(44) 我毕业了，就找工作。

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{wǒ } & \text{bì le yè, jiù zhǎo gōng-zuò} \\
S1 & S2
\end{array}
\]

I graduate-asp, then look for job

(i) ‘After I graduate, I will look for a job.’

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{S1} & \text{S2}
\end{array}
\]

(ii) ‘When I graduate, I will look for a job.’

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{S1} & \text{S2}
\end{array}
\]

(iii) ‘I will look for a job after I graduate.’

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{S2} & \text{S1}
\end{array}
\]

(constructed example)
The best interpretation of (44) is translated into (i); (ii) and (iii) are for comparative reference. The two conjoined sentences S1 and S2 are linked by a temporal connective 就 jiù ‘then.’ The example in (44) demonstrates that the sequence of Chinese temporal sentences is iconic and independently-motivated in the sense that the event that happens first (the event of graduating) must occur in the first clause/part of the sentence, and the later event (the event of looking for a job) follows. In English, the sequence may be reversed; see (44i) and (44iii) above. This fact that S1 has to come before S2 in Chinese temporal sequence (44) supports PTS.

Serial verb construction also follows PTS, as shown in (45). What makes serial verb constructions different from temporal-conjoined sentences is the lack of a temporal connective, such as 就 jiù, 才 cái, or 再 zài “then.” The fact that the sequence of two consecutive action expressions cannot be reversed in Mandarin Chinese is evidenced in (45a) and (45b).

(45)  a. 媽媽上床睡覺。

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
māmā & shàng-chuáng \text{ shuì-jiào} \\
\text{Mom} & \text{go to bed} \quad \text{sleep}
\end{array}
\]

‘Mom went to bed to sleep.’

b. *媽媽睡覺上床。

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
*māmā & shuì-jiào \text{ shàng-chuáng} \\
\text{Mom} & \text{sleep} \quad \text{go to bed}
\end{array}
\]

Mom sleep go to bed (constructed example)

The order in (45a) follows the temporal order in the conceptual world. If this order is reverse, as in (45b), it will yield an ungrammatical sentence.
The action-result pattern in Chinese verbal compounds is accounted for by PTS. I demonstrated this using the example 買到 mài-dào (buy-reach: procure, get) above in 1.6.5, which follows an iconic sequence of the relation between action and result. More examples are instantiated in (46a-d).

(46)  a. 看見  b. 聽懂  c. 打破  d. 學會
      kàn-jìàn  tīng-dǒng  dǎ-pò  xu-éhuì
      see-perceive  listen-understand  hit-break  learn-comprehend
      ‘to see’  ‘to understand’  ‘to break’  ‘to learn’

In the act of looking at something, one has to see an object in order to perceive it. This is exemplified in (46a). The example in (46b) shows that one has to listen before s/he can understand. In (46c), the action of hitting results in something broken. In the case of learning in the concept of Mandarin Chinese in (46d), one has to perform the act of learning before one can comprehend what one learns.

The position of directional locatives, like 從 cóng “from”, and 到 dào “to,” is also iconically postulated in (47), where mention of the destination follows mention of the point of departure.

(47)  我們從 Edison 開到 Key West。
      wōmen cóng Edison kāi dào Key West
      we from Edison drive to Key West
      ‘We drove from Edison to Key West.’

(constructed example)

6 dao 到 dào can also used as a verb, which means ‘to arrive, to reach.’ Used in a sentence like 她星期四到美國 tā xīng-qī-sì dào méi-guó ‘She will arrive in U.S. on Thursday.’ As we can see, it also follows PTS.
Further analysis of 從 cónɡ ‘from’, and 到 dào ’to’ can be found in Tai (1985: 53-4).

PTS also fits in the comparative construction 比 bǐ ‘to compare.’ A simple comparative sentence in Chinese is exemplified in (48).

(48) 我比他高
       wó bǐ tā gāo

‘I am taller than him.’

The activity of comparing the height of two persons has to be conducted before the result is shown. If two events are compared, as in (49) are conducted, the word order also obeys PTS.

(49) 他走路比我跑步快。
      tā zǒu-lù bǐ wǒ pǎo-bù kuài.

‘He walks faster than I run.’

PTS also applies to the word order of prepositional phrases or co-verbs in Chinese. These phrases occur before the main verb; see (50).

(50) 我們往南開。
        wǒmén wàng nán kāi

‘We drove towards the south.’

The sequence in (50) is also iconic since we have to face south before we are able to drive towards the south.
In (51), the manner adverb *kuài* ‘fast’ occupies the postverbal position, to convey a general statement (Tai 1985: 56). Manner adverbs follow PTS in that, as in (51), the tigers must first run before they can run fast. However, if the sequence is like that in (51b), then the sentence is infelicitous.

(51) a. 兩隻老虎跑得快。

\[ liăng \ zhī \ lăo-hŭ \ păo \ de \ kuài \]

two CL tiger run EXT fast

‘Two tigers run fast.’

b. *兩隻老虎快得跑

\[ liăng \ zhī \ lăo-hŭ \ kuài \ de \ păo \]

two CL tiger fast EXT run

The extential expression in Mandarin Chinese is *在 zài* ‘to be at,’ which can occur either before or after an event. The pre-event expression denotes the location of the event, and the post-event expression “denotes the location of a participant as the result of an event” (Tai 389). The existentials are exemplified in (52a) and (52b).

(52) a. 他在辦公室裡打電腦。

\[ tā \ zài \ bàn-gōng-shì \ lǐ \ dă \ dìăn-năo \]

he be at office inside hit-computer

‘He played computer in the office.’

b. 他掉在水裡。

\[ tā \ diăo \ zài \ shu \ lĭ \]

he fall at water inside

‘He fell in the water.’

[(48b) from Tai (1985: 57 (36a))]
In (52a), he must be in the office in order to play the computer, which is in the office. In (52b), he has to fall into the water to be inside the water.

Duration adverbs and frequency adverbs are ordered after the main verb. This sequential ordering demonstrates that the described activity occurs first, and the time span or frequency follows right after. This is evidenced in (53a) and (53b).

\[(53)\]
\[\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{ 她來了(已經)(有)} \text{ 十天了。} \\
& \text{tā lái le (yǐjǐng) (yǒu) shí tiān le} \\
& \text{she come ASP (already) (have) 10 days ASP} \\
& \text{‘She has (already) been here for ten days.’}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \text{ 我打給他三次了。} \\
& \text{wǒ dǎ gěi tā sān-cì le} \\
& \text{I call to he 3 times ASP} \\
& \text{‘I called him three times.’}
\end{align*}\]

The underlined segments in (53) are duration adverbs and frequency adverbs. The bold font 已经 yǐjǐng ‘already’ and 有 yǒu ‘to have’ in (53a) support the fact that the event of her coming to be here has lasted for ten days instead of that “she has been coming for ten days” (Tai 1985). In (53b), the syntactic behavior of the frequency adverb has the same pattern as duration adverb in (53a).

Tai also discusses the resultative and extent complement/adverb 得 –de, which occurs right after the verb. Its function is to describe the degree or extent of a result yielded after the activity or static event. When one is so angry that one becomes speechless, it can be expressed as in (54).
(54) 她氣得不能說話了。

>tā qì DE bù-néng shuò-huà le

she angry EXT cannot speak ASP

‘She is so angry/ mad that she cannot speak.’

(The constructed example)

The resultative state of being speechless is the center of the predicate because the semantic construal of the extent 得 –de is to profile and designate such a result.

I have provided examples for the operation of PTS in Chinese grammar. This is not to indicate that all facts of Chinese grammar can be explained with PTS. Some word order phenomena related to time expressions can be applied under the Principle of Temporal Scope (PTSC).

1.6.7.2 Principle of Temporal Scope (PTSC)

Tai (1985, 1989) defines PTSC as:

If the conceptual state represented by a syntactic unit X falls within the temporal scope of the conceptual state represented by a syntactic unit Y, then the word order is YX.

(Tai 1985: 60; 1989: 214)

Tai exemplifies PTSC with reports of address and time, as I mentioned in section 1.6.3 above. He also applies PTSC to Chinese time adverbs and adverbial clauses. For example,

(55) a. 她明天會來。

>tā míng-tiān huì lái

she tomorrow will come

‘She will come tomorrow.’
b. 明天她會來。

+míng-tiān tā hùi lái

tomorrow she will come

‘She will come tomorrow.’

c. *她會來明天。

+tā hùi lái míng-tiān

she will come tomorrow

(from Tai 1985)

The temporal scope of the arrival event is within the range expressed by the time adverb 明天 míng-tiān “tomorrow”; thus the temporal adverb will precede the main verb. Both (55a) and (55b) fall within the PTSC. The reverse order in (55c) does not obey PTSC, and yields an ungrammatical sentence.

PTSC together with PTS are principles that best account for Chinese word order phenomena. Both demonstrate highly iconic and cognition-based temporal sequences in Chinese grammar.

1.6.7.3 Whole-Before-Part

The conceptualization of the whole-part relation is well demonstrated in reporting of street addresses or time of day, as exemplified in (11) and (13) in section 1.6.3. This “zooming-in” effect can be seen in the following set of examples in (56).

(56) a. 我剝了橘子的皮。

+wǒ bāo le júzǐ de pí

I peel ASP orange POSS skin

‘I peeled the orange.’
These three sentences in (56) all share the conceptual similarity of the whole-before-part relation. This relation is distinct not only in the real world but also in the conceptual world. According to Tai (ibid.), it is the whole-part relation that allows us to talk about taking a part away from the whole, as 皮 pé ‘skin’ can be peeled away from the whole 橘子 júzi ‘orange.’ The whole 橘子 júzi ‘orange’ precedes the part 皮 pé ‘skin.’

There are also construal differences among the three sentences in (56). I consider (56a) to be a general statement used to describe a situation. I distinguish (56b) with 把 bā as an active construction, in contrast to the passive construction with 被 bèi in (56c). That is to say, in (56a) there is absence of energy agency while in (56b) the energy of agency is present. It is this notion of energy transmission that distinguishes the morpheme 把 bā (Dai 2002). I suggest that the conceptual schema of 把 bā in the bā construction evokes a pre-condition act that is interpreted as causative or active, and a designated scene of a manipulative, controlling resultative state as a result of the overall conceptualization of
‘holding.’ This seems to agree with what Tai has suggested for re-examination of the bā and bèi constructions “in light of the symbolization of causatives in space and time in Chinese culture” (1989: 204).

1.6.7.4 Principle of Information Center (PIC)

In addition to the natural word order in Chinese grammar, Tai (1985) notes the distinction between neutral clausal order and saliency clausal order. He considers the former as perceptually-based, and the latter to be based on “the speakers’ interests, involvement, focus, etc.” (Tai 1989: 208). Examples are evidenced in (57) and (58).

(57) 我吃太飽了，沒去運動。

wǒ chī tài bào le, méi qù yòng-dòng

I eat too full ASP not go exercise

‘I was too full, and (therefore), I did not go to exercise.’

(58) 我沒去運動因為我吃太飽了。

wǒ méi qù yòng-dòng yīnwèi wǒ chī tài bào le

I not go exercise because I eat too full ASP

‘I didn’t go to exercise because I was too full.’ (constructed examples)

The example in (57) illustrates the neutral order, with a temporally-based cause-result statement that is accounted for by PTS. In (58), the reverse order of the clauses and the requisite addition of the causal conjunction 因為 yīnwèi ‘because’ demonstrates Tai’s Saliency Principle (SP). The SP in (58) involves emphasizing the excuse or reason for the speaker’s action.

Tai also proposes the Principle of Information Center (PIC) in order to account for different syntactic mappings between Chinese and English (1989). He distinguishes the
notion of SP from that of PIC in that the former is defined based on focus, and the latter on information center. Focus is related to the speaker’s attitude, while the information center is “pragmatically structured” and “independent of a speaker’s attitude” (ibid.: 210). He demonstrates PIC with Chinese A-\(bù\)-A (A-not-A) construction as follows.

(59) a. 他跑得快不快?

\[
\text{tā pāo de kuài bu kuài}
\]

he run EXT fast not fast

‘Does he run fast?’

b. *他跑不跑得快。

\[
\text{tā pāo bu pāo de kuài}
\]

(Tai 1989: 209-10)

The information center exemplified in (59a) relates to the question about whether the agent runs “fast or not” instead of whether he “runs or not.” In (59a), the fact that “he runs” is presupposed, and the question or the information center is concerned with the assertion about whether he runs “fast or not.” Tai identifies discrepancies between Chinese and English on this matter of “running fast or not” as related to syntax rather than semantics. The Chinese A-\(bù\)-A (A-not-A) syntactic construction instantiated in (59) refers to the “information center” instead of the verb. Tai states that in PIC as “the asserted part of a sentence is ordered after the presupposed part” (Tai 1989: 210). He further applies the notion of “information center” to analyze Chinese topic-comment sentences.

1.6.7.5 Summary

I have demonstrated four major principles Tai proposes in order to characterize cognitive features underlying in Chinese grammar. They are respectively PTS, PTSC,
whole-before-part relation, and PIC. The conceptualization of reality captures the iconic nature postulated in some of the Chinese sentences we have discussed under section 1.6.7. Through this discussion, a semantic category of result in Chinese grammar emerges.

1.7 Centering Theory and Assumed Familiarity

I adopt Grosz, Joshi and Weinstein’s centering theory (1995) and Prince’s assumed familiarity (1981) to treat the cognitive status and constraints of segment $Y$ in terms of $X bâ Y Z$. The theoretical frameworks are provided in 1.7.1 and 1.7.2.

1.7.1 Grosz, Joshi and Weinstein’s Centering Theory

Centering is a theory that relates to the “focus of attention, choice of referring expression, and perceived coherence of utterances within a discourse segment” (Grosz, Joshi and Weinstein 1995: 3). It is a discourse approach designed to model local coherence, i.e., “coherence among the utterances in that segment” (ibid: 4) and its correlation to the attentional state at the local level. To examine the interaction between the choice of expressions and local coherence, Grosz, Joshi and Weinstein argue that differences at the local coherence level are in line with inferences represented in different types of referring expressions, which correspond to specific attentional states. The centering framework explains how the properties of particular attentional states account for these differences. I also relate the notion of attention to that of windowing attention in cognitive semantics proposed by Talmy (2000). Both involve a discourse segment that serves to attract the attention of the conversational participants. According to centering theory, the centers of an utterance refer to “those entities that serve to link that utterance to other utterances in the discourse segment which contains it” (Grosz, Joshi, and Weinstein
1995: 8). Centers are treated as semantic entities in discourse constructs. According to Grosz, Joshi and Weinstein, two important structures are associated within a discourse segment in this model. They are defined as below.

- Each utterance $U$ is a discourse segment (DS) is assigned a set of forward-looking centers; the notion is marked as $C_f(U, DS)$.

- Each utterance other than the segment initial utterance is assigned a single backward-looking center; therefore, $C_b(U, DS)$.

(Grosz, Joshi, and Weinstein 1995: 8; bold emphasis is mine)

The set of forward-looking centers ($C_f$) according to discourse saliency is ranked. The highest ranked discourse entity among $C_f$ is termed the PREFERRED CENTER, $C_p$ (Walker, Iida, Cote 1994). This $C_p$ is characterized with a predication with respect to $C_b$ in the next utterance. $C_b$ is the discourse entity that is centrally concerned in the utterance, a concept similar to “theme” (Reinhart 1981) or “topic.” This entity links the current utterance to the previous one.

1.7.2 Prince’s Assumed Familiarity

Prince defines a discourse entity as “a discourse-model object, …; it may represent an individual, a class of individuals, an exemplar, a substance, a concept, etc” (1981: 235). The classification of discourse entities based on Prince’s Assumed Familiarity falls into three categories: (1) New, (2) Inferable, (3) Evoked. The subcategories are diagrammed as below in Figure 1.18.

The evoked entities are those entities available in the context of a situation or on the textual ground according to Prince.
Figure 1.18: Prince’s “Assumed Familiarity”  
(Prince 1981: 235)

I will use Grosz, Joshi and Weinstein’s centering theory and Prince’s assumed familiarity to analyze the constraints of segment $Y$ in the $bā$ construction.

1.8 Data

Section 1.8 consists of two subsections. Section 1.8.1 discusses the sources and types of my corpus data in Mandarin Chinese spoken in Taiwan, while section 1.8.2 provides background knowledge of two dialects of Mandarins spoken in Mainland China and Taiwan.

1.8.1 Corpus Data

I collected a corpus of data in Mandarin Chinese, as spoken in Taiwan. My data come from several sources, which are detailed with each example. I categorize the data into two genres in order to distinguish the frequency distribution in the first type. The two types of data contain: (1) 5 episodes of a televised cooking instructional show 美鳳有約 $Měifēng$
yǒu yuē ‘Appointment with Meifeng’, in which each episode is 7 minutes long; (2) 15 episodes of a colloquial drama 四重奏 sì-chóng-zòu ‘Quartet’, for which each episode is 35 minutes long, a 40-minute interview with 金世傑 Jīn Shì-jié in 殷緣小品 Yīn-yuán Xiāo-pín, colloquial spoken data collected from different television variety shows, and colloquial spoken data I overheard from native Mandarin Chinese speakers from Taiwan. The overall occurrences of the bā construction in context consist of 235 tokens; 65 tokens are from the cooking instructional data, and 170 tokens are from in the colloquial conversational data in Quartet and other sources. Of these last 170 tokens, 87 tokens occur in the drama Quartet, 76 tokens are from spoken variety shows and other colloquial data I overheard, and 7 tokens are from the 40-minute interview. See Figure 1.19 for the relative occurrences of the bā-c in different discourse genres.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quartet</th>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Cooking</th>
<th>Total bā-c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>170</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>bā construction</th>
<th>Total Utterances</th>
<th>Percentile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooking</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quartet</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>≈ 3900</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1.19: Data of the bā Construction**

The 65 tokens of the bā-c occurs within a total of 75 utterances in 35 minutes of cooking instructional discourse. The frequency rate of the bā-c occurrences is about 86%. The percentage of the bā-c occurrences in the colloquial conversational data is relatively low. The approximate calculation of total utterances in one episode is 260 utterances. I
estimate that 15 episodes might contain about or over 3900 utterances. The estimated percentage of the occurrences of the bă-c for 15 episodes of Quartet is about 2.2%.

This estimated frequency rate demonstrates that the bă construction occurs much more frequently in the cooking instructional program rather than in the colloquial drama. Hence, the semantic nature of cooking instructional discourse is worthy of further investigation.

It is also worth noting that some of the bă utterances in Quartet are pronounced in Taiwanese; however, I assert that these occurrences of the bă construction are compatible with Mandarin Chinese bă construction.

1.8.2 Two Mandarins: Guóyǔ and Pǔtōnghuà

Mandarin Chinese has two names in the early twentieth century: 国语 Guóyǔ ‘national language’ and 普通話 Pǔtōnghuà ‘common speech’. Guóyǔ comes from kokugo ‘languages of the nation’ in Japanese, and refers to the Chinese spoken in Taiwan. Although the Kanji representations of kokugo are the same as the Chinese characters 国语 Guóyǔ, the meaning of Guóyǔ is slightly different from kokugo (Wu-Swihart 2003). Guóyǔ means “national standard language,” which has been officially-spoken language of Taiwan since 1948. Ninety-five percentage of Taiwanese people can speak Guóyǔ. Mainland China officially adopted the term Pǔtōnghuà ‘common speech’ in 1955 (ibid.). The pronunciation standards of Pǔtōnghuà are based on the Beijing accent, and its vocabulary and grammar are based on the vernacular Northern dialect.

One major phonological difference between Guóyǔ and Pǔtōnghuà is the retroflex zh-, ch-, sh-. Mandarin Chinese speakers in Taiwan tend to pronounce z-, c-, s- rather than zh-, ch-, sh-. With reference to the analysis of bă, I point out a major syntactic difference
between *Guóyǔ* and *Pǔtōnghuà*, or in a broader context, between vernacular Southern dialect and vernacular Northern dialect in (60): “have-not-have +VP”/ “VP-marker le-not-have” (did/ have …VP?). Example (60) is a constructed conversational interaction between a mother (M) and a child (C). Example (60a) occurs among southern speakers, while (60b) among northern speakers.

(60) a. M: 你有沒有把飯吃完？

    *nǐ yǒu-méi-yǒu bā fàn chī-wán*

    you have-not-have BA rice eat-finish

    ‘Did you finish eating/ Have you finished eating [the meal/ rice]?’

    C: 我有把飯吃完。(+)

    *wǒ yǒu bā fàn chī-wán*

    I have BA rice eat-finish

    ‘I have finished eating.’

    --> The event of eating is disposed.

    C: 我沒(有)把飯吃完。

    *wǒ méi(-yǒu) bā fàn chī-wán*

    I not (-have) BA rice eat-finish

    ‘I have not finished eating.’

    --> The event of eating is not disposed.

b. M: 你把飯吃完了沒有？

    *nǐ bā fàn chī-wán le yǒu-méi*

    you BA rice eat-finish ASP not-have

    ‘Did you finish eating/ Have you finished eating [the meal/ rice]?’

    C: 我把飯吃完了。(+)

    *wǒ bā fàn chī-wán le*

    I BA rice eat-finish ASP

    ‘I have finished eating.’

    --> The event of eating is disposed.

    C: 我沒(有)把飯吃完。(-)

    *wǒ méi(-yǒu) bā fàn chī-wán*

    I not (-have) BA rice eat-finish

    ‘I have not finished eating.’

    --> The event of eating is not disposed.
The 有沒有 +VP yǒu-méi-yǒu construction is used in the vernacular of speech communities in the southern part of China and Taiwan. This construction is used so frequently that northern speakers in China have started to adopt its use since the construction is phonologically shorter and easier (UC Chinese Programs Meeting 2003). I use this construction to distinguish that the bà predicate is in fact a verbal predicate that consists of an event. The 有沒有 yǒu-méi-yǒu +VP ‘have-not-have’ construction specifically demonstrates whether the event denoted in the bà construction is disposed or not.

I use Guoyu data throughout this work, and point out certain specific Putonghua data that demonstrate the regional difference (see Inalienable Possession in section 4.3.2.5).

1.9 Cognitive Relativism

The notion of cognitive relativism and the long-held view of linguistic relativity provide cognitive linguistics a means to re-examine the conceptual disparities reflected in different languages and cultures. Wilhelm von Humboldt viewed different languages as embodiments of different cognitive perspectives. He stated,

[Each language…..contains a characteristic worldview. As individual sound meditates between object and person, so the whole of language meditates between human beings and the internal and external nature that affects them… The same act which enables him [man] to spin language out of himself enables him to spin himself into language, and each language draws a circle around the people to whom it adheres to which it is possible for the individual to escape only by stepping into a different one. (1903-36, v.7:60 in Wierzbicka 1992: 3)

Following Humboldt’s characteristic worldview, I present a specific example in (61) to indicate the difference in construal of a mistake in Chinese and English.
As exemplified, the construal of a mistake in Chinese is attributed to account for the result 錯 cuò ‘wrong’ after an action 嫁 jià ‘marry’ done by the agent. However, in English it is shown with an adjective “wrong” modifying the “guy.” This cognitive difference identifies two different conceptual mechanisms in Chinese and English, and also raises the issue of “cognitive relativism.”

In Chapters 2 and 5, I will discuss the construal of result in Mandarin Chinese, and elaborate on this particular semantic category postulated in Chinese resultative compounds and further in the bā construction. After conducting the cognitive analysis in Chapter 4, the pedagogical implications of the action-result compounds and the bā construction are raised in Chapter 5, with emphasis on the semantic prime of result in Chinese.

1.10 Cognitive Linguistics and Pedagogy

Cognitive linguistics thus serves as the nexus to approach the field of pedagogy and second/foreign language acquisition (hereafter as SLA/FLA). Cognitive grammar is described as a dynamic usage-based model (Langacker 1990, 2000, 2001), and as such, is predestined to influence the research of pedagogy in SLA as well as in many other areas. Its unique comprehensive descriptive value can strengthen several facets of language instruction. For example, application of the notion of conceptual substrate forges the translation type of language acquisition or learning in isolated context, and focuses on “presupposed viewing arrangements, the nature and force of the speaker-hearer interaction,
and how expressions relate to the current discourse state” (Langacker 2001: 15). From this perspective, I analyze the pedagogical implications of how the bā construction in Mandarin Chinese could be taught or learned in Chapter 5.

1.11 Conclusion

Section 1.2 and 1.3 state the aim and an outline of this work. Subsections of 1.4 provide theoretical frameworks of cognitive linguistics in order to conduct a cognitive analysis of the bā construction in Chapter 4. The discussion of grammaticalization in subsections of 1.5 relates the significance of the diachronic study of a lexical morpheme to the synchronic study of a grammatical construction. Section 1.6 and subsections of 1.6 outline the conceptual structure and cognitive approach to Chinese linguistics. As the most important researcher in this field, Tai proposed principles of iconicity to account for Chinese word/clausal order, and his approach is central to my analysis. I also include my own data to support and illustrate the correlation between cognition and Chinese grammar, and offer my own analysis of the bā construction. Chinese is a language that demonstrates a heavy use of metaphors and images, and employs full imports of cognitive intakes in order to describe the scene perceived in the real world. These metaphors also involve concepts grounded in Chinese cultural values. The incorporation of centering theory and assumed familiarity in section 1.7 provides a means to examine the cognitive status and constraints of segment Y in the bā construction.
CHAPTER 2

THE SEMANTIC CATEGORY OF RESULT IN MANDARIN CHINESE

2.1 Introduction

This chapter consists of two parts. The first part (Section 2.2 and 2.3) identifies a semantic category of result in Mandarin Chinese, and addresses the different conceptualization patterns of result reflected in Mandarin Chinese and English. The second part (Section 2.4) defines the role of result in the analysis of bà in this work. The category of result is manifested in different constructions in Mandarin Chinese, e.g., resultative verbal compounds, the V-de-EXT construction (resultative –de construction), the bà construction, and the bèi construction. I adopt King’s (1985) metaphor “events are place” to define the construal of result in the analysis in Chapter 4.

2.2 The Semantic Category of Result in Mandarin Chinese

The concepts of linguistic relativity and worldview discussed in Chapter 1, section 1.9 and Chapter 5, section 5.2.1 have enhanced my investigation of the semantic category of result in Mandarin Chinese. I explicate here the nature of result in Mandarin Chinese by examining the general aspect of cognition found in several syntactic structures in Mandarin Chinese, i.e., resultative verbal compounds (RVC), the V-de-EXT construction, the bà construction, and the bèi construction. These constructions all demonstrate that Mandarin Chinese contains the semantic category of result both in syntactic constructions and in cognition.

2.2.1 Resultative Verbal Compounds

Mandarin Chinese has multiple construals of result, exemplified and evidenced in resultative verbal compounds. Such compounds are composed of action-result schemas.
(Tai 2003); for example, (1) 吃完 chīwán (eat-finish) ‘finish eating’, and (2) 走進 zōujìn (walk-enter) ‘walk into, enter’.

(1) 你吃完了沒有？
    nǐ chī-wán le méi-yǒu?
You eat-finish-ASP not-have
‘Have you finished eating?’ (constructed example)

(2) 他走進了健身房。
    tā zōu-jìn le jiàn-shēn-fáng
he walk-enter-ASP gym
‘He walked into the gym.’ (constructed example)

The example in (3) (repeated here from 1.9 in Chapter 1) also has an action-result schema, which demonstrates the syntactic differences in construing a mistake in Mandarin Chinese and English (Hsieh 1973, Tai 1989, 2003).

(3) 她嫁錯了人。
    tā jià-cuò le rén
she marry-wrong-ASP man
‘She married the wrong guy.’ (Tai 1989: 192)

This construal of making a mistake in marrying in Mandarin Chinese accrues the occurrence of the mistake 錯cuò ‘wrong’ to the result of a particular action the actor performs 嫁 jià ‘to marry’, while the English construction profiles the mistake with a nominal modifier ‘wrong’. In other words, the process of the agent’s making a wrong choice in a marriage is profiled in Mandarin Chinese. However, in English, the profile is on the discrepancy of the speaker’s two mental spaces, i.e., the reality space and the
expected space. The reality space refers to the wrong guy she married, and the expected space is the ideal guy she was supposed to marry. This comparison of examples from Mandarin Chinese and English involves two conceptualizations patterned in cognitive syntax: action-result schemas and modifier + noun.

English also demonstrates action-result schemas, which involve a resultative construction, exemplified in (4) and (5b).

(4) wipe <wiper wiped>

He wiped the table clean. (Goldberg 1995: 189)

(5) eat <eater>

a. He (already) ate.

b. He ate himself sick. (Goldberg 1995: 194)

Example (4) includes a wiper and a wiped table, and the resultative state of being clean describes the wiped table. In (5a), the unarticulated argument food is involved with the verb *eat* to imply that the agent has finished eating a meal. In (5b), the activity of eating extends over a period of time, which results in the agent’s change of state to being sick from over-eating. That is, based on Goldberg (1995), it is the agent’s extended continuous eating that made him sick, rather than the food he ate. Both (4) and (5b) are regarded as English resultative construction.

Mandarin Chinese incorporates elements of *result* in its richly-developed resultative verbal compounds. The systematic conceptual symmetry of the action-result schemata suggests that Chinese verbal semantics involves a semantic prime of *result*. Tai was the first to propose the concept of *result* as a semantic prime in Mandarin Chinese (1984). In
contrast with Vendler’s (1967) three categories of semantics\(^1\) for Chinese, Tai points out that the categories Vendler claimed were lacking in Chinese, i.e., accomplishment and achievement, are also present in Mandarin Chinese, expressed in resultative verbal compounds (V1-V2). Moreover, Tai identifies the resultative complement V2 as an indicator of foreground information, and V1 as background information (2003: 306).

Tai discusses the verb *kill* in English, which denotes the resultative state of the patient being dead (1984). In other words, the verb *kill* includes “the attainment of the goal” (Tai 2003: 306). In English, when the act of killing is performed, the result of somebody’s death is implied; see examples (6). However, Mandarin Chinese 殺 *shā* ‘to kill’ does not include the same implicated result (see example below in (7a)). The death of the patient needs to be specified in a resultative complement V2 死 *sǐ* “to die” as exemplified in (7b). Once 殺死 *shāsǐ* (kill-die) “to kill” is compounded, the act of killing cannot be redone, much less undone. Otherwise, it will yield an infelicitous reading as shown in (7c).

(6) a. I killed him [implication: he is dead]
   b. *I killed him, but he didn’t die.

(7) a. 我殺了他兩次，但他都没死。
   wǒ shā le tā liǎng-cì, dàn tā dōu méi sǐ
   I kill-ASP him two times but he all not die
   ‘I performed the action of attempting to kill him twice, but he didn’t die.’
   ‘I tried to kill him twice, but he didn’t die.’ (from Tai 2003: 306)

---
\(^1\) Vendler (1967) has proposed four semantic categories for English: state, activity, accomplishment and achievement, and he points out Chinese only has state, activity and result, lacking accomplishment and achievement.
b. 我殺死了他。

wǒ shā-sǐ le tā
I kill-die-ASP him
‘I killed him.’

c. *我殺死了他兩次，但他都沒死。

wǒ shā-sǐ le tā liǎng-cì, dàn tā dōu méi sǐ
I kill-die-ASP him two times but he all not die
‘I killed him twice, but he didn’t die.’  (from Tai 2003: 306)

When only 殺 shā ‘to kill’ is used, the embedded pragmatic reading that involves the
death of the patient is one that can be also found with the use of the bā/bèi construction
(Dai 2002, Tai 2003). I will discuss this in section 2.2.3.

Examples (8) and (9) show V1-V2 action-result schemas, in which V2 is a static verb
describing the affected patient, i.e., eyes and belly. I present (8) and (9) to demonstrate
what Tai (2003) suggests: that V2 indicates foreground information and V1 designates
background information. In my opinion, the profiled scene evoked in (8) is a pair of red
eyes as a result of crying and in (9) a stuffed belly as a result of eating. My resultative
reading accounts for the profiled events in (8) and (9) that the Construers perceive. In
order to identify V2 as the main predicate verb in action-result verbs, I compare (8a) to
(8b) and (8c), and (9a) to (9b) and (9c).

(8)  a. 她哭紅了雙眼。

tā kū hóng le shuāng-yān
she cry-red-ASP both-eyes

V1-V2
‘She cried her eyes red.’

‘Both her eyes were red as a result of crying.’

b. *她哭了雙眼。

tā kū le shuāng-yān

she cry-ASP both-eyes

c. 她紅了雙眼。

tā hóng le shuāng-yān

she redden-ASP both-eyes

‘Her eyes redden.’ (constructed examples)

In (8a), there is a description of two events: (i) the event of crying, (ii) the static co-event of red eyes accompanied by the prior event. These two events follow Tai’s Principle of Temporal Sequence, where V1 occurs temporally before V2. Example (8b) yields an ungrammatical sentence because 哭 kū ‘to cry’ is an intransitive verb. If (8c) is uttered in an appropriate context, we can understand that the situation of her eyes being red is due to the prior event of crying; however, there is no implicit understanding that crying was the cause of her red eyes -- it is also possible that she has an eye infection. The main point I want to address is that the schema of action-result verbs is profiled on V2 instead of V1, which concurs with what Tai proposed (1984, 2003).

(9)

a. 他吃撐了肚子。

tā chī chēng le dùzi

he eat-stuffen-ASP belly

‘He ate a belly-full./He stuffed himself.’
b. 他吃了肚子。

*tā chī le  dù-zi*

He eat-ASP belly

‘He ate belly.  [references eating of cow’s or pig’s stomach]’

c. 他撑了肚子。

*tā chēng le  dùzi*

He stuff-ASP belly

‘He stuffed his belly [with food].’ (Here food is a necessary implication)

‘His belly is stuffed.’ (constructed examples)

In (9a), the agent engaged in the activity of eating, and it is the belly of this agent that is consequently stuffed due to the activity within the conceived time. That is to say, the V2 element demonstrates the result as a consequence of the agent’s eating activity, and involves a unique time point for the occurring event, i.e., the endpoint of an event. The analogy of the endpoint of an event is parallel to King’s metaphor “events are places.” Example (9b) is patterned with S-V-O structure, and produces a totally different meaning. Example (9c) postulates an image of the stuffed belly of the agent, parallel to that in (9a). This set of examples also indicates that the V2 in action-result verbs is the main predicate, and evokes the image profile of a given situation.

I will employ King's (1988) metaphor “events are places” to define the semantic category of *result* evidenced in Mandarin Chinese resultative verbal compounds. V1 serves as the initial point of the occurring event, and V2 is metaphorically located as an endpoint of this event. Moreover, V2 is analogical to the destination of a journey, in that a
result can be comparatively construed as the endpoint of an event. As sketched in Figure 2.1, the trajector (tr) is the agent who conducted the V1 activity, and the landmark (lm) portrays the static result V2, which is located on a part of the tr.

![Figure 2.1: Event of 哭紅 kū hóng 'cry-red' (8) and 吃撐 chī chēng 'eat-stuffed' (9)](image)

I use Figure 2.1 to interpret both (8a) and (9a). In (8a), the agent is the tr who conducts the activity of crying, and the profiled oval indicates the landmark of tr’s red eyes as a result of the crying event that continues through conceived time to the end. In (9a), the agent is the tr who performs the activity of eating until his belly (indicated as the oval inside the circle) becomes stuffed as time unfolds. The variants in (8c) and (9c), which only use V2, are satisfactory alternative expressions for (8a) and (9a), since V2 is the main predicate of the event. My analysis for the V1-V2 action-result schemata in (8) and (9) shows what Tai (1984) predicts: V1 indicates a presupposed activity, and V2 an asserted result. Another way to understand Mandarin Chinese action-result verbal compounds is through Talmy’s idea of a causal chain event frame (2000) (discussed in section 1.4.5 in Chapter 1). This idea also involves an internal category of result that accompanies the action of the main event. All in all, the phenomena of action-result schemata in Mandarin Chinese verbal compounds suggests a profile of result in the cognitive perspective.
2.2.2  V-得 de-EXT Resultative Construction

I include the V-de-EXT construction, (de-EXT: to the degree that), as a type of syntactic construct that postulates result as a semantic prime in Mandarin Chinese. For example, the meanings conveyed in utterances (8a) and (9a) can also be expressed in Mandarin Chinese using the V-de-EXT construction, which indicates that the very nature of the event described “could have arisen only as a result of deliberate activity of an agent” (Jaxontov 1988: 132). Jaxontov (1988) calls the V-de-EXT a resultative construction in Mandarin Chinese. I concur with his viewpoint, and focus further on the aspect of result as construed in (10), which parallel (8a), and (11), which parallels (9a).

(10) 她哭得眼睛都紅了。

\[ \text{tā kū de yăn-jīng dōu hóng le} \]

she cry DE eyes all red ASP

‘She cried to the degree that her eyes were red.’

‘She cried her eyes red.’

(11) 他吃得肚子都撐了。

\[ \text{tā chī de dùzi dōu chēng le} \]

he eat DE belly all stuffed ASP

‘He ate to the degree that his belly was stuffed.’

‘He ate until he stuffed himself.’

(constructed examples)

The extential clauses described in (10) and (11) describe the static states that are construed as a result of crying and eating. In (10), the activity of crying carried out by the agent
continues through the conceived time, which leads to the landmark prominence of a result accompanied by this crying event, as illustrated in Figure 2.2.

![Diagram of Event of V-de-EXT Construction in (10) and (11)](image)

**Figure 2.2: Event of V-de-EXT (to the degree that) Construction in (10) and (11)**

The circle on the left, i.e., the agent, serves as a trajector, and the dashed arrow indicates the continuation of energy flow as time unfolds. The profiled oval inside the circle represents the landmark, i.e., her eyes, which takes prominence. The landmark is an extential clause that is profiled and characterized with a resultative description. The conceived time indicated in heavy dashed lines is also profiled to emphasize to the extent of her crying, to the point that her eyes became red. The analysis of (11) is parallel to the given above for (10).

The construal of the situations evoked in (10) and (11) pertains to the elaboration sites of the extential clauses. These examples suffice to make the claim that the V-de-EXT construction profiles the concept of *result* as a semantic category in Mandarin Chinese. The discussion of examples (8) to (11) suggests that Chinese is a landmark-prominent language, for which the aspect of result takes prominence within the landmark.

### 2.2.3 Bā/bèi Constructions

Returning to example (7), according to Tai (2003), the death of the patient is strongly implied when the the bā/bèi constructions are used to paraphrase (7). I correlate this link to
the conceptualizations of the bā/bèi morphemes, which evokes an image of a manipulative action/an adversative state done to an object or accompanied by an event.

(12) a. 我把他殺了。

wǒ bā tā shā le

I BA he kill-ASP

‘I killed him.’

[strong implication: he is dead] (constructed example)

b. 他被我殺了。

tā bèi wǒ shā le

he BEI I kill-ASP

‘He was killed by me.’

[strong implication: he is dead] (constructed example)

The morpheme 死 sǐ “to die” is optional in (12a) and (12b) because the bā and bèi constructions contain a strong sense of “manipulative state” denoted in the act of killing.

Both sentences imply the result of the patient’s death. I consider the bā and bèi constructions to be constructional devices that demonstrate result as a semantic category in Mandarin Chinese. Further discussion of these constructions follow in section 2.3 and 2.4.

2.2.4 Remarks

The result constructional devices described in sections 2.2.1, 2.2.2, and 2.2.3 reflect that construal aspects of reporting an event in Mandarin Chinese differ from construals of result in English. Chinese tends to report an action-result event or a result only event, while English speakers focus on a process in relation to reporting or describing an event. This finding supports Tai’s conjecture sketched in Figure 2.3.
Tai considers that English is an agent-oriented language; the agent’s perspectival orientation allows viewing an endpoint of an event from the perspective of an agent, and “thus allows action verbs to have implicational structures” (1984: 295). In contrast, Chinese is a patient-oriented language; Chinese speakers tend to view the endpoint of an event from the perspective of an affected patient, and hence “its action verbs do not exhibit implicational structures” (ibid.). I will discuss another structure in section 2.3.2.1 to further support this conjecture.

2.3 Construals in the 被 bèi Construction

This section continues the discussion of the 被 bèi construction in Mandarin Chinese, with example (12b), restated as (13a), to further identify the profiled construals in this construction. According to Chappell, the inherent semantic properties of the bèi construction in Mandarin Chinese include “adversity, completiveness, the identifiable nature of the subject/undergoer and the obligatory expression of the agent” (1983: v).

(13)  a. 他被我殺了。

\[ tā bèi wǒ shā le \]

he BEI I kill-ASP

‘He was killed by me.’  [strong implication: he is dead.]
The sentences in (13a) and (13b) both report an adverse event, that “he is dead (now).” Although the resultative morpheme 死 sǐ ‘to die’ does not appear in either (13a) or (13b), the semantic property of “completeness” (Chappell 1985) inherent in the 被 bèi construction carries the strong implication that the killing was completed to death. Such a reading is realized through a completed event of the act of killing: (agent) to kill, (patient) to die. I tentatively abel the use of the 把 bā construction in (13c) as the agentive bā
construction. This construction not only reports the event of the act of killing, but also
strongly implies the manipulative state of the patient’s death, via the notion of agency that
the morpheme ば encrypts in this construction. I suggest that the reading of manipulation
is the salience of the strong implication of the patient’s death. I will return to discussion
related to (13c) in Chapter 4.

In contrast to examples (13a, b, c), the declarative sentence in (13d) only reports the
event of an act of (attempted) killing; the consequence of this killing is not reported, so we
do not know for sure if the patient died or not. If the resultative morpheme 死 sǐ ‘to die’ is
overtly expressed, as in the declarative sentence in (13e), we know for certain that the
patient is dead. In the べi sentences (13a) and (13b), the patient’s death is strongly
implied. I consider that the tone of adversity in べi is conveyed in the べi construction, in
that it is the source; that is where the strong implication comes from. However, if neither
the resultative morpheme 死 sǐ ‘to die’ nor either the ば and べi constructions are involved,
the scene of the patient’s death is never construed, as in (13d).

As far as the event of killing in Mandarin Chinese is concerned, there are three ways to
denote or express the construal of the patient’s death. They are via: (1) the resultative
morpheme 死 sǐ ‘to die’, (2) the 被 べi construction, and (3) the 把 ば construction. The
resultative status is expressed in the second element of the V1-V2 action-result schemata, a
frequently-used syntactic mechanism in Mandarin Chinese, where the result of the event
(V1) is overtly accomplished in V2. The constructional devices of the 被 べi construction
and the agentive 把 ば construction also encode the result of the act of killing in their
constructions. In other words, the meanings of both constructions evoke a resultant state
accompanied by the major event described in the syntactic mechanism.
In order to present the resultant construals of the 被 bèi construction and further define the semantic category of result reflected in Mandarin Chinese, I will provide additional examples to illustrate the result phenomena encoded in the 被 bèi construction.

2.3.1 The Nature of the 被 bèi Morpheme in the 被 bèi Construction

The morpheme 被 bèi can be traced historically to a lexical verb in archaic Chinese; according to Bennet (1981), its meaning was close to ‘suffer from’ (被 bèi₁). Wang (1980), however, differentiated two distinct senses of 被 bèi: ‘cover’ and ‘suffer’. These two senses are derived from an earlier meaning of 被 bèi, ‘to put (something) on one’s body’. Gao (1957) also claims that 被 bèi was a verb that meant ‘cover’ (被 bèi₂). I submit that the nominal sense of 被 bèi is ‘quilt, blanket’, to further illustrate the viewpoint of an affected patient involved by 被 bèi. Some of the sense of the earlier meanings of 被 bèi were later integrated into the expression of the bèi construction around the fifth century A.D. As Wang remarks with regard to the 被 bèi passive, “a newly arisen grammatical construction only adopts a lexical form that is mutually appropriate for its expression” (1980: 430).

Newman (1996, 2001) underscores the importance of examination of certain verbs that have developed into grammatical morphemes, as well as those that show potential for this transition, taking figurative uses into consideration as well. Verbs that have undergone grammaticalization are mostly experientially-prompted, such as say, stand, go, lie. I concur with Wang as quoted in the last paragraph, and here I take up Newman’s (2001) challenge to examine the conceptualization of prior meanings of 被 bèi in the grammaticalization process in Mandarin Chinese.
To begin with the meaning of 被 ｂèi₁ as ‘to suffer (from)’, for example, this verb requires an undergoer and a theme to constitute an adversative event of suffering. The adverse state of affairs, which the undergoer suffers, is profiled and becomes the elaboration site. If we examine 被 ｂèi₂ ‘[theme] cover [undergoer]’ the domain that receives the impact (of being covered), and the domain that enacts an external transmission of energy (the act of covering) are both profiled in 被 ｂèi₂. However, the domain that receives the impact takes more prominence than the domain that causes this impact. The domain of receiving an impact is designated in the adverse state of affairs expressed in an active form in the meaning of 被 ｂèi₁. The domain of enacting from an external transmission of energy shifts in perspective onto the experiential domain of the undergoer encoded in 被 ｂèi₂, which conveys the passive reception of energy from an external source. The processual relations profiled in both meanings denoted in the morpheme 被 ｂèi are parallel to that of the semantic representation characterized in 被 ｂèi construction, i.e., NP 被 ｂèi (NP) Z. This parallel construct is sketched as below in Figure 2.4.

**Conceptualization of 被 ｂèi₁ ‘to suffer’**
Undergoer --> goes through adversity --> the adverse state of affairs, i.e., suffering

**Conceptualization of 被 ｂèi₂ ‘to cover’**
Theme --> cover --> affected impact on the undergoer

**被 ｂèi Construction**
Undergoer --> 被 ｂèi --> resultant construal

**Figure 2.4: 被 ｂèi and 被 ｂèi Passive**
I observe that the tone of adversity is not only construed in 被 bèi construction, as Chappell (1983) suggests (cited above in section 2.3), but is also encoded in the conceptualizations of 被 bèi₁ and 被 bèi₂. This interpretation accounts for the indication that perseverance of 被 bèi as a lexical verb that is retained and integrated into the 被 bèi construction. The phenomenon of perseverance and the perspectival profile of the retained meaning of “receiving the impact” provide strong evidence for my identification for a resultant construal of the 被 bèi construction. I will further address this issue in section 2.3.3.

2.3.2 The Semantic Nature of 被 bèi Construction

Two kinds of passive sentences are prevalent in Mandarin Chinese. The first type is the topic-comment construction, or “passive without bèi” (Chappell 1983: 9); the second type is the 被 bèi passive construction.

2.3.2.1 Passive without 被 bèi

At this point, I prefer to label this structure as passive without 被 bèi (Chappell 1983: 9) instead of as a topic-comment sentence, in order to avoid possible confusion a pragmatic or syntactic notion of “topic” that might result. Examples of passive without 被 bèi are shown in (14), and in the context of a conversation in (15).

(14) 魚 (NP) 吃了 (VP).
    yú  chī le
    fish  eat-ASP
    undergoer  (agent) action verb
Example (14) is a frequently-occurring sentence structure in Mandarin Chinese.\(^2\) Example (14) is an isolated sentence that has four plausible interpretations. The primary reading is the focus of this section: passive without 被 bèi. The first discourse segment, 魚 yú ‘fish’, is introduced, and the second discourse segment is described as an action done to the first discourse segment from the speaker’s point of view. I note that Chappell marks this sentence type as passive without bèi, based on the assumption that the bèi construction is parallel to the English passive construction. I provide two other readings (b) and (c) without involving passive interpretations because I consider the bèi construction is similar to, but not equivalent to the English passive sentences. In my opinion, the semantic nature of this type of NP-VP construction (14) is the disposal semantics of an event that involves and centers around the entity of NP: the implicit agent ate the fish, and thus the event of eating the fish is disposed. Further discussion of this type of construction is in section 4.6 in Chapter 4. The second interpretation can be construed from the context of a natural marine setting or a cartoon, where the entity fish is considered as an agent conducting the action of eating.

I adopt centering theory (Walker, Iida and Cote 1994, Grosz, Joshi and Weinstein 1995) in order to fine-tune the roles of the discourse segments brought forth in sentences of

\(^2\) Most Chinese linguists (Chen 1983, Tsao 1987) use “topic-comment” to describe this type of sentence structure. While I find this term convenient to use, I also find it very confusing to construe. I therefore discard the notion of “topic-comment”, and focus on exploring the embedded construal perspective of this type of sentence in Mandarin Chinese.
passive without 被 bèi sentences. To do so, I examine (14) within a broader context provided in (15).

(15) A (a) : 我今天中午替你煮的東西，你吃了嗎？

wǒ jīn-tiān zhōng-wǔ tì nǐ zhǔ de dōng-xī nǐ chī le ma?

I today noon for you cook DE stuff you eat-ASP PRT

C_f C_b C_f

‘Did you eat the stuff (food) I cooked for you at noon today?’

a: [C_b = stuff I cooked for you] [C_f = I, you, the stuff I cooked for you]

B (b/c) : 魚(我)吃了，c：肉(我)沒吃。

yú (wǒ) chī le  | ròu (wǒ) méi chī

fish (I) eat-ASP | meat (I) not eat

C_b = C_p C_f     C_b C_f

‘I have eaten the fish, but not meat.’

b: [C_b = C_p = fish] [C_f = (I), fish] SMOOTH-SHIFT

c: [C_b = C_p = meat] [C_f = (I), meat] SMOOTH-SHIFT

A (d) : 肉 Ø 爲什麼沒吃，e: Ø 不好吃嗎？

ròu Ø wèi-shén-me méi chī 1 Ø bù hǎo chī ma

meat (you) why not eat 1 (meat) not good eat PRT

C_b = C_p = meat C_f = (you) C_b = C_p = Ø (meat)

‘Why didn’t you eat meat? It didn’t taste good?’
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There are six utterances (15 (a) to (f)) in the conversation between Speaker A and Speaker B. According to centering theory, \( C_b \) is the discourse entity that is centrally concerned in the utterance, and is similar to the concept of “theme” or “topic.” This entity links the current utterance to the previous one. Within the context of (15), the “stuff” (15a) includes fish and meat, that speaker A cooked for B, and constitutes the center of the discourse, \( C_b \), and this element is also part of the \( C_f \) (15a). The element is indirectly realized in (15b) and (15c) since the stuff that Speaker A cooked for B contains fish and meat. The fish referred to in (15b) is the highest-ranked element of \( C_f \) (15b), thus \( C_p \), and is also the mostly centrally concerned entity, therefore \( C_b \). The meat referred to in (15c) is the \( C_b \) as well as \( C_p \). According to the centering transition state,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( C_b (U_i) = C_p (U_i) )</th>
<th>( C_b (U_i) = C_b (U_{i-1}) ) OR ( C_b (U_{i-1}) = [?] )</th>
<th>( C_b (U_i) \neq C_b (U_{i-1}) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( C_b (U_i) = C_p (U_i) )</td>
<td>CONTINUE</td>
<td>SMOOTH-SHIFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_b (U_i) \neq C_p (U_i) )</td>
<td>RETAIN</td>
<td>ROUGH-SHIFT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Walker, Iida, and Cote 1994: 8)
Utterance (15b) and (15c) contains the same \( C_b \) and \( C_p \), but do not have the same \( C_b \) in the previous discourse, demonstrating a SMOOTH-SHIFT transition. When both \( C_b(U_i) = C_b(U_{i-1}) \) and \( C_b(U_i) = C_p(U_i) \) hold, as in (15d) and (15e), a CONTINUE transition is demonstrated. I find that in the passive without \( bèi \) (NP-VP) construction, the undergoer is both the \( C_b \) and the \( C_p \), and the viewpoint is drawn from the perspective of the patient rather than that of the agent. This finding further supports what Tai proposes: Chinese is a patient-oriented language (1984, 2003). I consider that what is left in the sentence to describe the relation to the other \( C_f \) (the agent), usually mentioned in the prior discourse, is optionally deleted, and the disposal action on \( C_b \) is what I call resultant construal, that portrays an outcome or a result related to \( C_b \), as below in (16).

(16) a. NP VP
    b. undergoer (agent) action verb
    c. \( C_b = C_p \) \( (C_f) \) resultant construal

I conclude that this type of NP-VP construction in Mandarin Chinese does not involve passive voice (although it has been translated as passive by western linguists (Chappell 1983) and those Chinese linguists who follow this tradition), but rather reflect that Chinese is a patient-oriented language. Chinese speakers tend to view things from an endpoint of an event, and ascribe a result together with the event. I utilize centering theory to suggest that this type of sentences identifies that backward-looking center as the preferred center, and that the optionally-deleted forward-looking center is usually the agent who conducts the event.
2.3.2.2 被 bèi Passive

The second type of passive sentence in Mandarin Chinese is the 被 bèi construction, i.e., $NP \text{ 被 bèi (NP)} Z$. What distinguishes this construction from passive without 被 bèi is the characteristic “of wanting to say something primarily about the undergoer of an event” (Chappell 1983: 14). According to Chappell, this notion is related to the semantic property of adversity denoted in the 被 bèi construction (see section 2.3 above). I note that the notion of “wanting to say something primarily about the undergoer” and “a passive of adversity” reflect a shared semantic field of cognition that is conceptualized and reflected within a Chinese speakers’ mind when choosing to use the 被 bèi construction.

To support her point about the tone of adversity, Chappell found that even for the predications referencing good fortune, “the newly arisen state of affairs” (Chappell 1983: 22) is still construed as an unfortuneate one for the undergoer. This configuration is exemplified in (17).

(17) 我昨天被老師好好地表揚了。

$wǒ zuó-tiān \text{ 被 } lǎo-shī hǎo hǎo de \text{ 表-ASP } biǎo-yá le$

I yesterday BEI teacher well ADV praise-ASP

‘I was paid a very nice compliment by my teacher yesterday.’

(Chappell 1983: 23; my translation)

This example has two readings, and I translated it in a neutral tone as above. The sentence is ambiguous, in that it can either imply the speaker’s embarrassment about the event of
receiving a nice compliment in public\(^3\), or describe the compliment ironically as in the situation of scoring only 23 out of 100. In my opinion, the speaker’s construal, i.e., the perspective of the subject, is portrayed through the *bèi* construction from a patient-oriented viewpoint. The resultant scene is receiving a nice compliment from the teacher, and adversity is that the subject doesn’t want to experience such an event. The subject’s emotional perspective is profiled through the use of the *bèi* construction.

The example in (18) describes a less extreme neutral event than (17), but the “annoyance” state of the speaker is profiled through the *bèi* construction.

(18) 這本雜誌被他翻了一頁。

\[zhè běn zá-zhì bèi tā fān le yī yè\]

‘This magazine was glanced through by him (to my annoyance).’

(from Chappell 1983: 23)

The nature of this sentence is a complaint. The speaker thinks that whoever performed the act of flipping over few pages of the magazine should not have done so. The perspective of a subjectival construal of the owner\(^4\) of the magazine is profiled and interpreted into something the speaker considers undesirable.

The example in (19) best captures the subjectival construal of adversity conceptualized within the speaker’s overtone articulated in the use of the *bèi* construction.

---

\(^3\) The standard way to respond to a compliment face to face in Chinese is not 謝謝 *xièxiē* ‘thank you’, but 哪裡 哪裡，您太客氣了*nà-lǐ nà-lǐ, nín tài kè-qì le* ‘No no, you are too polite.’ To receive a nice compliment FROM A TEACHER IN PUBLIC might cause social awkwardness for the student because s/he may be embarrassed to be singled out.

\(^4\) The speaker might have borrowed somebody else’s expensive magazine and does not want anybody to touch it.
Chappell indicates that it is not the ‘scholarship’ that underwent the loss, but the person who imagined that he could have become a recipient of the scholarship, i.e., 我 wǒ ‘I’, experiences the loss. Chappell states that “the resultant state of affairs is construed as a loss of this person” (1983: 29). This view corresponds to my idea of subjectival construal from the speaker’s perspective, and further supports my notion of resultant construal.

2.3.3 Resultant Construals in the 被 bèi Construction

Resultative morphemes, directional complements, and V-de-EXT construction (to the degree that) all show resultant construals in the 被 bèi construction. The element of result is strongly implied in segment Z of the 被 bèi construction, and subjectival construals mentioned in section 2.3.2. I will provide one example for each case below.

(20) 我快被他笑死了。

wǒ kuài bèi tā xiào sǐ le

I almost BEI he laugh-die-ASP

V1-V2 (result)

‘I was almost laughed to death.’

‘He almost laughed me to death.’

(constructed example; the second interpretation is from Brody)
The resultative verbal compounds 笑死 xiào-sī ‘laugh to death’ is not literal, but describe an extreme hilarious state. V-死了 sǐ le “V-to death” is a frequent hyperbolic expression to indicate an “extreme” state of the verbal description in Mandarin Chinese. Example (20) means “he really cracked me up” or “what he said really cracked me up.”

(21) 那個秘密被她講出來了。

nà ge mìmì bèi tā jiǎng chū lái le

directional complement

‘That secret was leaked out by her.’

(colloquial data 2004)

In (21), the directional complement -出來 chū-lái “out-come: out” is also considered a resultative complement. Its conceptual motion portrays the path of an action, and describes the resultant state of an action, like the verb-particle construction in English.

(22) 被笑得直不起腰來。

bèi xiào de zhí bù qǐ yāo lái

‘I was so cracked up (by somebody’s joke) that I couldn’t straighten up.’

(colloquial data 2004)

The Mandarin Chinese V-de-EXT (to the degree that) resultative construction is also compatible within the 被bèi predicate. Example (22) demonstrates a resultant state of being doubled over with laughter.
As discussed in section 2.2.3 and 2.3, example (23) carries the strong implication that the patient is dead via the act of killing.

2.4 Findings and Conclusion

Talmy (2000) states that a resulting event is accompanied by a major event or state. The notion of result was developed to construct a semantic category of result in Mandarin Chinese by Tai (2003). I utilize this concept of result and examine its presence throughout Mandarin Chinese resultative verbal compounds, the V-de-EXT resultative construction, the bā construction and the bèi constructions. In contrast to English, Mandarin Chinese seems to suggest a semantic prime of result, which is both profiled in its syntax and reflected in habitual thinking patterns.

Extending King’s metaphor and applying his definition of “events are places” (1988: 581), I will define the semantic category of result in Mandarin Chinese:

1) An event is an extended space;
2) An agent is the head of energy within an event-space;
3) An action is an event-space within which an agent produces energy;
4) A patient is the tail of the energy emanating from an agent;
5) A state is a location in space at which a patient is located;
6) A change of state of a patient is an event-space within which the patient moves from an initial state-location S1 to a final state-location S2;
7) In a resultative event or a resultant state, event space e2 is accompanied or connected from event space e1.

The semantic category of result in Mandarin Chinese is evidenced in the syntactic NP-VP construction, the RVC construction, the bèi construction, and the V-de-EXT resultative
construction. The passive sentence without bèi (NP-VP construction) does not correspond to passive voice, but rather perspectivizes from the viewpoint of the patient. The NP/patient is the backward-looking center and the preferred center, and the VP is the resultant construal of its relation to the backward-looking center; the agent is usually deleted. My analysis supports Tai’s (1984) claim: Chinese is a patient-oriented language, and view things from the endpoint of an event.
3.1 Introduction

The first part of this chapter aims to elucidate the semantic motivation and the conceptual construal of the morpheme ́bā ‘to take, to hold’ in Mandarin Chinese using a cognitive semantic approach. The second part of this chapter addresses grammaticalization of the morpheme ́bā in relation to its use in the ́bā construction. The construal of ́bā further addresses the metaphorical semantic extension of its polysemous nature categorially, i.e., as classifier, as noun, as modifier, as a lexical verb, and as one element in a verbal compound. The predications of the morpheme ́bā in the ́bā construction have been construed by Li and Thompson as $X ́bā Y Z$ (Li and Thompson 1981), and the status of its lexical category has been a much debated topic (Wang 1947, Lü 1955, Chao 1968, Peter Wang 1970, Li and Thompson 1981, Tsao 1987, Audrey Li 1991, Yang 1995, Sun 1996, Jelina Li 1997, Bender 2000, Ding 2001, D. Li 2003). I will demonstrate the transmission of energy evoked in ́bā in the predication of the ́bā construction by using the action chain model (Langacker 1987). The highly-profiled conceptualization motivates the syntactic ́bā construction in Mandarin Chinese, and accounts for the nature of disposal semantics (Wang 1947, Li and Thompson 1981, Sybesma 1992) underlying the ́bā -c postverbal constituents (Ding 2001, Dai 2002).

This chapter has eight major sections related to conceptualization and grammaticalization of the morpheme ́bā. Section 3.2 reviews the types of profile introduced in Chapter 1: Langacker’s (1987) concepts of thing, relation, and process, as
applicable to ば。 In 3.3, these notions are employed to discuss different profiles of the morpheme ば as a verb, a classifier, an adverb, and a grammatical marker. Section 3.4 addresses meaning-extension as a motivated phenomenon from the perspective of conceptualization and grammaticalization. In section 3.5, I present an account for the extensive semantic senses of ば, and construct a lexical network of ば. Section 3.6 discusses the relationship between subjectification and grammaticalization, in order to apply these related processes to the conceptual and grammatical development of ば.

Section 3.7 concludes with summary remarks.

3.2 Types of Profile

Three types of profiles are discussed in Langacker’s CG model (also seen in section 1.5.2): thing, relation, and process. Two prominent participating entities in the profiles of relation and process are trajector and landmark, which are similar to Talmy’s notion of figure and ground. In general, a noun profiles a thing, while a verb designates a processual construal, and a preposition profiles an atemporal relation. A table is a thing, which depicts the predictions of a noun designating a region that abstractly describes a set of interconnected entities (illustrated in Figure 3.1).

![Figure 3.1: Prototypical Image of a table](image URL)

The arrow in Figure 3.1 indicates the prototypical function of a table, which is to provide a surface on which people may place things, that may be used to eat or to work. The use of
*table* exemplified in (1) metaphorically extends its usage as a verb. Such a relation invokes a process that involves people and things.

(1) to table the discussion ‘to place an item/topic on the agenda’

‘to postpone the discussion’

The verb *table* in (1) designates a process that includes a sequence of states residing between each interconnected state of trajector (tr) and landmark (lm), i.e., to metaphorically put something on the surface of a table. The interconnection between the trajector and landmark is illustrated in Figure 3.2.

![Figure 3.2: Processual and Static Construals of “to ‘table’ the discussion”](image)

In Figure 3.2, the metaphorical invocation of “putting” is extended as “placing an item/topic on the agenda” or “postponing the discussion of an item/topic,” where the agenda is a metaphorical surface onto which metaphorical items (for discussion) may be metaphorically placed. The image invoked the way discussants metaphorically place (3.2a) or prolong (3.2b) the item of discussion on the metaphorical table, which profiles a
processual or static construal parallel to a larger schema of functions that a table might have. The construals in Figure 3.2 also apply to non-metaphorical uses as well.

### 3.3 Profiles of 把 bā

Six different profiles are invoked in the predications of the morpheme 把 bā ‘to take, to hold’ in Mandarin Chinese: a full lexical verb, a verb compound component, a classifier, an adverb when used with 一 yī-, a noun, and a co-verb or a preposition. The morpheme 把 bā profiles a process when it is a full lexical verb, as in (2), or the first element of a verb compound, as in (3). It profiles different types of relations (discussed below) when it serves as a classifier, shown in (4), a modifier, shown in (5), and a preposition, as in (7). When the morpheme 把 bā co-occurs with other noun compound elements, such as 門 mén ‘door’, 手 shǒu ‘hand’, a nominal phrase is construed, as in (8).

(2) 把 bā as a full verb

a. 明月幾時有，把酒問青天。

*ming yuè jīshí yǒu bā jiǔ wèn qīng tiān*

bright moon when have hold wine ask blue sky

‘When will there be a bright moon? I hold the wine up, and ask the Heaven.’

(SU Shi, extracted lyrics, 1076 A.D.)

b. 他倆把酒言歡。

*tā liǎng bā jiǔ yán huān*

he two hold wine converse happiness

‘They two raise their wine cup and converse cheerfully.’

‘They two converse cheerfully over a glass of wine.’ (constructed example)
Note that the semantic properties of 把 bā as a full lexical verb consist of Motion-Contact/Contact-Motion events: holding up or raising the wine cup. This notion extends the conceptual content, i.e., motion, that bā denotes. I discuss the motion semantics of 把 bā in section 3.3.1.

(3) 把 bā as one element of a verb compound （modern Mandarin Chinese）
   a. 把持 bā-chí take-hold ‘control, dominate, monopolize’
   b. 把尿 bā-niào hold-pee ‘hold a baby while helping it urinate’
   c. 把握 bā-wò hold-hold ‘hold, seize, cherish (opportunity or person)’

Disyllabic verb compounds are very prominent in modern Mandarin Chinese. As exemplified in (3), the morpheme 把 bā collaborates with other verbal elements 持–chí ‘to hold’ (3a), 尿–niào ‘to pee’ (3b), and 握–wò ‘to hold’ (3c), to form verbal compounds. Each compound constitutes a scene of physically holding or metaphorically seizing something, derived from the verbal semantics of 把 bā.

(4) 把 bā as a classifier with 一 yī (one)
   a. 一把雨傘 yī bā yǔsān one-CL-umbrella ‘an umbrella’
   b. 一把刀 yī bā dāo one-CL-knife ‘a knife’
   c. 一把米 yī bā mǐ one-CL-rice ‘one handful of rice’

The meaning of 把 bā as a classifier is related to the graspability of the objects it classifies. For instances, 雨傘 yǔsān ‘umbrella’ and 刀 dāo ‘knife’ are physical objects which are most typically held in the hand of an agent to perform their functions. The
application of the 把 bā classifier to rice originates in ancient commercial transactions, where quantities of rice to be bought or sold were measured out by hand. The common feature of 把 bā as a classifier resides in graspability, which is denoted in the verbal semantics of 把 bā as well.

(5) 一把 yī bā as a modifier

a. 她也有一些年纪了。
   tā yě yǒu yī bā niánjì le
   she too have one-CL age ASP
   ‘She is getting on in years.’
   ‘She is not that young (implication).’

b. 考试快到了，要加(一)*把劲。
   kǎoshì kuài dào le, yào jiā (yī-)* bā jìn
   exam almost arrive ASP must add (one-)* CL strength
   ‘The exam is coming up. (I/You) have to put on a spurt of energy/ make greater effort (to study/to hit the books).’ ( )* indicates optional

c. 金城武乱帅一把的。
   Jīchéngwǔ luàn shuài yī-bā-de
   Name messy handsome one-CL-PRT
   ‘Jinchengwu is very/ghettofabulous/mad/crazy handsome.’

(constructed examples)

Together with the morpheme 一 yī ‘one,’ 一把 yī-bā means ‘quite a few’, as evidenced in the collocated modifier 大 dà ‘big’ to describe the phrase in (6a).
(6) a. 一大把  yī- dà-bā  one-big-handful  ‘quite a lot’

b. 一小撮  yī- xiǎo- cuo  one-small-pinches  ‘a small amount’

c. 一小撮鬚鬃  yī- xiǎo- cuo húxū  ‘a small amount of whiskers’

In (6a), the image of [A HANDFUL] is associated with large quantities. This cue prompts the meaning of [A LOT] or [VERY] to modify certain abstract uncountable nouns, such as 年紀  nián-jì  ‘age’ (5a), or 劲  jìn  ‘strength, energy’ (5b), or modifying the degree of looking handsome (5c). The modifier 小  xiǎo  ‘little’ is collocated with the classifier 撮  cuo  ‘CL: to pinch’ in (6b), which means ‘to take with fingers (between thumb and forefinger)’ as a verb, the image evoked is the amount that can be held between these two fingers: [A SMALL AMOUNT]. In (6c), one can pinch a small amount of whiskers between thumb and forefinger. In English, a pinch is prototypically performed with the thumb and the forefinger – a small sharp brief hold. The semantic domain of [QUITE A FEW] in (5a,b) and [VERY] in (5c), (6a), and (6c) extends from the scene of how much one can hold in one’s hand to general expanded capacity. In the scene exemplified in (6b) and (6c), where the pinch between two fingers is associated with a small amount: [SMALL, EXTREME]. The examples in (5) and (6) indicated parallel extremes of size scope. The classifier 撮  cuo  ‘CL: to pinch’ invokes hand action in a fashion similar to bā, but it is not extensive across grammatical categories.

(7) 把  bā  as an instrumental preposition (Classic Chinese)

qian  men  wan  hu  tongtong  ri
thousand  door  ten thousand  family  luminous  sun
zong  ba  xin  tao  huan  jiu  fu
always  INST  new  peach  replace  old  charm
‘The bright rising sun shines through thousands of families, and finally the old peach wood charms are replaced with the new ones.’

(in Ding 2001:106)

The function of the morpheme 把 bā in classic Chinese in (7) is to introduce an instrument; hence, Ding (2001) analyzes it as an instrumental preposition.

(8) 把 bā in a nominal phrase

a. 門把 mén-bā door-handle ‘door knob’
b. 把手 bā-shǒu handle-hand ‘handle, grip, knob’
c. 把戲 bā-xì hold-drama/ play ‘magic trick’

(constructed examples)

The morpheme 把 bā as a noun means ‘handle’ or ‘bundle’; hence the compound nouns in (8a, b) are easily conceptualized. The example in (8c) refers to a magician who performs a sleight-of-hand trick; accordingly, the phrase is construed as 把戲 bāxi ‘holding drama, a drama in the hand’.

3.3.1 Processual Profiles of 把 bā

In this section, I will employ Langacker’s notion of process (1991), Talmy’s notion of motion-contact schema (2000), and Gao’s (2001) classification of physical action verbs in Mandarin Chinese to illustrate the temporal profile of 把 bā. I interpret the physical action verb 把 bā ‘to take, to hold’ as involving at least two stages of energy flow: motion and contact. This interpretation is based on my intuitive perception of the verbal semantics of 把 bā, which is corroborated by Gao, who states that “[f]or those verbs that express a Constant Physical Contact …., such as zuo ‘sit, ba ‘hold’, …..the energy flow
may be understood as having two stages if we take the pre-conditional act … as part of the scene as a larger image” (2001: 29). My sketch of the two stages of energy flow of 把 bā is presented in Figure 3.3.

![Figure 3.3: Two Stages of Energy Flow in 把 bā](Dai 2002)

I further introduce the concept “contact-manipulative state” denoted in 把 bā in stage 2; see the heavy line in stage 2 in Figure 3.4. The prototypical scene evoked by 把 bā involves the grasp at the final state, which comes about as a result of the energetic physical interaction that moves through space, and is retained on the object it contacts. The energy contacts the physical object, which remains affected: this is represented in stage 2, contact – state in Figure 3.4.

![Figure 3.4: Intrinsic Motion in Verbal 把 bā](motion contact state)

The notion of intrinsic retained energy stage 2 of verbal 把 bā is further supported by my findings from two translation tasks. In the first task, I asked ten native speakers of Mandarin Chinese in Taiwan to translate the line from classic Chinese in (2) into English.
Their translations were either ‘holding the wine up’, as in (2a), or ‘raise the wine (up)’, as in (2b).

In a second cross-linguistic study with ten native speakers of German who had two or more years of study in Mandarin Chinese, I presented the subjects with two sentences in German to translate into Mandarin Chinese. The German sentences differ only in the case; the sentences in German are from Li (2001: 1). The German sentence in (9a) describes a stative event, while in (9b), the use of verb and accusative case involves the concept of “Bewegung” (‘motion’). Interestingly, seven out of the ten students used 在 zài ‘extential “at’’ in their translation of (9a), and 把 bǎ in their translation of (9b).

(9) a Sie pflanzen die Blumen auf dem Feld.

They plant the flowers in DAT field.

他們在田裡種花。

tāmén zài tiánlǐ zhòng huā

they be at field-in plant flowers

‘They planted the flowers in the field.’

b Sie pflanzen die Blumen auf das Feld.

They plant the flowers into ACC field.

他們把花種到田裡。

tāmén bǎ huā zhòng dào tiánlǐ

they BA flowers plant into field-in

‘They planted the flowers into the field.’
In (9b), the accusative case in German involves an inherent motion, which is expressed in the Mandarin translation of the *bā* construction. These findings further my argument for the inherent symbolic conceptual structure that *bā* evokes: energy transmits, energy sinks. In the following subsections, I will divide the profiles of *bā* into the domains of lexical verb, compound verb, and grammaticalized verb (further discussed in section 3.5). The process of profiling and sequential scanning of a relationship will be shown to be distributed and distinguished within the conceived time.

### 3.3.1.1 Lexical Verb

Verbal *bā* consists of a prototypical physical scene of “holding”: an agent holds a physical object that is highly affected in his/her hand. I present the simple spatio-temporal frame of *bā* in Figure 3.5.

![Figure 3.5: Spatio-temporal Frame of *bā*](image)

The movement of the hand is analogous to the trajector shown in the circle, the physical object illustrated as a square indicates the landmark. The scope of the base is that the hand of the agent is the most prominent participant, i.e., the trajector, which moves through the conceived time and reaches an endpoint, i.e., the landmark, which is the reified state of the object is grasped by the hand. However, depending on the discourse context, the
realization of affectedness on the impacted object could be shown either in the
orientational motion or the resultative state after being affected. In other words, the
interconnection between trajector and landmark construes another level of organizational
complexity: motion or state. Two major scenarios that verbal 把 bā invokes are the
notions of:

1. [MOVING], [CONTACTING], and [MOVING WHILE HOLDING];
2. [MOVING], [CONTACTING], and [HOLDING].

The former is exemplified in (2), repeated here as (10), and the latter is exemplified in
(11).

(10) 他倆把酒言歡。

他倆把酒言歡。

`tā liàng bā jiǔ yán huān`

he two hold wine converse happiness

‘They two raise their wine cup and converse cheerfully.’

‘They two converse cheerfully over a glass of wine.’

(constructed example)

(11) 士兵手把著槍，勇敢地向前衝鋒。

士兵手把著槍，勇敢地向前衝鋒。

`sì bīng shǒu bā zhe qiāng, yǒnggǎnde xiàng-qián chōngfēng`

soldier hand hold ASP gun bravely forwards charge

‘Holding their rifles in [their] hands, the soldiers charged forwards bravely.’

(Ding 2001: 107)

Figure 3.6 illustrates the spatio-temporal base of the 把 bā predicate, in which the
rightward arrow at the bottom represents the conceived time, and the upward arrow the
conceived space. The large squares represent different states, the small squares stand for
the states of the landmarks, and the circles represents the sequential states of the trajectors. The dashed line illustrates the orientation of the energy flow. The spatial-temporal sense of the sentence in (10) is represented in Figure 3.6 (a), while that of (11) is portrayed in Figure 3.6 (b).

In Figure 3.6 (a), the held wine is raised or moved upward; in Figure 3.6 (b), the rifle is held in the soldier’s hand as time unfolds.
The scene of the manipulative state is not confined to physical manipulation with the action of hand contact. It can be also conceptualized metaphorically, as “hitting on a woman,” which is used for a man’s action to hit on (in the colloquial or slang U.S. English sense), control, or manipulate a woman in a relationship in Mandarin Chinese spoken in Taiwan; only a male can be the agent of this action. In example (12), the domain of [MANIPULATION] in this metaphorical sense is profiled.

(12) 他把美国的女朋友啊！

\[
\text{tā bā méiguó de nǚ-péngyǒu ah}
\]

‘He is hitting on American girls!’

(colloquial spoken data in a variety show Happy Sunday)

The social manipulation denoted in the verbal 把 bā in (12) is similar to the imagery that U.S. slang phrase ‘hit on’ evokes. Both are metaphorical verbs that evoke hand imagery associated with volitional manipulation by the agent.

### 3.3.1.2 Compound Verb

The morpheme 把 bā often occurs as the first element of a verb compound. It denotes the sense of physical holding in (13a-c), the metaphorical seizing or cherishing people or opportunities in (13d-e), the metaphorical sense of hitting on, dating, courting and controlling a woman in (13f-g), and the more abstract extensive sense of guarding and carefully checking in (13h).

(13)  a. 把脉 bā-mài hold-vein ‘examine the pulse’

b. 把尿 bā-niào hold-pee ‘hold the baby while helping it urinate’
c. 把屎 bā-shī hold-poop ‘hold the baby while helping it deficate’

d. 把握機會 hold-seize-chance ‘seize the chance’

bā-wò jīhuì

e. 把持 bā-chí hold-keep ‘control, monopolize’

f. 把妹 bā-mèi hold-sister/girl ‘(slang) hit on a girl’

g. 把馬子 bā-mǎzi hold-horse-suffix ‘(slang) hitting on a chick’

h. 把風 bā-fēng hold-wind ‘guard a pass, check on something, make a careful evaluation of the qualities of goods’

The above verbal compounds are of two types: VN structure and VV structure. In (13a) for example, the morpheme 把 bā is the verbal element (V), the hand serving as the trajector, and mai ‘vein’ is the nominal element (N), the landmark, where the trajector lands. This defines the prototypical scenario where a Chinese doctor takes a patient’s pulse. Both (13b-c) are VV compounds, which show an action-result schema (Tai 1984, 2002b, 2002c, 2003). The action of [HOLDING] is explicit\(^1\) in (13b-c). The temporal profiles hence contain sequential states aimed at making the baby relieve: [HOLDING], and [MAKING IT RELIEVE].

Examples (13d) and (13e) exhibit a coordinate structure (Hsiao 2003), in which the morpheme 把 bā is partially synonymous with the second morpheme 握 -wò ‘seize, hold’ and 持–chí ‘hold’. In addition, the morpheme 把 bā can be compounded with 妹-mèi ‘girl’ and –馬子 mǎzi ‘horse-suffix: chick,’ both slang terms for a woman, in (13f) and

\(^1\) These actions are in practice accomplished by conventional implicitly-evoked sound expressed to help babies to relieve themselves. The care-giver produces an iconic sound of peeing [ssss] or pooping [ʔmʔm] with the goal of encouraging the baby to act.
(13g), to denote the same meanings shown in example (12). The metaphorical sense of [CONTROLLING IN A RELATIONSHIP] is analogous to the literal [PHYSICAL MANIPULATIVE HOLDING] denoted by the physical action verb 把 bā. The metaphorical extension in (12) and (13f) and (13g) reflect cultural experiences in a male-dominated society. The domain of a hand manipulating the affected object metaphorically parallels that of men controlling women in a patriarchal society. In (13h), the metaphorical sense of [CHECKING] or [GUARDING], further extends the metaphorical scope of predication of 把 bā.

3.3.2 Regional Profiles of 把 bā

The nominal predication of 把 bā profiles a region characterized as a “handle.” It is used as either the first or second element in nominal compounds in Mandarin Chinese. There are two kinds of structures in a nominal compounds: NN and VN. In addition, the morpheme 把 bā can also profile an instantiation of a noun type, namely, a classifier. The use of the classifier 把 bā presupposes the perceptual graspable qualities of the nouns.

3.3.2.1 Nominal Compound

There are several types of nominal compound that incorporate with 把 bā: NN_bā, V N_bā, and V_bā N. The morpheme 把 bā can profile either a region or a relation in the nominal compound. In the case that 把 bā profiles the region of a ‘handle’, 把 bā is the central meaning of a nominal phrase, and is second in the compound. The first element of the 把 bā as ‘handle’ compound be a noun, a verb, or a static verb. In (14a-b), the first element of the compound describes where the handle is located, or the instrument used to operate the handle. The composite structure of (14a) respectively profiles two regions: the first region
is the door, where the second region, the handle, is located. The interconnection between these two entities instantiates a specific type of door handle operated with the hand. The compound (14b) profiles a region of the prototypical value of ‘handle’. Example (14c) is an alternate expression of (14b); they are used interchangeably. See the diagrams in Figure 3.7, which illustrates prototypical examples of (14a) and (14b).

(14) \( \text{NN}_\text{bā} \) : where to function

a. 門把 \( \text{mén-bā} \)  door-handle  ‘door handle’

b. 手把 \( \text{shǒu-bā} \)  hand-handle  ‘handle (of a pot), a bike handlebar’

c. 把手 \( \text{bā-shǒu} \)  handle-hand  ‘handle (of a pot), a bike handlebar’

(14a) \( \text{Figure 3.7: Nominal Compound 門把 ménbā and 手把 shǒubā} \)

The handle in heavy lines in Figure 3.7 indicates the designated regions that are profiled, and shows the location of the handles.

When the first element of a 把 \( \text{bā} \) nominal compound is a verb, it describes the function of the object to which the handle is attached, such as 扒 \( \text{sāo} \) ‘to sweep (the floor)’ in (15a), 拖 \( \text{tuō} \) ‘to wipe (the floor)’ in (15b).

(15) \( \text{V N}_\text{bā} \) : Function

a. 扒把 \( \text{sāo-bā} \)  sweep-(graspable) stick  ‘broom’

b. 拖把 \( \text{tuō-bā} \)  wipe-(graspable) stick  ‘mop’
The composite structure of (15a) profiles the function 扫 sǎo ‘to sweep’, with a regional designation of 把 bā, a graspable stick, which is also the instrument to sweep. The same analysis applies in (15b). The first element specifies a function that the second element can perform.

The first element of the nominal compound can also be a static verb, which describes the shape of the handle as in (16a-b).

(16) V N_bā: Static verbal attribute

a. 平把 ping-bā flat-handle ‘a type of bicycle, that has a flat straight handle bar’

b. 彎把 wān-bā curve-handle ‘a type of bicycle that has a curved handle bar’

The concept of “part as whole” is invoked because 平把 ping-bā and 彎把 wān-bā literally mean different shapes of bicycle handlebars, but refer to different types of bicycles, as shown in Figure 3.8. The profile of the handle as an important part of a bicycle represents the entity of whole.

(17) V_bā N compound is shown in (17). The first element in (17a) has the same base as the lexical verb 把 bā, but the designated region is profiled in the second element 柄 bǐng ‘handle of something, to control, to handle’. The imagery of something being controlled or

Figure 3.8: 平把 ping-bā and 彎把 wān-bā

The V_bā N compound is shown in (17). The first element in (17a) has the same base as the lexical verb 把 bā, but the designated region is profiled in the second element 柄 bǐng ‘handle of something, to control, to handle’. The imagery of something being controlled or
possessed is extended metaphorically onto a piece of negative evidence that somebody may control or have. The physical object graspable within a hand is mapped onto information considered as evidence, which a person might manipulate in a metaphorical domain. In (17b), the literal combination of a drama held within a hand profiles the abstract sense of ‘magic trick, sleight-of-hand’.

(17) \( V_{bã} N: \) Content

a. 把柄  \( bã-bíng \)  hold-handle  ‘evidence (negative)’

b. 把戲  \( bã-xì \)  hold-drama  ‘magic trick’

Regional profiles of 把  \( bã \)  nominal composite structures include regional profiles and atemporal profiles. When the base of ‘handle’ or ‘graspable stick’ is profiled, then the other element designates the shape, the location or function of the base; we see this in (14), (15) and (16). When the base of ‘hold’ is profiled, the other nominal element profiles an entity that is usually mapped onto its metaphorical cognitive domain, shown in (17).

Regional profiles in nominal compounds in Mandarin Chinese postulate three underlying notions between two elements in a nominal compound: (1) where a function takes place; (2) what function takes place; (3) an extended or metaphoric sense.

3.3.2.2 Classifier

According to Taylor (2002: 343-53), the conceptual organization of a nominal phrase involves four components: specification, instantiation, quantification, and grounding. This layered conceptual structure is laid out in (18a) and exemplified in (18b-c) as follows.

(18) a. (Grounding (Quantification (Instantiation (Specification (Type))))))

b. (the (seven (0 (old (guitars)))))  -- English

c. (這 zhèi (七 qī (把 bã (老 lǎo (吉他 jítā)))) ) – Mandarin
Classifiers in Mandarin Chinese have the specific function of instantiating a noun-type. Classifiers in Chinese categorize noun types based on their perceptual qualities and on the functions that the nouns denote, such as shape, size, flexibility, graspsability (Tai and Wang 1990, Tai and Chao 1994, Tai 2002b). As shown in (18c), the property of a guitar presupposes that it can be held as an object; hence, the classifier morpheme 把 bā instantiates this particular noun type, which refers to graspable entities. In (19), I have categorized a set of examples where 把 bā functions as a classifier, arranged according to the following fundamental semantic properties: [GRASPABILITY] in (19a-f), [HANDFUL] in (19g-h), [PHYSICAL HAND ACTIVITY] in (19i), and [HAND TRACEABLE ACTIVITY] in (19j).

(19)  [GRASPABILITY]
   a. 一把雨傘 yī-bā-yǔsǎn one-CL-umbrella ‘an umbrella’
   b. 一把椅子 yī-bā-yǐzǐ one-CL-chair ‘a chair’
   c. 一把刀 yī-bā-dāo one-CL-knife ‘a knife’
   d. 一把鑰匙 yī-bā-yàshǐ one-CL-key ‘a key’
   e. 一把火 yī-bā-huǒ one-CL-fire ‘a torch’
   f. 一把花 yī-bā-huā one-CL-flower ‘a bunch/heap of flowers’

   [HANDFUL]
   g. 一把米 yī-bā-mǐ one-CL-rice ‘one handful of rice’
   h. 一把眼淚 yī-bā-yǎ-lèi one-CL-tears ‘crying hard’
[PHYSICAL HAND ACTIVITY]

i. 洗把脸  xiā-bǎ-liǎn  wash-CL-face  ‘wash face’

[HAND TRACEABLE ACTIVITY]

j. 加把劲  jiā-bā-jìn  add-CL-energy  ‘give a spurt/ cheer
(with hand gestures)’

The combined image of [GRASPABILITY] with [BUNDLE] / [HEAP] and [HANDFUL] is derived from the domain of the activity of the whole hand in holding or grasping physical objects. All of the nouns in the compounds in (19a-h) are manipulated through the grasp of a person’s hand.

Extended metaphorically from [HANDFUL], 把 bā also denotes [QUITE A LOT] (discussed in section 3.3), which involves the event of crying hard in (19h) yielding handfuls of tears. I refer to (19i) as [PHYSICAL HAND ACTIVITY] since the event of washing one’s face involves repetitive hand motion. As for (12j), the scenario of cheering for somebody is associated with an accompanied [HAND TRACEABLE ACTIVITY], i.e., when a raised fist moves in the act of cheering.

In general, the morpheme  bā is a classifier because it “individuates [the] referent, so that it can be counted” (Craig 1992: 281).

3.3.3 Relational Profiles of 把 bā

The morpheme 把 bā can also function as a modifier, a coverb, and a marker in profiles of atemporal relations. The designated relation of a modifier is rather simple; however, that of a grammaticalized verb, a coverb or a marker in the bā construction is more complex.
3.3.3.1 Modifier

Nominal phrases in Mandarin Chinese require a classifier in order to be countable; the notion of countability is applied to quantify an event in Mandarin Chinese. The most convenient way to quantify an event in Mandarin is to modify the verb with a quantifier adverbial (Tai 2002b: 6-8). Recall that 一把 yī-bā ‘one-CL’ takes on the extended meaning of ‘quite a few, quite a lot’, shown in the discussion of (19h) above. The conceptual structures of (20a) and (20b) are construed in a parallel fashion. To quantify an event of grabbing in (20c), 一把 yī-bā functions as an intensive quantifier adverbial of either a real physical grabbing activity or a metaphorical extension of doing someone a favor, helping them or lending them a hand. In addition to modifying an activity verb, 一把 yī-bā can also modify a stative verb, such as 酷 kù ‘cool’ or 帥 shuài ‘handsome.’ The expression “亂X一把的 luàn X yī-bā-de” in (20d) is very popular among Taiwanese youth.

(20) a. 個把月 gè-bā-yùe CL-CL-month ‘(lit.) a bundle of month; several months’

b. 有一把年紀 have-one-CL-age ‘(lit.) have much age;

yǒu yī-bā niánjì quite old, not young’

c. 拉他一把 pull-him-one-CL ‘(lit.) pull him with one grab; help

lā tā yī-bā him, give/lend him a hand!’

d. 亂酷一把的 messy-cool-one-CL-DE ‘(lit.) chaotic cool, messy cool;

luàn kù yī-bā de very/ crazy/ ghettofabulous cool’
e. 一把抓  yī-bā-zhuā  one-CL-grasp ‘be able to juggle things and master at doing it; to grasp all the power or authority (of an organization)’

The intensity denoted in 一把 yī-bā in (20d) not only portrays the speaker’s enthusiastic evaluation, but also expresses the highly modified degree of the stative verb. In (21e), the image of metaphorically grasping everything with one hand describes a jack of all trades, good at a lot of skills or a power-grabber.

3.3.3.2 The Status of 把 bā in the bā Construction

During the Tang dynasty (7th century A.D.-9th century A.D.), an innovative construction with 把 bā arose: X bā Y Z (Li and Thompson 1981). As seen below, different authors have used different names for this construction, which I will refer to as the bā-c. In this section, I introduce some prior analyses of the bā-c, review its semantic nature, sum up the prevalent interpretations of the bā-c, and compare these notions to the schema evoked in the morpheme 把 bā in the bā-c.

Various labels that have been applied to what I call the bā-c include: 处置式 chúzhì shì “disposal construction” (Li Wang 1947); “ergative construction” (Frei 1956 in M. Wang); “pretransitive construction” (Chao 1968), “executive construction” (Hashimoto 1971); “accusative construction” (Teng 1975); “ba construction” (Li and Thompson 1981, M. Wang 1987); “topic-comment” construction (Tsao 1987); “causative construction” (Chappell 1991, Wu 1996, Sybesma 1999); “serial verb construction” (Jelina Li 1997), and “BA resultative construction” (Ding 1992, 2001, Dai 2002). Several of these labels are based on syntactic analysis of the construction, which requires the assignment of a lexical
category to 把 bǎ. In some cases, bǎ has been assigned a lexical category according to the translation of its function into English. However, I maintain that it is never justifiable to assign a lexical category according to translation procedures. In this case, the particular issue involves the linguistically-mediated cognitive differences between the way that English native speakers and Chinese native speakers view the world. The translation methods result in a misguided analysis.

Most of the prior analyses of the bǎ-c have focused more on syntax than on semantics. Here I will take a close look at previous discussions of lexical assignments for the morpheme 把 bǎ in the bǎ-c with regard to both syntax and semantics. I re-examine the conceptualisations of bǎ used to determine the categorial membership of bǎ in the bǎ-c. In (21) below, I have summarized previous claims about the status of bǎ in the bǎ-c.

(21) prior claims of the status of bǎ

d. bǎ as a marker:
   2. a transitive marker: Sun (1995)
   3. an object marker: Zubin and Li (1986)
   4. a patient marker: Frances Li (1971)
   5. a topic marker: Tsao (1987), Chen (1983)
e.  *bā* in syntactic constructions

a.  a dummy Case assigner: Huang (1982), Goodall (1987) in Audrey Li (2001: 8)

b.  a dummy inserted filler: Sybesma (1999)

c.  head of a base-generated functional category: Zou (1995 in A. Li 2001)

d.  a based-generated assigner: Audrey Li (1990)

In my opinion, all of the claims about the status of the morpheme *bā* in the *bā*-c in (21) fail to account for its semantic nature. I claim that it is the semantic nature of *bā* that determines the function of the *bā* construction in discourse context. A complete analysis of the *bā*-c requires taking both a formal syntactic approach and a functional cognition-based approach.

In the following subsection 3.3.3.2.1, I will discuss prior assessments of the semantics of the *bā*-c, including discussion of the implication of the labels applied for the analysis of the *bā*-c. In order to be clear, I will henceforward use bold lower case and italicized *bā* to refer to the morpheme *bā* in the *bā*-c.

**3.3.3.2.1 The Semantic Nature of the *bā*-c**

In the following descriptions of labeling and prior analyses of the *bā*-c I will emphasize in bold the various labels and definitions used to provide an overall view of how linguists have defined and labeled what I call here the *bā*-c.

L. Wang labels the *bā*-c as 處置式 *chǔzhìshì* `disposal construction’, a form that states “how a person is handled, manipulated, or dealt with; how something is disposed of; or how an affair is conducted” (Wang 1947 in Li 1974: 200-1).
Chao describes the *bā*-c as a special form of the verbal-expressions-in-series (V-V series) (1968: 342). He identifies *bā* as a first verb, the pretransitive, in the construction.

Hashimoto posits out that *bā* is an executive verb in the *bā*-c, and considers this executive construction as “an embedding structure with ba as the matrix verb which takes an object NP and a complement sentence” (1971: 66-7). Generally speaking, Hashimoto adopts a syntactic analysis, and hence did not specifically define the semantic nature of an executive construction. However, the name suggests that the *bā*-c has something to do with the execution of an action. She also points out that some instances of *bā* in the *bā*-c seem to carry a causative meaning (1971: 72). This interpretation is somewhat parallel to Li Wang’s (1947) definition of the *bā*-c as a “disposal construction.” Rather than emphasizing the meaning of “disposal,” Huan Wang interprets the *bā*-c via Song’s (1981, cited in M. Q. Wang’s [1987: 22]) definition, as follows:

> the action expressed by the verb of the sentence has some positive influence on the object introduced by *ba* so that the object often undergoes a certain change, has a certain result or is in a certain state. Therefore, disposal represents a relation between the verb and the object; it does not necessarily represent a purposeful action of the person or thing expressed by the subject.

(Wang 1984 quoted in M. Q. Wang 1987: 22; emphasis is mine)

H. Wang’s preference for Song’s definition over that of L.Wang resides in the use of “often” in Song’s definition, which opens the interpretation to the possibility that the object in the *bā*-c might not undergo any change.

Li and Thompson describe the surface form of the *bā*-c as *X bā Y Z*, which produces the meaning “X disposes of Y in the state described by Z” (1981). The meaning expresses and foreshadows WHAT X did to Y, where the *bā* NP is instantiated.
Chappell identifies two kinds of bā-c causatives: intransitive and transitive (1991). She further shows that both types of the bā-c are “conceptually causatives” (1991: 568). Moreover, she agrees with Frei (1956 in Chappell 1991) that the bā NP is the affected entity that is “subjected to a change” (1991: 569). This characterization is similar to that of Sybesma, who concludes that all bā-c are causatives: “the subject brings about (“causes”) a new state of affairs characterizable as the result of the event denoted by the verb” (1999: 180).

J. Li also considers bā as a verb, with two theta-roles for NPs. The external theta-role is assigned to the subject and the internal one to the bā NP (1997: 199). She also adopts the concept of disposal, and further posits that the bā-c indicates “the result state of the object being handled or dealt with” (1997: 193). She also identifies the post-bā as a passive verb, which does not assign an external theta-role.

Ding proposes that the morpheme bā in the bā-c is a grammaticalized verb, which means “to bring out a resultative state” (2001: 102), and which marks a resultative construction. Building upon the notion of “resultative,” Ding construes the bā-c as the bā Resultative Construction as follows:

A bā sentence belongs to the Bā Resultative Construction if, and only if, the object of ba holds a proper semantic relationship with the successive clause that denotes a resultative state. The semantic relation between the object of ba and the clausal complement can be PATIENT-and-resultant or EXPERIENCER-and-stative.

(Ding 2001: 105; emphasis is mine)

Ding understands bā to take a central role in the bā periphrastic Resultative Construction, in that the omission of bā in this construction yields an entirely different meaning for the sentence (2001: 116-121). Also, if we see bā as a preposition, the deletion of a
prepositional phrase \((bā + \text{NP})\) in a sentence should not cause any major semantic differences. Compare examples (22) and (23).

(22) a. 叫你把他忘了

\[
jià nǐ bā tā wàng le
\]

ask you BA him forget ASP

‘I told you to forget about him!’

(the event of forgetting him)

(colloquial spoken data 2003)

b. 叫你他忘了 (omission of \(bā\))

\[
jià nǐ tā wàng le
\]

ask you him forget ASP

c. 叫你忘了 (omission of \(bā\) and its object)

\[
jià nǐ wàng le
\]

ask you forget ASP

‘(I) Told you to forget!’ (about one specific thing or person)

((22b-c) are constructed modified examples)

(23) a. 你要把她餓死啊！

\[
nǐ yào bā tā è sī a
\]

you want BA her hungery die PRT

‘You want her to starve to death!’ (emphasis on the event of making her starve)

(Quartet 2003)
b. 你要她餓死啊!  

(nǐ yào tā è sǐ a)  

you want her hungry die PRT  

‘You want her to starve to death!’

(emphasis on the desire of the interlocutor)

Examples (22) and (23) show that  

(b) serves a crucial and indispensable role in determining the resultative elements registered in the clause. If we omit the element  

(b), (22b) becomes an incomplete utterance. If we see  

(b) NP as a prepositional phrase and remove it in (22c), the result is grammatical, but the object must be either a specific person or a thing, while the object in (22a) is the event of forgetting. In (23a), the emphasis is on the result of the event referred. Without  

(b) in (23b), the emphasis shifts onto the speaker’s desire. The omission of  

(b) and its object alters the original meaning of the sentence.

I draw the following conclusions from the segments I highlighted in bold above: the semantic nature of the  

(b-c) invokes the sense of disposal, execution, transitive, change of state, resultative, affectedness, conceptual causative, experiencer, influences, and patient. The underlying semantic prime commonalities denoted above can be summed up as [EXECUTION] or [CAUSATIVITY], [TRANSITIVE], [ACCEPTEDNESS],
[CHANGE OF STATE] and [RESULTATIVE]. These semantic primes seem to correspond to three stages of energy transmitted in the verbal BA: [MOTION], [CONTACT] and [MOTION] or [STATE].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th>Stage 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>motion</td>
<td>contact</td>
<td>motion/state</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[EXECUTION] or [TRANSITIVE]</th>
<th>[AFFECTED]</th>
<th>[CHANGE OF STATE]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[CAUSATIVITY]</td>
<td>[INFLUENCE]</td>
<td>[RESULTATIVE]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[DISPOSAL]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3.9: Comparison of the Schematization of ɓa**

### 3.3.3.2.2 Bɑ as a Co-verb in the ɓɑ-c

Many linguists claim that ɓɑ in the ɓɑ-c is a co-verb (Chao 1968, Chang 1977, Li and Thompson 1974 and 1981, Ross 1991, Gao 2001). However, only a few of them discuss the grammatical category of co-verbs with respect to the morpheme ɓɑ in the ɓɑ-c. I will cite Li and Thompson (1974), Chang (1977) and Ross (1991) to clarify the controversy about the status of ɓɑ in the ɓɑ-c.

The term “co-verb” was first used in Hockett *et al.* in 1945. There, it was defined as follows:

Co-verbs serve to mark nominal referents in a sentence, either (1) connecting the following nominal referent to a preceding one, or (2) indicating the relation of the following nominal referent to all the rest of the sentence.

(Hocket 1945 in Li and Thompson: 258)
This definition suggests that a co-verb can be either a verb or a preposition. Chao never addresses the question of whether co-verbs are verbs or preposition but takes a more ambiguous stand (1968). He first categorizes bā as a co-verb, but then goes on to treat bā as a pretransitive in serial verbal expressions. He did not specifically define co-verbs but simply addressed the syntactic position of co-verbs in the Mandarin serial verb construction as follow:

Verbs differ in the frequency with which they function as first verb in a V-V series …. A listable number of verbs occur as first verbs with at least the same order of frequency as in other positions and are thus called co-verbs or prepositions.  
(Chao 1968: 335)

J. Thompson makes a strong statement that a co-verb in Mandarin is, “of course, simply a Chinese transitive verb that happens to be translated by an English preposition” (1971: 15). Nevertheless, he provides no evidence, which weakens his claim. In any event, his point about the role of translation in the interpretation of this structure is well taken.

According to Li and Thompson, co-verbs are “semantically like prepositions,” but many of them are “homophonous with verbs” (1974: 257). The syntactic position of co-verbs is postulated as “subject _______ NP  V  (NP).” In my opinion, this definition is also tainted by translation from English. The use of the phrase, “semantically like prepositions” takes the perspective of English speakers using quasi-equivalent and conceptually inadequate translation as their criteria for interpretation. The claim that many co-verbs are “homophonous with verbs” implies that they are in fact not verbs, but have homophonous true verb counterparts. With particular reference to bā, they claim, “it is quite easy to find co-verbs which are never verbs in modern Mandarin, such as the object marker ba” (1974: 258). However, they provide no empirical evidence for this claim with
respect to the morpheme ɓā in the ɓā-c. They simply state that co-verbs are prepositions with other co-verbs, and list ɓā as one member of the co-verb class.

Both Chang (1977) and Ross (1991) also claim that ɓā is a co-verb. Chang argues that ɓā “has progressed farthest and almost completed the transition” from verb to preposition based on its verbal properties (1977: 90). Chang identified the verbal properties of ɓā based on the following tests of verbhood: (i) if it participates in the V-ɓù-V (V-not-V) construction, (ii) if it takes an aspect-marker, and (iii) whether it can serve as the predicate. I dispute the appropriateness and validity of these tests, because they are designed to test a full lexical verb, not a co-verb. Ross comments on the inappropriateness of using the standard distributional test to determine the classification of either co-verbs or verbs (1991: 81–93). Ross further disputes Li’s (1990) claim that ɓā is a preposition (1991: 91). Li concludes that ɓā is not a verb but a preposition is because ɓā is not a proper governor and is unable to assign the theta role. Ross acknowledges that “theta assignment is in fact relevant in identifying the categorical status of at least a subset of co-verbs” (1991: 93), and she further demonstrates that the determinant factor to distinguish the overlap between co-verbs and verbs in Mandarin is the presence of a subject (1991: 107-8). She demonstrates this using examples of the ɓā-c that shows that ɓā has a subject in the ɓā-c, and hence is a verb (ibid: 93-100).

I take the position that ɓā in ɓā-c is in fact a verb, based on Ross’ analysis (1991) and Ding’s claim (2001): I present the schematization of the morpheme ɓā in Figure 3.9 above evidence to support this position. What Ross (1991) has concluded provides the syntactic evidence to support the categorial status of ɓā in the ɓā-c, and Ding (2001) offers a semantic, typological and pragmatic approach to the ɓā-c, stating that the semantic
meaning of \textit{bā} has been bleached from “to take, to hold” to “to bring out a resultative state.” Figure 3.9 demonstrates the parallel schematization between verbal \textit{bā} and the morpheme \textit{bā} in \textit{bā-}c. It shows that the energy of the morpheme \textit{bā} is carried out not only through the NP, but also via the clausal complement of the \textit{bā-}c, which completes the transmission of energy of verbal \textit{bā}.

\subsection*{3.3.3.2.3 Conceptual Construal of \textit{bā} in the \textit{bā-}c}

Cognitive domains postulate meanings in accordance with grammatical constructs built upon “the archetypal status of the billiard-ball model” (Langacker 1991: 283). According to Langacker, this model comprises four elements: space, time, material, and substance. Each element interacts and participates with every another. The prototypes for verbs and nouns are defined on the basis of energetic interactions with physical objects. Langacker proposes the \textit{billiard-ball model} to characterize a finite clause, in which the content verb depicts an energetic interaction. He further uses the notions of \textit{canonical event model}, \textit{stage model}, and \textit{action chain model} to describe how the transfer of energy is accomplished. I will first elaborate on the aforementioned notions, which I introduced in Chapter 1, section 1.4.2. Secondly, I will relate Ross’ and Ding’s analyses of the \textit{bā-}c to the canonical event model. I will then show a parallel schematic characterization between the conceptual import of the lexical verb \textit{bā} and that of the verbal \textit{bā} in the \textit{bā-}c.

Langacker refers to semantic role conceptions as \textit{role archetypes} because of their primal status, and their non-linguistic origin (1991: 304). He considers that these conceptualizations are basic and experientially ubiquitous, and that their construal of linguistic expressions is flexible and various. He compares role of archetypes to “the highest peaks in a mountain range” in contrast to/rather than “a row of statues in an art
museum” (1991: 285). To support my analysis, I will introduce his notions of the archetypal agent, patient, instrument, and experiencer: bold emphasis in the following quotations from Langacker represent my emphasis (not in original). Langacker defines the archetypal agent as a person “who volitionally initiates physical activity resulting, through physical contact, in the transfer of energy to an external objects” (1991: 285). The archetypal patient is an inanimate object that “absorbs the energy transmitted via externally initiated physical contact and thereby undergoes an internal change of state” (285). Langacker defines an instrument as a physical object that has been “manipulated by an agent to affect its patient,” and it considers it as “an intermediary in the transmission of energy” (ibid). An experiencer is a person who is engaged in mental activity.

The canonical event model (shown in Figure 3.10) contains the ideas derived from the stage model and the action chain (Langacker 1991). The stage model can be compared to watching a play, where the focus an observer has upon his/her surroundings is analogous to the attention a theater-goer directs to the stage. Actors can utilize props on the fixed stage, as viewers organize the scene into a setting “populated by interacting participants” (1991: 286). The sequential interactions among the participants are regarded as constituting events. The stage model provides a way to talk about our “moment-to-moment experience.” The action chain is a useful construct for demonstrating the relationships among elements in a clause structure. An action chain describes what happens when one object makes physical contact with another as resulting in a transfer of energy. The source of this transmission of energy, the initial object, is referred to as its head; the goal, or final object, is its tail. Combining these two models, a canonical event
model picks up the concept from the stage model that an event takes place within a setting and a viewer observes it from afar. Moreover, it adopts the concept of energy transmission from the action chain. The head in an action chain model refers to the agent in role archetypes, while the tail is the patient. The canonical event model hence represents “the normal observation of a prototypical action” (1991: 286).

![Diagram of Canonical Event Model](Langacker 1991: 285)

Others have applied the concepts of energy and causation to the bā-c. Henri Frei was the first to apply a notion similar to that of energy transmission to the bā-c (1956). He claimed that “there is no opposition, in this structure, between a subject class and object class, but between an energetic and an inertial class” (Frei 1956: 46 cited in M. Wang 1987: 9). Chappell points out that the notion of causativity she employs in her analysis of the bā-c applies to “the cognitive-conceptual level within the act of communication” (1991: 569). To take Ross’ (1991) example in (24), Ross states that 跑走 pǎo-zǒu ‘run away’ is an intransitive verb, and hence as such assigns one theta-role, to the subject 一個賊 yī-ge zéi ‘a thief’. As an intransitive verb, it cannot assign a theta role to 你 nǐ
‘you.’ According to her analysis, the role of 你  nǐ ‘you’ serves as the source of the events that causes and contributes to the result of the thief’s running away. In other words, this role needs to be assigned by some verb other than 跑走 pāo-zǒu ‘run away.’ The only candidate for this role is 把 bā, which makes 你  nǐ ‘you’ become the subject of bā. Since bā has a subject, it must be a verb. In terms of cognitive grammar, I interpret the source of the event, 你  nǐ ‘you’ to be the source of the energy transmission, the archetypal agent.

The archetypal patient could be interpreted as the speaker, since this utterance assigns the blame or responsibility for the action the archetypal agent has done.

(24)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
S \\
\downarrow \\
NP1 & VP1 \\
\downarrow \\
V & NP2 & S \\
\downarrow \\
你 & 把 & 一個賊 & 跑走了 \\
nǐ & BA & yīge zéi & pāozǒu le \\
you & BA & one-CL-thief & run-away ASP \\
\end{array}
\]

‘You allowed a thief to run away!’ (based on Ross 1991: 95)

‘You caused this event to happen. This event is that a thief ran away.’

Within the canonical event model in Figure 3.10, the viewer in (24) is the speaker, the agent, according to the speaker, is 你  nǐ ‘you’, that is, the interlocutor. The patient could be an authority, or an institution to which the speaker belongs that is affected by the thief’s escape. The speaker blames the agent for the occurrence of the event, i.e., that the thief ran
away. This example of the bā construction incorporates two “semantically predicative elements” (Mohanan 1997 cited in Bender 2000: 112): (1) you did it; (2) a thief ran away. Hence, the sentence can also be translated as ‘you allowed a thief to run away’. From the speaker’s viewpoint, the interlocutor causes an event to take place which brings out the result of a thief’s running away. In other words, from the perspective of the speaker, the head of the energy is the interlocutor, and the affected patient is authority to which the speaker belongs, which is the tail of the energy. The energy transfer results from the actions on the part of agent. The transmitted energy remains with the result denoted in the clause. This analysis corroborates Ding’s (2001) conclusion: bā means “to bring out a result.”

The set of examples in (25) illustrates bā as a physical action verb in (2a), repeated here as (25a), a metaphorical transitive verb in (12), repeated here as (25b), and a verb that carries out the abstract conception of transitivity in its clause in (25c).

(25) a. 明月幾時有，把酒問青天。 (physical action verb)

míng yuè jǐ-shí yǒu bā jiǔ wèn qīng tiān
bright moon when have hold wine ask blue sky

‘When will there be a bright moon? I hold the wine up and ask the Heaven.’

(SU Shi, extracted lyrics, 1076 A.D.)

b. 他把美國的女朋友啊！ (metaphorical verb)

tā bā měiguó de nǚ-péng-yǒu ah
he hit on America POSS girl-friend PRT

‘He is hitting on American girls!’

(colloquial spoken data in a variety show Happy Sunday)
c. 他把這件事搞砸了。

(abstract)

$tā \ bā \ zhè \ jiàn \ shì \ gāo \ zá \ le$

he  BA  this   CL  matter  do  ruin   ASP

‘He messed the thing up.  He got this thing ruined.’

‘He had a hand in messing this up./ He had a hand in this mess.’

(colloquial spoken data 2003)

In (25a), the prototypical value pertains to the physical process of holding an object invoked by $bā$. The agent is the speaker, and the patient is $jīu$ ‘cup of wine.’ The transitivity relation is carried out from the agent to the patient in the first verbal expression $bā jīu$ ‘hold the wine up.’ It accompanied by another scene coded in the second verbal expression $wèn qīngtiān$ ‘ask the sky.’ The prototypical value of physical holding $bā$ shifts from a concrete domain to an abstract domain in (25b): to have an impact on a woman or girl in a relationship, i.e., hitting on (slang), trying to date and be in control of a woman. The agent is the man, and the patient is the American girl. The transmitted energy portrayed is not that of from a concrete physical scene, but involves extension to a more abstract sense of manipulating or having influence on a woman, metaphorically derived from the physical act of holding. In (25c), two semantic predicates are conjoined by $bā$: (1) he did it; (2) the result is a mess. The first clause portrays energy transmission that involves two Construers, the agent and the patient, possibly the speaker. The second clause corresponds to the archetypal conception of a resultative situation, in which “an entity manifests an inherent property or finds itself a certain location” (Langacker 1991: 303). The pivotal verb $bā$ incorporates these two clauses by conveying the transitivity

---

$^2$ Professor Jill Brody offers this translation, which metaphorically incorporates the action of hand in creating a problem.
relation from the agent 他 tā ‘he’ to the clausal object that describes a static situation. The locus of the real action is coded in the resultative verbal compound 搞砸 gǎo zá ‘do-ruin.’ The organization of this finite transitive clause reflects the canonical event model by adjoining two events into one. In other words, this model supports a more complex grammatical construct which concurrently profiles an agent – patient – result relation: 

((he))===>((Construer 2))===>((a mess)). This configuration involves the assignment of responsibility or blame from the perspective of the speaker, who construes the agent, i.e., Construer 1, as the one to blame, and her/himself, i.e., Construer 2, as the victim who has to suffer the consequence of the mess created by the agent.

Examples (25a), (25b), and (25c) demonstrate how the meaning of bdd is semantically bleached from that of a physical action verb, to a metaphorical verb, to a pivotal verb that brings out a result. These three different uses of bdd share a common schematic characterization: an effect—impact relation. This relation construes the basic sense of bdd, as it functions in one of the most frequently-used bdd constructions in Mandarin Chinese: the bdd-c. Ding (2001) calls bdd a grammaticalized verb, and sums up the development of its abstract meanings from “to hold” as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>hold a concrete object</th>
<th>manipulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hold any object</td>
<td>resultative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3.11: Development of Abstract Meanings from “to hold”**
(adapted from Ding 2001: 113)

In my analysis, I focus on the motion schema and energy transmission process in the semantic content of bdd, and elaborate on the nature of the transitivity relation bdd carries. I have summarized the semantic development of bdd in relation to examples (25a) to (25c) in Figure 3.12.
This figure displays the conceptualizations of *bā* shifting from a concrete domain to an abstract domain. Throughout, the degree of affectedness is realized through the interaction of a physical object, an animate role, and a clausal object. In other words, affected entities can be in the form of an inanimate object, an animate object, or a clausal object. I propose that the schema of motion-contact-motion/state is evoked in the conceptualizations of *bā* motivates the resultative meaning of *bā* in the *bā*-c, which contributes to its polysemy: all related to *result* by extension.

Conceptualization of *bā* in the *bā*-c profiles a [RESULT] relation that shares the same base as verbal *bā*. Semantic characterization of *bā* establishes and projects onto syntactic constructions that interconnect the agent, the patient and the action. According to Ullman (Cognitive Linguistic list 2003), polysemy is “the only pivot of semantic analysis.” Based on Ullman’s definition, I understand the polysemic *bā* to be the only pivot for semantic interpretations of the *bā*-c. I further understand *bā* to be a pivotal verb, and I will henceforward refer to it as such. The conceptual structure of *bā* functions like a pivot in the *bā* construction, a structure in which the pre-conditioned (Gao 2001, Dai 2002) schematic energetic motion of *bā* is connected with “to do/bring out, to cause,” and its static state is presented as a result.
3.4 Meaning Extension as a Motivated Phenomenon

The central claim of Tyler and Evans’ principled polysemy is meaning extension as a motivated phenomenon (Tyler and Evans 2003, Evans and Tyler 2004). According to Evans and Tyler’s analysis of the English lexeme in, “lexical structure and organization is in fact highly organized, achieving a particularly clear indication of a motivated system in the process of the meaning extension… [that] results from the complex interaction of spatio-physical experience and language use ” (2004: 157, 158). I base my analysis of the morpheme bā on Evans and Tyler’s premises, and argue that the same kind of meaning extension they find for spatial prepositions in English also are found in the Mandarin Chinese morpheme bā, where they are similarly grounded in experiential-physical perceptual experience.

The morpheme bā is comprised of a set of schema that all derive from one central sense: ‘to take, to hold’. I ascribe two major kinds of factors as determinant of the meaning extensions of bā: (1) human experience-determined factors, discussed in section 3.4.1 below, and (2) polysemy-attributed factors, discussed below in section 3.4.2. Discussion in 3.4.3 addresses issues of iconicity and motivation in relation to bā in Mandarin Chinese. In section 3.3.4, I construct a lexical network of bā, which provides further evidence for its meaning extension as a motivated phenomenon.

3.4.1 Language Change and Human Experience

Linguistic phenomena reflect inherent aspects of human experience both synchronically and diachronically. The emergence of the physical action verb ‘to take, to hold’ represents an aspect of human experience, and its expression fulfills a basic communicative need. A speaker describes some object s/he catches, hunts, grasps, or holds in the context of daily
activities during normal social linguistic interaction with others. Further refinement of the basic concept involves relating what speakers do with the thing they hold in their hands and how they do it. The resultative meaning produced from ‘to take, to hold’ “is due to the capacity of humans to take objects in their hands and controlling them at will” (Ding 2001: 114) in connection with the defining human need for communication. I discuss the diachronic semantic change of “to take, to hold” using cross-linguistic examples in 3.4.1.1, and I provide a related example in 3.4.1.2. In these three sections I demonstrate that the process of semantic change from concrete to abstract domains is based in human experience.

3.4.1.1 Cross Linguistic Evidence of “to take, to hold”

The semantic nature of the human physical action involved in the verb “to hold” contributes to its various abstract cognition-oriented interpretations. This association is not idiosyncratic, nor is it particular to Chinese; rather, it can be observed cross-linguistically for human experience-related physical action verbs, as shown in Figure 3.11 above. Shared semantic elements of the lexical item “to hold” not only constitute an argument for “metaphorically structured cognitive and linguistic understanding,” but also “throw some light on interaction between semantics/ pragmatics and syntactic structure” (Sweetser 1984: 12). That is, if we describe the event of holding an object as an activity, it is reasonable to narrate or ask about what happens to this object later as a result of the action of its being held. Consider the pragmatics of a question – answer adjacency sequence, where the question contains the bā construction that typically takes the form in (29).

(29) “X bā Y zěnme le” ‘what did X do to Y?’
The speaker requests new information that describes what happens to Y, i.e., the result of the event. The cognitive semantic analysis of the physical action verb “to hold” and the perceptive verb, “to see” can uncover some murky areas of semantic constructs and semantic change related to human experience. I discuss the case of the verb “to see” in the following section.

Lord (1982) has examined the physical action verb de “to take, to hold” in Akan. According to her analysis, the meaning and function of de shifts from a lexical verb to an instrumental (16a) or case-marker in (26b) through a process of grammaticalization, where de changes from a verb to a preposition.

(26) a. o-de eñkrante tya duabasa. (marking instrumental)
    he-de sword cut branch
    ‘He cut off a branch with a sword.’

b. o-de mfoníni bi kyèré né bá. (marking patient)
    he-de picture certain show his child
    ‘He shows his child a picture.’

(Lord 1982: 281)

Lord points out that the “former verb meaning of de and the action-result meaning of serial verb constructions still determine what can be marked by de … the range of possible objects for de would be describable syntactically rather than semantically” (1982: 285; bold emphasis is not in the original). My emphasis in bold in the preceding quotation highlights the iconic features involved in the conceptual cognition represented in the syntactic behavior of Akan de “to take, to hold.” Lord implies that an iconic semantic
characterization lies beneath the syntactic behavior of Akan *de*, although her analysis is primarily oriented toward syntax.

Resultative readings derived from the semantic content of “to hold, to have” can also be found in Latin and Old German.

(27) (Latin)

Navem para-t-am habeo/ teneo
ship-acc.sg.f prepare-pass.part.acc.sg.f have/ hold (first person singular)

‘I have/ hold a ship prepared.’

(28) (Old German)

Wir habêm/ eigum managiu guot gi-saz-tiu
we have/ hold a lot-acc.n. of wealth put-pass.part.acc.n.

‘We have accumulated a lot of wealth.’

(from Ding 2001: 113)

Maslov (1988 cited in Ding 2001) describes the formation of perfect constructions in Indo-European languages as being “actional perfect” (Ding 2001), a description that involves a resultative sense.

3.4.1.2 The Verb “to see”

Sweetser uses the idea of “metaphorical structuring of one domain (e.g., the epistemic domain) in terms of another (e.g., the sociophysical domain)” (1984: 12) to demonstrate the semantic extension of the verb “to see” in English to the extended meaning of “to understand.” The semantic content of the physical-world lexical verb “to see” links “physical vision” to an abstract “mental vision,” which permits the shift from a physical/ biological base to a mental/psychological abstraction: “to understand” (Sweetser
The metaphorical connection between sight and knowledge resonates with the meaning extension of the verb from the visual to the intellectual domain.

Sweetser analyzes the structure of metaphors of perception in English into three levels: (1) objective + intellectual; (2) interpersonal + communication; (3) subjective + emotional. Only the first of Sweetser’s levels appears in Figure 3.13 below.

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 3.13: The Structure of our Metaphors of Perception**
(from Sweetser 1984: 39)

The process of semantic change in perception verbs in English and in physical action verbs in several languages displays meaning extension based in human experience. This natural process contributes to meaning extension and further motivates the phenomenon of polysemy structure, which I will discuss in section 3.4.2.

### 3.4.2 Polysemy

particular lexeme, which shares some semantic core across the multiple meanings that
demonstrates “semantic flexibility” (Taylor 2001: 98). Polysemy arises within the
established connection “between different cognitive models and between elements of the
same model” (Lakoff 1987: 13), specifically when the associated semantic elements
become entrenched as units (Langacker 2000).

In conceptualizations of 把 bā in Mandarin Chinese, for example, polysemous senses
can be evoked from different spheres of schematic construal characterized in the
morpheme 把 bā. The grapheme 把 bā is constructed upon a fundamental semantic
element invoked in the central meaning of ‘to take, to hold’, i.e., a hand radical as the left
part of the character. The hand is depicted as an instrument that enables a person to
perform the act of grasping, taking, holding, possessing, and manipulating. The pre-
conditioned act of 把 bā produces the meaning ‘to take’ from the concrete domain of
manipulation to the abstract domain, ‘to cause.’ The central sense of 把 bā ‘to hold’
evokes different spheres with respect to the act of holding: possession, control,
manipulation, authority, impact, and affectedness. The consequence or result of the act of
holding is a resultative state that describes the affected state of a physical object.

To employ the above-mentioned aspects of holding in a social domain, the derived
meanings of the 把 bā element in a verbal compound extends to mean ‘to hit on’, ‘to
guard’, and ‘to closely examine’ (See example (13) above). Agency is both conveyed and
characterized in the 把 bā element in the bā construction. Cooking instructional discourse
includes abundant imperative uses of bā construction because the nature of instructional
discourse invites and commands the audience to do as the speaker says. It is the aspect of
authority that incorporates assigning responsibility or blame when the speaker reports a subjective construal event, as I discussed above with respect to example (25c).

When 把 bā is used as a classifier or as one element of modifier, the senses of ‘a handful’, ‘quite a lot’ are profiled in relation to the perceptual shape of the measured objects, the degree, and the quantity of the modified expressions. Both senses are invoked on the basis of a conceptual structure of what and how much a hand can hold.

The semantic flexibility that the morpheme 把 bā displays extends from the central sense ‘to take, to hold’ to the senses of “to cause,” “to bring out a result,” “to control,” “to manipulate,” “to possess,” “to have impact,” “to be affected,” “to hit on,” “to guard,” “to examine in details,” “a handful,” and “quite a lot.” In addition to these polysemous senses, 把 bā also exhibits its semantic value in the high-frequency Mandarin Chinese bā construction on a pragmatic level. This usage lends support to the value of polysemy studies in relation to meaning extension as a motivated phenomenon.

3.4.3 Iconicity and Motivation

According to Haiman, polysemy is both iconic as well as economic because “recurrent similarity of form must reflect similarly in meaning” (italics in original) (1985a: 26). Croft defines iconicity as the way in which “the structure of language reflects in some way the structure of experience, [i.e.,] the structure of the world” (1990: 164). Iconicity between linguistic structure and experiential domain can be understood as involving two aspects, which Haiman calls “isomorphism” and “motivation” (1985). Croft refers to what Haiman calls “motivation” as “iconic motivation.” I adopt Croft’s usage, to focus on discussion of “iconic motivation” in terms of CG.
To the extent that the structure of *bā* in the *bā-*c reflects conceptual structure, it constitutes an example of what Croft calls “iconic motivation.” The morpheme *bā* introduces an NP that serves as background or given information in discourse. This process is shown in example (29). Speaker A is the elder sister of Speaker B, and A is asking about her (A’s) children. I use the mark “A > B” to indicate their hierarchic status, which is based on relative age.

(29)

A: 孩子呢?

\[háizi ne?\] (QUESTION)

\textbf{kids} PRT (question)

‘What (and how) about the kids?’

B: 這個時間差不多快到家了。你放心，

\textit{zhège shíjiān chàbùduō kuài dào jiā le, nǐ fāngxīn.}

this-CL time almost soon arrive home ASP. you put-heart

‘They will arrive home soon at this time. Don’t worry.’

你在醫院的這段時間噢，

\textit{Nǐ zài yīyuàn de zhè duàn shíjiān ò,}

you extential hospital DE this-CL time PRT,

‘During your stay in the hospital,’

我會把他們都照顧得好好的。

\textit{wǒ huì bā tāmen dōu zhàogù de hǎohao de.}

I will BA they all take care EXT well DE.

‘I will take good care of them.’
‘They will arrive home soon at this time. Don’t worry. During your stay in the hospital, I will take good care of them.’

The element that speaker A asks about is the foregrounded piece of information: 孩子 háizi ‘kids’ is the focus of the question. Within the cultural content, speaker B knows that speaker A will worry about A’s children, so B first asks A not to worry because B will take the initiative to take good care of A’s children. The focus of the answer to the question 孩子 háizi ‘kids’ is introduced by pivotal 把 bā, which functions as given information in the b-c. This 把 marks the focused element 他們 tāmen ‘they’ co-referencing ‘kids,’ and joins the agent 我 wǒ ‘I’ and the resultative clause “take good care of them.” The segments 把 bā Y and Z are packaged together as one piece of new information and backgrounded element. In (29), the 把-c marked by the ANSWER arrow functions as an answer to the question marked by the QUESTION arrow, in that it provides new information: 我 wǒ ‘I,’ and 照顧得好好的 zhàogù de hǎohào de ‘taking good care of them’. The interpretation of this 把-c is that speaker B will actively take on the responsibility of providing good care for A’s children. In this way, the 把-c reflects two levels of iconic motivation: (1) in the experiential domain; (2) in the grammatical structure. The former arises from the status of holding a physical object as an iconic representation of holding the focus of the question. The latter is determined by the transference of the conceptual structure and cognitive salience from a pre-conditioned volitional act to the derived meaning [TAKE INITIATIVE TO] as the manipulative state, to a resultant construal.
3.5 Lexical Network of *bã*

Multiple semantic attributes can be evoked from the prototypical sense of *bã* via extension, specifically the extraction of schemata derived through extended senses. According to Langacker, all extensive senses are “linked by categorizing relationships of elaboration and extension” (1991: 3). Thus, extension is conceived of as “recognition achieved at the cost of invoking a schematized version of categorizing structure” (2000: 102). Langacker proposes a general mechanism to describe the relationships among prototype, extension and schema, diagrammed in Figure 3.14. The co-occurrence of prototype and extension reinforces their abstract commonality and further facilitates the establishment of a cognitive entity, i.e., schema. When the schema is entrenched as a unit, it can be described not only as a schema of instantiation by its prototype but also as an extension from the prototype (2000: 99-103).

![Diagram of Complex Category Structure](image)

**Figure 3.14: Complex Category Structure**  
(Langacker 1993: 2)

I base my analysis on Langacker’s notion of complex category structure, and I construct the complex category structure of *bã*, as a network, (Tyler and Evans 2003) in which linguistic structures are linked by categorizing relationships. The nodes of this network comprise the alternate senses of the polysemous lexical item *bã*. 
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First of all, I will introduce the central or prototypical value of bable, which is represented in its grapheme 把 bā. The left part of this grapheme is the radical “hand,” where the meaning resides; the right part of this grapheme bā is the phonetic representation. The radical “hand” and the phonetic representation bā constitute the semantic-phonetic grapheme 把 bā. The central sense of ‘to take, to hold’ is thus conceptualized in the written form. In Figure 3.15, the highest nodes are presented by bold blank circles, and labeled with numbers to indicate their relation to polysemic group meanings of bā given in upper case; the terminal nodes are shown in bold profiled small circles, which are labeled by numbers in brackets to specify the individual polysemic bā in lower case, and which are linked in the examples that follow. Figure 3.15 diagrams the lexical network of bā, as extending from the proto-scene of bā (1) in Figure 3.15.

**Figure 3.15: Lexical Network of bā**
[2.1] Physical activity
a. 把脈 bā-mài hold-vein ‘examine the pulse’
b. 把尿 bā-niào hold-pee ‘help the baby while it relieves’

[2.2] Metaphoric
a. 把握 bā-wò hold-hold ‘seize (a chance, a person’
b. 把持 bā-chǐ hold-hold ‘control, monopolize’

[3.1] Relationship
a. 把妹 bā-mèi hold-gal ‘hit on a chick/ woman in a relationship’
b. 把妞 bā-niū hold-chick ‘hit on a chick/ woman in a relationship’

[4.1] Guarding
a. 把關 bā-guān guard-gate ‘guard, check’
b. 把風 bā-fēng guard-wind ‘guard’

[5.1] Classifier
a. 一把花 yī-bā-huā one-CL-flower ‘a bouquet of flowers’
b. 一把椅子 yī-bā-yīzǐ one-CL-chair ‘a chair’

[5.2] Degree modifier
a. 一把年紀 yī-bā-nián-jì one-CL-age ‘quite old, not young’
b. 亂酷一把的 luàn kù yī-bā-de ‘crazy/ghettofabulous cool’

[6.1] Handle
a. 刀把 dāo-bā knife-handle ‘the handle of a knife’
b. 把手 bā-shǒu  handle-hand  ‘handle’

[6.2] Part as whole

a. 平把 ping-bā  flat-handle  ‘straight-handle bar type of bicycle’
b. 彎把 wān-bā  curve-handle  ‘curved-handle bar type of bicycle’

Each of the examples above relates to an aspect of the lexical network of bā. More discussion of the bā-c will be conducted in Chapter 4. The semantic extension of bā into underlying polysemy is due to the interaction between human physical experience based on a prototypical scene and the pragmatic operationalization of the experience. Therefore, meaning-extension can function as a motivated phenomenon in the case of bā.

3.6 Subjectification and Grammaticalization

In this section, I discuss the Mandarin Chinese bā construction from the point of view of subjectification and grammaticalization, i.e., the evolution of grammatical elements from lexical items. Langacker defines subjectification as “a shift from a relatively objective construal of some entity to a more subjective one” (2000: 297), and addresses its role in grammaticalization. The process of grammaticalization involves attenuation “in the degree of control exerted by an agentive subject” (ibid.). Take the classic English language example of be going to construction for instance, the evolution of a verbal meaning “to go” to a marker of futurity qualifies as subjectification, because the involvement of an actual movement through space by the subject becomes a “subjective movement through time by the conceptualizer [C]” (Langacker 2000: 302). See Langacker’s example in (30) that provides two semantic interpretations. In Figure 3.16, the capital R stands for a reference point, and the capital C indicates the conceptualizer.
(30) Sam is going to mail the letter.

[\textit{be going to} ①: actual physical objective movement through space by the subject]

[\textit{be going to} ② = will : subjective movement through time by the conceptualizer]

(modified from Lanagcker 2000: 302)

The instantiation of an action “to go” at one point along a spatial path is invoked in the \textit{be going to} ① construction, while that of a future event, with no actual motion involved, is expressed in the \textit{be going to} ② construction. Sketches of these two interpretations are provided in Figure 3.16.

\textit{be going to} ①

\textit{be going to} ②

![Diagram of constructions of \textit{be going to} ① and \textit{be going to} ②](image)

\textbf{Figure 3.16: Constructions of \textit{be going to} ① and \textit{be going to} ②}

(Langacker 2000: 303)

The first sense of \textit{be going to} involves a trajector that follows the spatial path as time (t) unfolds to the endpoint which is designated as a relational landmark. The second sense in \textit{be going to} ② does not involve a scope of space; instead, the mental path the
conceptualizer follows is along the temporal axis, and the conceptualizer “situates the
infinitival event of downstream in the flow of time relative to some reference point [R]”
(Langacker 2000: 302). According to Langacker (2000), the role of the trajector in the
diagram of be going to ⋄ is diminished in the profiled relationship because it no longer
involves physical motion in space, and its prominence is retained in the activity confined in
the landmark event.

In the case of the bà construction, I will examine the semantic type of bà construction
illustrated in (31) and (32), in which segment Y is a person that has been affected by
segment X or some thing X has done. In (31) and (32), the morpheme bà no longer
involves physical manipulation. Instead, it expresses the emotional or mental manipulation
that the patient, i.e., I, felt toward what the agent, i.e., he, and what has done to create such
an impact, i.e., be extreme angry, on the patient in (31). In (32), the patient is also the
experiencer who claims that (writing) a dissertation causes or has had such an impact, i.e.,
to be tired, on the patient. In both of these examples, trajectors have a diminished role,
since the prominent static activity is confined landmark to the event, i.e., “I am so mad”
(31) and “I am so tired” (32). The trajectors are expressed as causes that leads to the
occurrence of a resultative event.

(31) 他把我氣死了。tā bà wò qì  si  le  he BA I angry-die-ASP
‘He made me so mad/angry.’

(32) 論文把我搞得好累。lùnwén bà wò gào de hǎo lài  dissertation BA I do EXT tired
‘(Writing) Dissertation caused me to be so tired.’

The schemata of these two examples show a configuration parallel to that of the spatio-
temporal frame of bà in Figure 3.17.
The profile of this configuration supports the generalization that Chinese is a “patient-oriented” language (Tai 2003). The manipulative state is interpreted as a significant subjectively-construed result or impact from the vantage point of the patient. There is semantic domain shift from an objective construal of a hand grasping a physical object to a subjective construal of something causing someone to feel an emotional impact.

3.7 Conclusion

This chapter reveals multifaceted conceptualizations of $b$ in Mandarin Chinese: as a verb, a noun, a classifier, a modifier, and a marker. The profiles of the different expressions determine the semantic categories of $b$, i.e., a noun profiles a thing, and a verb profiles a temporal process. The relation between the profile and base determines the different semantic senses of $b$. Some senses arise from the prototypical value of the morpheme, while others instantiate more schematic characterizations (Langacker 2000: 4-6). The extended senses of $b$ derive from its prototypical scene ‘to take, to hold’, and establish a lexical network that is linked by categorizing relationships, i.e., extension and schema. This meaning-extension phenomenon further motivates the conceptual structure of the $b$-c, manifested in Mandarin Chinese.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTANT CONSTRUALS IN MANDARIN CHINESE BＡ CONSTRUCTION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter contains seven sections. In 4.2, I will introduce prior studies that use different approaches to examine the bａ construction in Mandarin Chinese, in order to construct a general overview of the linguistic features of the bａ construction. In 4.3, I will identify and discuss the resultant elements in segment Z that are construed in X bａ Y Z: aspect 了-le, durative 著-zhe, tentative V- 一yi-V, the locative complement, the double object construction 给 ‘gěi’, inalienable possession, durative and frequentative aspects, and the perspectival regard predicate 当成 dāngchéng ‘see…as, be regarded as…’, and the V-de-EXT resultative construction. In 4.4, I correlate the common features of resultant elements in the bａ construction to the conceptual meanings of 把 bａ: energy flow that causes and completes a reified event. A cognitive account of the energy encoded in the morpheme 把 bａ ‘to take, to hold’ illustrates how this physical action verb accomplishes transferal of energy from a concrete domain to an abstract domain and unifies the formation of the bａ Resultative Construction, hereforth as “bａ –RC” (Ding 2001).

I also use the centering discourse approach (Grosz, Joshi and Weinstein 1995) to identify the Y segment as the backward-looking center of the construction. I analyze the cognitive status of Y, the bａ referent, based on assumed familiarity by Prince (1981). In 4.5, I interpret the segment X as the initiation or source of energy as either “to cause”, “to enable”, or “to bring out a result” pending the archetypal role of X and the profile of a
speaker’s subjective construal, attitude, or stance. I compare the Mandarin Chinese bable -RC to the English “get/have + p.p.” construction to demonstrate the notion of agency embedded in both constructions. To identify a process and its resultant element in the bable construction, I compare the Mandarin Chinese bable construction to the German inseparable prefixes, which also exhibit a semantic nature of result coded in an event. The final section concludes my new findings with respect to the Mandarin Chinese bable construction.

4.2 Prior Studies on the Mandarin Chinese bable Construction

The Mandarin Chinese bable construction is a much-debated syntactic construction; the controversy involves the different theoretical perspectives in syntax, semantics, pragmatics and language acquisition applied in examining this construction. Prior studies include: (1) the structural viewpoint of the bable construction as [subject bable direct object verb] (Chao 1968); (2) analysis of the bable verbal constellation, which includes the verbal semantics and aspectual properties in segment Z (Li Wang 1947, Wu 1996); (3) the specificity of the bable referent or the topic status of this construction (Tsao 1987, Wu 1996, Guo Wu 1998); (4) acquisition regarding of the bable construction (Jin 1992, Fahn 1993, Chen 2004); and (5) studies comparing the bable construction to the passive construction (Cheung 1973, Yang 1995).

In Figure 4.1, I classify the prior studies on the bable construction based on these different approaches to the categorical status of bable. The Figure includes the theoretical orientation of each work, the categorization given for bable, and the terms used by each author.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Category given to ｂａ</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Li Wang (1947)</td>
<td>auxiliary verb</td>
<td>disposal-c</td>
<td>Semantics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chao (1968)</td>
<td>pretransitive verb</td>
<td>pretransitive-c</td>
<td>syntax, semantics, and pragmatics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hashimoto (1971)</td>
<td>verb</td>
<td>executive -c</td>
<td>Syntax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ding (1993)</td>
<td>resulative verb</td>
<td>ｂａ –RC</td>
<td>Syntax, semantics and pragmatics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ding (2001)</td>
<td>grammaticalized verb</td>
<td>ｂａ -RC</td>
<td>+ grammaticalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross (199?)</td>
<td>verb</td>
<td>ｂａ-c</td>
<td>Syntax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jelina Li (1997)</td>
<td>verb</td>
<td>ｂａ-c</td>
<td>Syntax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bender (2000)</td>
<td>verb</td>
<td>ｂａ-c</td>
<td>lexical functional grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dianyu Li (2003)</td>
<td>stance verb</td>
<td>agentive</td>
<td>multiperspectival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>causative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>experiential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ｂａ-c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheung (1973)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ｂａ-c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frei (1956)</td>
<td>inertial preposition</td>
<td>ergative-c</td>
<td>Syntax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li and Thompson (1981)</td>
<td>preposition (co-verb)</td>
<td>ｂａ-c</td>
<td>semantics and pragmatics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen (1983)</td>
<td>topic marker</td>
<td>topic-comment</td>
<td>Syntax, semantics and pragmatics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsao (1987)</td>
<td></td>
<td>ｂａ-c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chappell (1991)</td>
<td>causative marker</td>
<td>causative</td>
<td>syntax and semantics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ｂａ-c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun (1996)</td>
<td>highly transitive marker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wu (1996)</td>
<td>causative marker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wu (1998)</td>
<td>object marker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.1: Prior Studies of the Mandarin Chinese ｂａ Construction**
The following seven subsections demonstrate certain important semantic features evoked in Mandarin Chinese *bā* Construction with respect to my analysis.

### 4.2.1 Li Wang’s 處置式 *chūzhīshì* “Disposal Construction”

Li Wang (1947 in Li and Thompson 1981) was the first linguist to introduce a grammatical term 處置式 *chūzhīshì* “disposal form” or “disposal construction” to identify the Mandarin Chinese *bā* Construction (hereforth as *bā*-c). According to Wang, this term describes the combination of certain verbs that take *bā* in a fronted position or before preverbal objects, indicate the execution or disposal of a process. He defines “disposal form” as following:

> The disposal form states how a person is handled, manipulated or dealt with; how something is disposed of, or how an affair is conducted. Since it is specifically designed for disposing, the disposal form cannot be used unless the action possesses the quality of disposal.

(Wang 1947: 160-161 in Li 1974: 200-201)

Wang’s insight is vital to later semantic studies that address the *bā* construction. He maintains that the intrinsic meaning that *bā* introduces is the action of “doing,” in relation to “execution” (Wang 1987:117). I agree with this aspect of his analysis, and I interpret his notion of “execution” as [DO (TO/UPON)] or [TO TAKE INITIATIVE]. However, I consider his categorization of the *bā*-c as a verb to be inadequate and insufficient to characterize the full range of semantic traits of this construction. He regards those verbs that can co-occur with the *bā*-c as “disposal verbs,” and those that cannot as “non-disposal verbs.” I exemplify this inadequacy with one case of a non-disposal verb 爱 `ài ‘to love’, which, according to his categorization, can still co-occur within *bā*-c as long as a hyperbolic resultative complement 死了 - sǐ le ‘to death, to extreme’ is added. That is to
say, the idea of disposal is not explicitly expressed in the verb, but in the resultative complement. The extension of bā-c to a hyperbolic non-disposal verb is evidenced in the contrastive examples in (1).

(1)  a. 我爱他。  wǒ ài tā  I love he  ‘I love him.’  
    b. *我把他爱。  wǒ bā tā ài  I BA he love  ---  
    c. 我把他爱死了。  wǒ bā tā ài sǐ le  I BA he love-die-ASP  
       ‘I love him SO./I love him to death.’  

((1a) and (1b) are from Wang 1987: 117; (1c) is mine)

Wang is right about the fact that the mental action verb 爱 ài ‘to love’ alone cannot co-occur with the bā-c, “…unless the action possesses the quality of disposal” (Wang 1947: 161). In my opinion, however, his notion of “action” is better understood instead as a “process” that includes both an action and a result. Wang correctly points out that the concept of result resides implicitly in the definition of the “disposal construction” as “how a person is handled, manipulated or dealt with; how something is disposed of, or how an affair is conducted” (Wang 1947 in Ding 2001: 103). However, he never integrates this semantic distinction into his method of verb categorization. The method therefore fails to demonstrate the essential feature that the bā-c carries: the semantic quality of disposal, which I call “resultant construal.” Nevertheless, Wang opens the door for a semantic investigation of the bā-c.

4.2.2 Li and Thompson’s Analysis of the bā Construction

Thompson (1973) interprets the bā-c as X bā Y Z. This formula means that X disposes Y in the state described by Z, or what X did to Y in the state of Z. Li and Thompson (1981)
follow Wang’s idea of disposal, but further extend the implication of disposal to
demonstrate the essential semantic feature characterized, followed by the verb. They
investigate the types of direct objects and verbs that occur in this construction, and
examine the communicative function that the bā-c serves. According to Li and Thompson,
the idea of disposal (1) has to do with “what happens to the direct object” (Li and
Thompson 1981: 468), (2) includes what can be inferred or understood implicitly, (3) is
key to the interpretation of the bā-c. Li and Thompson identify the types of noun phrases
that occur after bā are identified as either definite or generic (1981: 465). The referents of
these noun phrases are usually shared or understood by the speaker and hearer from
preceding discourse or situationally-evoked context, although sometimes they are specific
entities that are known only by the speaker.

Li and Thompson’s analysis of the bā-c is semantically and pragmatically conditioned.
They approach the bā-c within the context of its utterance, which I find to be a much better
method than that used in the prior studies, which considered the bā sentences in isolation.
Moreover, they acknowledge the interaction of the prominence of the bā noun phrase and
the degree of the disposal (Li and Thompson 1981: 482-90), i.e., “affectedness” and
“resultant construal,” in my terms. Li and Thompson claim that “the less the message
involves the prominence or the disposal of the object, the more likely the sentence is to be
expressed in the non-bā form” (1981: 487), and they lay out this generalization by means
of the continuum shown in Figure 4.2. The four points on the generalization continuum
examples are sequentially instantiated from left to right in (2-5).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( bā )</th>
<th>( bā )</th>
<th>( bā )</th>
<th>( bā )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>impossible</td>
<td>unlikely</td>
<td>likely</td>
<td>obligatory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

indefinite or nonreferential object   definite and highly prominent object
no disposal           strong disposal

**Figure 4.2: Li and Thompson’s Generalization of the \( bā \) Noun Phrases**

(Li and Thompson 1981: 487)

Sentences that exemplify the four points along the generalization continuum are sequentially instantiated, from left to right, in (2) to (5).

(2)  

a. *我把戴姓。

\( wō bā dài xìng \)

I BA Dai be:surnamed

‘I am surnamed Dai.’

b. 我姓戴。

\( wō xìng dài \)

I surname Dai

‘I am surnamed Dai.’

The morpheme 姓 xìng ‘surname’ is a verb in Mandarin Chinese. Example (2a) is incompatible with the \( bā \)-c because the last name Dai cannot be disposed of. The sentence type can only be declarative as in (2b). There is no sense of affectedness involved, nor is there any resultant construal in this sentence type; therefore, it is incompatible with the \( bā \)-c.
The unlikely point in the bā disposal continuum is exemplified with the use of the tentative aspect marker in (3). This type of bā-c involves either the tentative aspect marker V-yì-V (一), or the durative aspect marker 著-zhe. Such aspect markers involve weak disposal, and the bā noun phrase is not highly prominent.

(3)  a. 他把手錶看一看。 [bā unlikely]

   tā bā shǒu-biǎo kàn yī kàn
   he BA watch see-one-see
   ‘He took a look at the watch.’

   (Li and Thompson 1981: 487; question mark is mine)

b. 他把手錶看一看之後，轉身就走。

   tā bā shǒu-biǎo kàn yī kàn zhī-hòu zhuǎn shēn jiù zǒu
   he BA watch see-one-see after turn body then go
   ‘After he took a look at the watch, (then) he left.’

   (constructed example based on (3a))

In my opinion, the construal of a tentative action moment that involves a very short moment of conceived time is depicted through the agent’s taking a look or glancing at the watch. That is to say, the tentative action gains prominence, and therefore is profiled, rather than the bā noun phrase, i.e., the watch. I understand the profile of the tentative aspect as a type of resultant construal that portrays the situation of what the agent does in relation to the watch. In my opinion, utterance (3a) cannot stand alone, unless a temporal conjunction is used or other modifiers co-occur, see (3b).

Next on the continuum is where the bā noun phrases are likely; here they are either marked by a demonstrative, or involve resultative verbal compounds. The former indicates
that the ｂａ noun phrase is definite, and the latter warrants the nature of resultant construal.

This is evidenced in example (4).

(4) 我会把这件事办好，你就别操心了。  [ｂａ likely]

wǒ huì bā zhè jiàn shì  bàn-hǎo, nǐ jiù bié cāo-xīn le

I will BA this CL matter do-well  you EMP don’t  worry ASP

‘I will take good care of this matter. You don’t need to worry about it.’

(colloquial data 2004)

The extreme of the continuum is what Li and Thompson consider the most prominent type of the ｂａ noun phrase, having a strong sense of disposal. I interpret that what underlies their assignment of high prominence to the obligatory ｂａ noun phrase involves the abstract domain of “affectedness” of the NP after being manipulated. The strong sense of disposal is an explicit resultant construal after the object has been manipulated, exemplified in (5).

(5) 他把纸门踢了一个洞。  [ｂａ obligatory]

tā bā zhǐ-mén  tī le  yī gè dòng

he BA paper-door  kick-ASP  one CL hole

‘He kicked a hole in the paper door.’  (Lü 1955)

Example (5) involves the resultant construal of a hole in the paper door as a result of his kicking.

I consider Li and Thompson’s semantic and pragmatic approach to the ｂａ construction as appropriate. I also consider that their examination of the ｂａ-c in real interaction contexts to be profitable. Li and Thompson conclude that for the ｂａ-c “the more prominent the object is and the more strongly the sentence expresses disposal, the more
likely it is that the message will be expressed in the form of a *bā* construction” (1981: 490). I correlate their interpretation of the prominence of an object to Langacker’s notion of “prominence” in terms of conceptualization, where the prominent entity is construed as the affected one (Langacker 1987, 1990). Li and Thompson’s notion of a strong sense of disposal corresponds to what I call the explicit resultant construal, where the processual construal of the segment *Y*, i.e., the door, and the result characterized in the segment *Z*, i.e., a hole (in the door), are profiled. In other words, the resultant hole in the door came about due to the manipulative action of a kicking foot. I will consider this relational profile as one type of *bā* construction.

### 4.2.3 Tsao’s Topic-Comment Approach to the *bā* Construction

Tsao (1987) analyzes the *bā* construction from the perspective of topic-comment. He argues that the initial noun phrase is a regular primary topic, and that *bā* is a secondary topic marker. For Tsao, the meaning of the *bā*-c is to “make clear the transitivity relation between the primary topic and the *ba* topic and to bring into focus the result, as expressed by the verb and its complement” (1987: 1). In addition, he points out that an extended use of the *bā*-c expresses a causative relation. He further generalizes the rule for interpreting the *bā*-c as follows:

> If the primary topic is capable of being interpreted as the agent of the action denoted by the verb, then assign the transitivity reading in the clause. If not, the clause will be assigned as causal reading. (Tsao 1987: 41)

Tsao postulates that language change has resulted in the *bā*-c taking the meaning of causality. While I agree with his characterization of the two basic meanings that *bā*-c carries: causative and resultative meanings, I disagree with his account of the causative
Having evolved as an extension of the *bā*-c, I account for the these two meanings based on different conceptualizations of the morpheme *bā*, which permit the interpretation of at least two basic image schemata: (1) to cause and (2) to do and henceforward bring out a result, depending on which designated area is profiled. Moreover, I think that Tsao’s account of the function of *bā* as simply marking topicality ignores the importance of the categorical centrality of *bā* [DO (TO/UPON)]. For example, this type of imperative *bā*-c is prevalent in the genre of cooking instructional discourse.

(6) 把洋蔥切一切。

*bā yáng-cōng qiē yī qiē*

BA onion cut-one-cut

‘Cut the onion.’ (cooking show of 美鳳有約 *Měifèng yǒu yuē*, 2004)

Cooking recipes are a type of instructional discourse. The speaker instructs the audience or readers to perform certain acts upon an object. Example (6) illustrates two issues discussed earlier: (1) it exposes the limit of Tsao’s analysis in that it does not account for the intrinsic semantic meaning the morpheme *bā* [DO (TO/UPON)]; (2) it reveals that instructional discourse allows the delimitive aspect that is not present in the narrative genre in (3a). The underlying reason for the prevalence of the imperative *bā*-c in cooking instructional discourse reveals via the semantic centrality of *bā*. (See section 4.3.1).

### 4.2.4 Ding’s *bā* Resultative Construction

Ding identifies three types of *bā* sentences as “*Bā Resultative Construction*” (henceforth as *bā*-RC, Ding 1993): (1) the regular type, (2) the object-retained type, and (3) the causative type. They are exemplified as below:
(7) [regular type]

A：你把她怎麼了？

B：我把她弄哭了。

你 BA she what/how-ASP
我把她弄哭了。 I BA she make-cry-ASP

‘What did you do to her?’
‘I made her cry.’

(colloquial data 2004)

In the utterance B in (7), It can also be interpreted into “what I did made her cry” because of the presupposed meaning of [DO] coded in the morpheme of  bā.

(8) [object-retained]

A：你把那個蛋糕怎樣了？

B：我把它吃了一半。

你 BA that-CL cake how ASP
我把它吃了一半。 I BA it eat-ASP one-half

‘What did you do to the cake?’
‘I ate half of it.’

(colloquial data 2004)

(9) [causative type]

A：論文把她怎樣了？

B：論文把她累死了。

Lùn-wén dissertation BA she how ASP
論文把她累死了。 dissertation BA she tired-die-ASP

‘What did her dissertation do to her?’
‘Her dissertation made her exhausted.’

(colloquial data 2004)

---

1 An alternate interpretation is “what I did made her cry” because of the presupposed meaning of [DO] coded in the morpheme of  bā.

2 In this case, the noun phrase can be interpreted as an event, “writing her dissertation made her exhausted.”
In order to recognize the common features shared among these three types, Ding further defines the \( b\ddot{a} \) –RC as follows.

A \( b\ddot{a} \) sentence belongs to the \( B\ddot{a} \) Resultative Construction if, and only if, the object of \( b\ddot{a} \) holds a proper semantic relationship with the successive clause that denotes a resultative state. The semantic relation between the object of \( b\ddot{a} \) and the clausal complement can be PATIENT-and-resultant, or EXPERIENCER-and-stative.

(Ding 1993: 14)

Ding’s definition is consonant with my idea of the resultant construal of the \( b\ddot{a} \)-c; however, Ding’s definition does not account for the semantic nature of the entity in segment X. I identify the archetypal roles in segment X as explicit agent, implicit agent, and event; I discuss which semantic relation is embedded for each of these in section 4.5 below.

Ding bases his argument on Nedjalkov and Jaxontov’s notion of “resultative” (1988), which distinguishes between “resultative” and “stative”: “the stative expresses a state of a thing without any implication of its origin, while the resultative expresses both a state and the preceding action it has resulted from” (Nedjalkov and Jaxontov 1988: 6). Ding further categorized five types of \( b\ddot{a} \)-RC: (1) subjective resultative, (2) objective resultative, (3) possessive resultative, (4) locative-objective resultative, (5) objective-impersonal resultative. In (10) to (14) below, I provide one example of each of these five types of \( b\ddot{a} \)-RC.

(10) 那個美女把他們看呆了。 [subjective resultative]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{nà gè } & \text{ měi-nǚ } \quad \text{bà tā-mén kàn dāi le} \\
\text{that-CL } & \text{ pretty-woman BA they watch-dull-ASP} \\
\text{‘That beautiful woman has got them all dull.’} \\
\text{They looked at that beautiful woman -- > they get dull. (from Ding 1993: 18)}
\end{align*}
\]
(11) 你把身體練壯一點。  

你 have to BA body  exercise-strong a bit  

‘You have to exercise and build your body stronger.’  

You exercise -- > Your body gets stronger.  

(colloquial data 2003)

(12) 你怎麼會把自己的身體弄成這樣。  

你 how can BA self POSS body make-become this-state/manner  

‘How can you have your body (implied: health) become like this!’  

You have done this to your body.  -- > Your body/health becomes like this!  

(Quartet 2003)

(13) 他們把冰箱放在這裡。  

他們 BA refrigerator put  LOC here  

‘They put their refrigerator here!’  

They put the refrigerator here.  -- > The refrigerator is here.  

(Quartet 2003)

(14) 把總理也病了。  

BA premier also sick-ASP  

‘Even the premier got sick.’  

Unknown -- > The premier is sick.  

(Ding 1993: 19)
Ding does not include “the substitute type of 得-de [EXT] Resultative Construction,” shown in (15a), in his category of bā sentences with the bā-RC (Ding 1993). Like Tsao (1987), Ding calls upon diachronic processes to account for the extension of meanings for bā. He considers the substitute type of sentence, i.e., V-de-EXT resultative construction, as the outcome of an analogical change based on the verb copying construction [V-O-V-de] shown in (15b) that carries over a resultative meaning. He interprets result as relevant to the event, but irrelevant to any particular entity in the sentence.

\[(15)\]

\(a.\) 美月把寶蓮照顧得好好的。
[De Resultative Construction= de-RC]
\[
Méiyuè bā Bāoliàn zhào-gù de hǎo hao de
\]
Name BA Name take care EXT well DE
‘Meiyue has Baolian well taken care of.’ (Quartet 2003)

\(b.\) 美月照顧寶蓮照顧得好好的。
[Verb-copying construction]
\[
Méiyuè zhào-gù Bāoliàn zhào-gù de hǎo hao de
\]
Name take care Name take care EXT well DE
‘Meiyue takes good care of Baolian.’ (my variation based on (15a))

According to Ding, the bā in the de-RC is analogous to the first V in the verb copying construction. I dispute Ding’s view that the bā in (15a) is only relevant to the event and not to a particular entity. I propose that the profile in the bā-c in (15a) is construed through the agency of Meiyue and the resultant scene ascribed to Baolian’s state. The entity Baolian is obviously the backward-looking center of the construction (see section 4.4 below).

Therefore, the bā in example (15a) is relevant to a particular entity, in the event, Baolian.
However, in the verb-copying construction (15b) based on (15a), the agent Meiyue is the backward-looking center, and the event of taking care of Baolian is profiled. These two constructions receive different degrees of prominence in terms of cognitive reality; hence, I do not consider (15a) as an analogical change from a (15b). Instead, in my opinion, the focus should be on the kinds of constructions that are compatible with the $bā$-c, and on those features allow these constructions to co-occur with the $bā$-c.

Ding’s position with regard to the $bā$-c has developed over time, he first argued that $bā$ is a resultative verb (1993) and then later claimed that $bā$ is a grammaticalized verb (2001). Both interpretations are consonant with his view of $bā$ as a verb that means “to bring out a result.” Ding examines the $bā$-RC from syntactic, semantic and pragmatic perspectives (1993); he later goes on investigate to the grammaticalization of the morpheme $bā$ (2001). I am basically in accord with his analysis, except for discrepancies related to the 得 $de$-RC “to the degree that.” (See section 4.3.2.8).

4.2.5 Guo Wu’s Information Structure of the $bā$ Construction

Wu claims that the $bā$-c is a special type of double nominative sentence, unless $bā$ is a marker of the affected participant in its transitivity relationship (1998: 116-54). The focus of the $bā$-c in his view is on how the V is characterized with the affected state as a result of transitivity. He also regards the $bā$-c as a type of topic-comment construction, in which V represents a comment on the participant. This formulation evinces a pragmatic constraint when the $bā$-c is employed. Besides topic-comment, Wu considers that the $bā$-c can also form a thetic structure, which usually involves accidental actions; see his example in (16).
(16) 我不小心把一個小孩撞傷了。

wǒ bù xiǎo-xīn bā yī gè xiǎo-hái zhuàng shāng le

I not careful BA one-CL child hit - injure-ASP

‘I injured a child accidentally by hitting him with my car.’ (Wu 1998: 139)

Wu states that when the bā-c forms a “thetic structure,” the morpheme bā actually “cancels the topic status of the preverbal NP2 and marks it as part of the comment” (Wu 1998: 154). The function of bā in this case is just to introduce a thetic clause. Wu forms the rule as follows in (17).

(17) NP1  bā NP2  V

T      C

He posits that the question that could elicit the answer in (16) could be the general one in (18a) but not the highly specific one in (18b), since the affected participant in (18b), i.e., the child victim, is “more contextually marked” (Wu 1998: 141).

(18) a. 你怎麼了?

nǐ zěnme le

you what ASP

‘What did you do?’

‘What happened to you?’ ‘What’s wrong?’

b. 你不小心把一個小孩怎麼了?

nǐ bù xiǎo-xīn bā yī gè xiǎohái zhuàng shāng le

you not careful BA one-CL child hit - injure-ASP

‘What did you do to a child accidentally?’

---

3 The verb 撞 zhuàng means ‘to bump, to hit with a strong impact,’ It could be with a car, one’s body.
In general, Wu’s analytic method is based on information structure. According to Wu, the \( b\text{-}c \) can be either a pragmatically well-formed topic-comment structure or a thetic structure, depending on the cognitive constraints of the referent and the type of verb involved.

4.2.6 Li’s Multiperspectival Approach to the \( b\text{-}\) Construction

Li (2003) outlines and structures the meaning potential of \( b\text{-}\) in the \( b\text{-}c \) by adopting Allwood’s (1999) semantic-epistemic operations (MDSEO) model. Li interprets two meanings for \( b\text{-} \) in the \( b\text{-}c \), demonstrated in (19) and (20) as below.

(19) “When subject NP is personal, agentive, or possessive, it means ‘to (have) initiate(d) and be in control of a resulting state’ or ‘to (have) receive(d) and be in a resulting state.’”

(20) “When subject NP is expressed as inanimate thing, it means ‘to cause/make somebody or something to undergo a process and a state that is resulted from that process.’”

(Li 2003: 74-5)

Li proposes that \( b\text{-} \) is a light verb in resultative and causative constructions. Andrews and Manning defines light verbs as verbs “taking phrase structure complements which appear superficially to be ordinary VP complements” (1999: 26 in Li 2003: 63). A light verb functions as an incomplete higher predicate “that needs a co-predicate to make it a complete predicate” (ibid: 64). I correlate Li’s notions of “incomplete” and “complete” to a semantic conceptual relation in which an incomplete semantic interpretation is expressed in \( X \text{ } b\text{-} \text{ } Y \) (NP1 \( b\text{-} \) NP2): (1) \( X \) has done something to \( Y \); (2) \( X \) causes \( Y \) to become a certain state. To complete the semantic interpretation, the missing conceptual semantic content is
realized in the co-predicate, i.e., the segment $Z (V \text{ NP3/ ASP})$. Li’s claim corresponds to my hypothesis (2002) as shown in Figure 4.3.

![Figure 4.3: Action and Result in the $b\text{ā}$ Construction]( Dai 2002: 36)

The dashed blue line in Figure 4.3 indicates a semantically presupposed act of [DO]. The semantic content of the action is described in the verb in the co-predicate, as indicated by the concrete blue line, and its manipulative result is construed in NP3 or the aspectual markers, as indicated in the concrete red line. The dashed red line indicates a semantic relation of [AFFECTEDNESS] designated to the archetypal role of patient or experiencer to which segment $Y$, i.e., NP2, refers in the $b\text{ā}$-c. That is, the incomplete semantic content is indicated in the dashed lines, coded as [DO] and [AFFECTEDNESS] in the morpheme $b\text{ā}$; the complete semantic relation therefore involves not only action, but also result. See further analysis in section 4.3.

Li also identifies three semantic types of $b\text{ā}$ construction: $b\text{ā}$-causative, $b\text{ā}$-accusative, and $b\text{ā}$-experiential, as shown in Figure 4.3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syntactic Construction</th>
<th>bā-causative</th>
<th>bā-accusative</th>
<th>bā-experiential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semantic type</td>
<td>causative</td>
<td>Agentive</td>
<td>experiential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREDICATE</td>
<td>bā &lt;cause, patient,</td>
<td>bā &lt;agent, theme,</td>
<td>bā &lt;experiencer, theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;&lt;</td>
<td>&lt;&lt;</td>
<td>&lt;&lt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT</td>
<td>cause</td>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>experiencer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJECT</td>
<td>patient</td>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP</td>
<td>V + AP</td>
<td>V + AP</td>
<td>AP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.4: Li’s Categorization of Semantic Types of the  bā Construction**

(Li 2003: 117)

According to Li (2003), the pragmatic nature and communicative function of the  bā-c is to report a perceived situation from the perspective of the speaker in the indicative mood, and to direct the listener to perform a task in the imperative mood. This description corresponds to the sentences types in the drama colloquial data, e.g., (15a), and in the cooking instructional data, e.g., (6). The distinctions of communicative functions in reporting and directing action in terms of uses of the  bā-c also reflects the different semantic types of the  bā-c, and further provides significant guidance for pedagogical applications, which I discuss in Chapter 5.

I find Li’s insights to be very helpful for analysis of the semantic nature of the  bā-construction, most especially for making comparisons of the semantic and pragmatic nature for similar constructions in Mandarin Chinese and other languages. However, I disagree with Li’s argument that  把 bā is a “stance” verb (Li 2003: 85-93). The determinant factor for Li’s categorization of  把 bā as a “stance” verb is based on the verbal properties of  把 bā ‘to hold’ as compared to those of  奈 ná ‘to take, to hold.’ Li
considers that the attributes of verbal 把 bā ‘to hold’ describe a verbal stance, “a bodily attitude that requires active maintenance and can be maintained indefinitely” (ibid: 85), comparable to the verbs zhàn ‘to stand’ and zuò ‘to sit.’ It is this argument that Li terms verbal 把 bā ‘to hold’ is a “stance” verb. Li claims that the class of “stance” verb is further evidenced because verbal 把 bā ‘to hold’ can co-occur with the aspect marker, -zhe, i.e., the progressive marker.

I find that my data do not support Li’s notion of “stance” verb: the underlying reason is the different usages in Mandarin Chinese spoken in Mainland China, where Li’s data originated and that spoken in Taiwan, where my data originate. However, I can relate 把 bā in the bā-c through a cognitive interpretation of “stance,” i.e., an expression of the stance toward the patient and the event based on the speaker’s subjective construal, developed from Carter and MacCarthy’s interpretation of the English “get-passives” (1999). I will further discuss this notion in section 4.5. In instructional discourse, in narration or report, the speaker describes his/her stance toward what the agent or an event has done to/caused the patient to arrive at an ascribed state. The speaker expresses a subjective stance related to the performance of the event by using imperative bā sentence. I think that 把 bā can be associated with the idea of “stance” if and only if the notion of “stance” is applied to the speaker’s vantage point.

4.2.7 Yang’s Systematic Theory of Process Type in the bā Construction

Based on the systematic theory of information structure and semantic characteristics, developed in Halliday’s (1985) functional grammar. Yang distinguishes three types of bā construction: (1) the process-disposal type, (2) the resultative-descriptive type, and (3) the
thing-gain/loss type (Yang 2004: 49). He further characterizes four process types in the $bǎ$-$c$: material, behavioral, mental, and relational process (Yang 2004: 62-80). I will not further discuss Yang’s analysis, but note that his analysis relies on what Halliday has pointed out regarding the special construction of Mandarin Chinese $bǎ$-$c$ with respect to the focus of information.

Suppose however that I want the focus of information to be the Process rather than Goal …… This means that the Process, not the Goal, must come last. In Chinese, which has a similar word order and information structure, there is a special construction, for achieving this; but in English, it is impossible – I cannot say *they the meeting cancelled* – unless the Process is split into two parts. This therefore is what happens, with a phrasal verb: it splits the Process into two parts, one functioning as Predicator and the other as Adjunct coming in its normal place at the end: they cancelled the meeting off$^4$.

(Halliday 1985: 185; bold emphasis is original)

This functional view offers an additional perspective from which to examine the Mandarin Chinese $bǎ$-$c$: segment $Z$ is a process. This focus on process further strengthens the vantage point of perspectival construal of the $bǎ$ construction in my later analysis.

### 4.3 Segment $Z$ in $X bǎ Y Z$

Based on the general overview of the $bǎ$ construction in section 4.2, in this section, I consider the nature of the segment $Z$ in the form of $X bǎ Y Z$. Segment $Z$ involves resultative verbal compounds (4.3.1), aspectual markers (4.3.2.1), verbal constellations with directional complements (4.3.2.3), double object *gěi ‘give’* construction (4.3.2.4), inalienable possession (4.3.2.5), durative and frequentative complements (4.3.2.6), and perspectival regard predicates (4.3.2.7). Each coded event in the form *give* above is construed with a transfer of energy and a resultant state where the energy sinks.

$^4$ The expression “they cancelled the meeting off” is only good in British English. In American English, the correct form should be “they called the meeting off.”
4.3.1 Resultative Verbal Compound

The resultative verbal compound (RVC) in Mandarin Chinese consists of a main verb followed either by a resultative suffix denoting the state of the object (19), or by another verbal component (20).

(19) 把親事講好。

*bā qīn-shì jiàng-hǎo*

BA marital matter talk-settled/good/resolved/finished (up)

‘Settle (up) the marital matter.’  
*(Quartet 2003)*

The social interaction frame in (19) is a mother talking to her son about his relationship with his intended wife. She asks him to finalize the engagement. The traditional Chinese cultural context of proposing engagement to be married is usually brought about through talk between the parents on both sides. Therefore, the compound verb 講好 *jiàng hǎo* ‘talk-settled/good/finished (up)’ consists of the action 講 *jiàng* ‘to talk (about)’, and the result of its action 好 *hǎo* ‘to be settled/resolved, finished, good’. The latter describes the completed resultant state of having talked about the engagement and come to an agreement about the engagement, i.e., arriving at the agreement to marry. More examples like this are discussed in section 4.3.1.1.

(20) 閒言閒語把我淹死了。

*xián yán xián yǔ bā wǒ yān sǐ le*

idle-word idle-talk BA I drown\(^5\)-die ASP

‘Gossip is drowning me./I am being drowned by gossip.’  
*(Colloquial data 2003)*

\(^5\) Although the morpheme 淹 *yān* is translated into ‘to drown,’ it does not denote the meaning that someone is dead. However, in English, both “to kill” and “to drown” denote the death of an animate entity.
Example (20) is characterized metaphorically with a V-V schema that describes a result expressed in V2 死 sǐ ‘to die’ from a passive verb V1 淹 yān ‘to drown’. The speaker of (20) expresses an unfortunate stance that she is metaphorically drowned dead by gossip. Such a metaphor postulates the speaker’s expression of adversity and oppression by the gossip event directed at her. This evoked image supports the claim Tai (2003) proposes: Chinese is a patient-oriented language. The power of gossip takes control of her and metaphorically drowns her as if in water, which leads to her metaphorical death, which represents her resultant emotional state. The experiencer, i.e., the speaker I, constructs a subjective construal of her strong affected feelings that resulted from the manipulative control of gossip. According to this affected participant, it is the gossip that puts her into the affected state of metaphorical drowning and as a result metaphorically kills her.

These two examples demonstrate two kinds of typical RVCs in Mandarin Chinese. In (19), the suffix 好 hǎo is self-contained as the termination point of an event which is described in the process of 講 jiǎng, i.e., talking about this event of getting engaged. That is, the action of talk is completed in resolution. In (20), the action of metaphorical drowning V1 淹 yān ‘to drown’ is completed in metaphorical death V2 死 sǐ ‘to die.’ We will look into these two kinds of RVCs closely in the following sections.

4.3.1.1 Resultative Suffixes 好-hǎo, 完-wán, 光-guāng

Three of the most frequently-used resultative suffixes in Mandarin RVCs are 好-hǎo ‘finish, complete, good’, 完-wán ‘finish, complete’ and 光-guāng ‘finish, empty, bare’ (Wang 2000: 62-5); they can also stand alone as independent verbs.6 When they serve as

---

6 For example, (constructed examples)
resultative suffixes, they collaborate with an action verb to denote the telicity of that event. In order to demonstrate this feature, I construct a set of contextualized examples in (21) that involve these resultative suffixes in the constructed conversation between a boy to his mother, he asks if he can play a videogame. This context posits a culturally embedded expectation to perform well or carefully done on homework assignments.

(21) A. 媽，我可不可以打電動？
    mā wǒ kē-bù-kè-yī dā diàn-dòng
    ‘Mom, may I play the videogame?’

B. 等你把功課寫完/好，牛奶喝光/完，就可以打電動。
    děng nǐ bǎ gōng-kè xiě-wán/hǎo niú-nǎi hē-guāng/wán jiù kěyǐ dā diàn-dòng
    ‘Wait till you finish your homework well, drink your milk empty (drink it all up), then you can play videogame.’

A2 媽，我已經把功課寫好/完了，牛奶也喝光/完了。
    mā wǒ yǐjīng bǎ gōng-kè xiě-wán/hǎo le niú-nǎi yě hē-guāng/wán le
    ‘Mom, I have already finished the homework and milk.’

In the conversation above, 完 -wán ‘be finished’ is both interchangeable with both 好- hǎo ‘be finished, good’ and 光 -guāng ‘be finished, empty.’ Notice that 完 -wán ‘be finished’ can occur both in relation to writing homework and to drinking milk. I think that the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) 你好了沒？</th>
<th>(b) 我完了！</th>
<th>(c) 別光著身子！</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nǐ hǎo le méi</td>
<td>wǒ wán le!</td>
<td>bié guāng-zhe shēng-zǐ!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you finish ASP Not</td>
<td>I finish PRT</td>
<td>don’t bare-ASP body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you ready?</td>
<td>I am finished (doomed)!</td>
<td>Don’t be naked! (lit. in Chinese)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Get dressed! (in English)
conceptualizations of 完–wán ‘to complete, to be finished’ can be equated with either the completion of an event, i.e., writing homework, or a resultant state that describes that the milk has been finished, i.e., the empty state of the milk glass.

The completion of an event evoked in 完–wán ‘to complete, to be finished’ overlaps the conceptualizations of 好–hǎo ‘be finished, good’ with respect to the telicity of a signified event. I suggest that what distinguishes 好–hǎo from 完–wán is that 好–hǎo ‘be finished, good’ evokes the speaker’s subjective construal of an event with a good outcome or quality for her/himself; for example, in (19) settling up the marital matter makes the speaker, the mother, worry less and hence good for her if the engagement is resolved.

The resultant state evoked 完–wán ‘to complete, to be finished’ overlaps with the completion construed in 光–guāng ‘be finished, empty’ regarding to nothing (contained) left (container) in a contained-container relationship. In other words, 光–guāng ‘be finished, empty’ and 完–wán ‘be finished’ both postulate a conceptual resultant state of nothing contained in a container relationship in this case. For example, the entity in (21b), milk, (also see (22) below, soup) is the contained in the container; therefore, in (22), 完–wán is also interchangeable with 光–guāng.

I have reached a preliminary categorization of these three resultative suffixes in Figure 4.5. I located four instances of ‘V+好–hǎo’ and four examples of ‘V+完–wán’, but no ‘V+光–guāng’ in my drama colloquial data. I provide one example of each in (22) and (23).
好-hāo 完-wán 光-guāng

a completive event a completive event contained-container
with a good outcome contained-container A - B
or a positive manner A - B finished empty
finished empty

Figure 4.5: Resultative Suffixes of 好-hāo, 完-wán and 光-guāng

(22) 不過媽媽叫我帶補湯來，

bú-guò mā ma jiào wǒ dài bǔ-tāng lái

but Mom ask I bring supplement-soup come

叫我一定要親眼看你看它喝完(光)。

jià wǒ yī-dīng yào qīn-yǎn kàn nǐ bā tā hē-wán (-guāng)

ask me must have to with my own eyes see you BA it drink-finish (-empty)

‘But mom asks me to bring the nutrition soup over, (she) asks me to watch you
finish having it with my own eyes.’  (Quartet 2003)

Setting: the elder sister’s room
Participants: the younger sister speaks to her elder sister, who is sick

This conversation is between the younger sister and her elder sister, who is sick. Their
mother has asked the youngest daughter to take the soup to her married sister who is sick,
and demands that the younger daughter watch her until she finishes drinking the soup. The
resultative suffix 完-wán ‘to be finished’ signifies the resultant state of having nothing left in the soup bowl following the event of drinking the nutrition soup. I have also constructed the resultative suffix 光-guāng ‘empty, finished’ in the parenpathesis in (22) to indicate that in this case it conceptually overlaps with 完-wán ‘to be finished’ and henceforward can be interchangeably used. Since the context provides a container-contained relationship which is not present in the suffix 好-hǎo, this suffix hence cannot be applied in this context. The segment Y, i.e, the nutrition soup, is previously mentioned in the first clause, and an expected result related to the event of having drunk the soup is expressed in the segment Z. The form of bā Y Z (bā tā hē wán: ‘BA it drink-finish’), is characterized as performing an activity to Y to achieve a resultant state described in Z. Since the event of drinking ends with having nothing left in a container, the suffix can only be replaced with 光-guāng ‘be finished, empty.’

(23) 阿姨對不起你，沒有把你顧好。

a-yí duì-bù-qí ní méi-yǒu bā ní guǐ-hǎo

aunt feel sorry you  not-have BA you take care-well

‘Aunt is sorry (because) I have not taken good care of you.’ (Quartet 2003)

Setting: in the living room where the steaming iron incident happens

Participants: the aunt and her nephew

This utterance occurs in the context when the speaker’s young nephew has been hurt due to contact with a steaming iron. His aunt expresses that she feels sorry that she did not take good care of him, which led to his injury. The resultative suffix 好-hǎo ‘to be good, be finished’ in (23) expresses the expected result that the process of taking good care of
somebody is considered to be complete when nothing harmful occurs to the one who is cared for. The suffix 好-hǎo codes an image that the person being taken care of continues to be physically ‘well.’ Here again the resultative suffix 好-hǎo ‘to be good, be finished’ involves a good outcome for the Construer, therefore it cannot be replaced with the suffix 完–wán ‘to be finished,’ since 完–wán does not construe any image related to physical wellness.

4.3.1.2 Action-Result Schemata of V-V

In addition to RVC, the V1-V2 form also occurs frequently in the bā-RC. In this construction, there are two independent verbs that refer to different arguments; V1 codes the activity, and V2 describes a result due to the consequence of V1. For example, V1 in 打開 dǎkāi ‘hit-open: open’ in (24) describes a metaphorical hand-trace physical action to mean [DO WITH HAND], and V2 indicates the resultant state of the occurrence to the book, which is [TO BE OPEN].

(24) 他坐在對面讀書，每天晚上我看他在那邊打瞌睡。

tā zuò zài duì-miàn   dú-shū   měi-tiān wǎn-shàng wǒ kàn tā zài nàbiān dǎ-kēshuǐ
he sit EXT opposite-side read-book every-evening I see he EXT there hit-doze

聽到爸爸媽媽在叫了，趕緊把書 打開。

tīngdào bāba māma zài jiào le gānjīn bā shū dǎ-kāi
hear-arrive dad mom PRO call ASP hurry BA book hit-open
'He was sitting on the other side of me studying. Every night I saw him dozing off over there. When he heard dad and mom calling on him, he opened the book in a hurry.' (interview with playwright)

Situation: The interviewee was narrating what he remembered the time when his brother prepared for college entrance exam.

I use this narrated example from colloquial speech because it illustrates the resultant state of an open-paged book in a situation construed conceptually as a scene of studying. The situationally-evoked referent described in segment $Y$, i.e., the book, is supposed to be open because the brother wanted his parents to think he was studying hard. That is why he had to perform the action upon the book, to open it up. This act and the result it brings out demonstrate the conceptual dependency of studying. A parallel image schema between Mandarin Chinese and English slang is used to describe a scene of studying: (1) 打開(書) $dākāi$ (shū) ‘to hit-open (books)’: to open up (the book); (2) to hit the books: to study.

The example in (25) is from TV colloquial cooking instructional data. The chef instructs the audience to perform an act upon the cabbage: to cut it apart.

(25) 首先把大白菜，把它切斷。

$shǒu-xiǎn bā dà-bái-cài bā tā qiē-duàn$

first BA big-white vegetables BA it cut-break

‘First the cabbage… Cut it apart.’ (cooking show 2004)

---

7 Professor Jill Brody provides this example.
Example (25) consists of two parts: the first part is an unfinished utterance or sentence fragment as the first underscored, and the second part is a complete utterance as indicated in the second underscored. The first part of the utterance codes an event of preparing to perform an action upon the cabbage: the conceptual content of this particular action is realized as 切斷 qiē-duàn ‘cut-break’ in the second part of the utterance. The action performed upon the cabbage is implied conceptually in the segment of bā Y, the sentence fragment. This fragment conveys the implied action of [DO (TO/UPON)] upon the cabbage through the bā, and the cognitive reality is characterized in the second utterance. I find this example present a clear conceptual overlap between [DO (TO/UPON)] as encoded in bā Y and the designated consequence of this act, i.e., cutting it apart, in segment Z. This example exhibits a prototypical semantic category of cooking instructional discourse: perform a task upon an ingredient to attain a resultant state. Such a procedural construal is parallel to what is invoked in the bā grammatical construction, i.e., [DO (TO/UPON)] and [RESULT]. The intrinsic semantic value of [DO (TO/UPON)] is denoted in the morpheme bā, and the construal of [RESULT] is evoked in the V1-V2 action-result schemata.

To sum up, the RVC construction is prevalent in Mandarin Chinese. The resultative elements of the RVC can be used with the suffixes 好–hào ‘finished, good’, 完–wán ‘finished’ and 光–guāng ‘finished, empty, bare’, or another verbal component denoting the state of the segment Y.

4.3.2 Resultant Construals in Segment Z

it is the postverbal adverbial complement, rather than *bā* itself, that constitutes the meaning of “disposal” or “conjunctive” in the *bā*-c. Li and Thompson (1981) concluded that the strong semantics of disposal lies in the complexity of the VP rather than the V alone.

Sybesma supports their view: “[w]hether [the *bā*-c] is interpreted as ‘disposed of’ or not depends on the nature of postverbal constituent” (1999: 134). Sybesma categorized Mandarin Chinese *bā* construction postverbal constituents into ten categories, based on the thirteen classes of Lü (1955 in Sybesma 1999: 135–139). It is striking that most of these categories either exhibit a resultant state or carry an indicator of the result, whether in locatives, goal, or durative/frequentative marker. Hoekstra labeled complements of these combination verbs as “result arguments” (1988 in Sybesma 1999: 157). I adopt Sybesma’s classification but use a cognitive approach; moreover, I add two more groups, based on 235 tokens of the *bā*-c in my colloquial corpus data: 170 are from colloquial drama, and 65 from cooking instructional discourse. I discuss each category in the subsections below.

4.3.2.1 Aspectual Markers 了–le, V–yi-V, 着–zhe

The aspectual marker that co-occurs most frequently with *bā* construction in my data is 了–le. Twenty-five out of 170 examples from the colloquial data involves the aspectual marker 了–le. The four examples, 了–le co-occurs either with a verb: 忘 *wàng* ‘to forget,’ 做 *zuò* ‘to do,’ 殺 *shā* ‘to kill,’ and 取 *qǔ-xiāo* ‘to cancel.’ In 21 examples, 了–le co-occurs with the RVC. Notice that all four verbs that co-occur with the aspectual marker 了–le conflate an aspect of result in their verbal semantics; their use together with 了–le, marking completive and inchoative aspect, thus evokes a resultant construal.
In order to define the meaning of the aspectual marker 了–le, I adopt Wu’s discourse approach, which is based on “our world knowledge of the typification of everyday situations involving participants, circumstances, scenes, and events and interacts with discourse types and speech act” (Wu 2001: 268). I exemplify 了–le in relation to world knowledge in the following sentence which demonstrates four different meanings.

(26) 吃饭了。

*chī fàn le*

eat-rice ASP

(a) It’s time to eat.

(b) (someone) has started to eat his meal.

(c) (someone who could not/refused to eat meals before) has started to eat [meals].

(d) (I) have had my meal. (from Wu 2001: 268)

Wu applies semantic and pragmatic analyses of 了–le based on its use in the context of social interaction. I follow his approach to further refine the meaning of 了–le. The interpretations in (26a) to (26d) are each evoked from differently contextualized utterances of (26), and all of them signify a change about the event of eating, either in the immediate future or in the past. According to Wu (2001), these interpretations result from cognitive operations on the part of the addressee, since to the addressee must take into account the participant, circumstances of the situation, and speech acts in any occasion of this utterance.

The interpretation in (26a) is a directive typically employed by a mother to urge (and initiate) the recipients, i.e., family members, to begin eating a meal. This directive 了–le

---

8 Rice is prototypical food for Chinese.
indicates “the change from a non-eating situation to an eating situation, and signals to the family members to update their perception of the situation” (Wu 2001: 269). The interpretation of (26b) occurs in the circumstance of answering a phone call. It is a statement to indicate that someone the caller tries to reach is not available at that moment, and further to signal the participant, i.e., the caller, to update the situation because that someone has entered the event of eating, and for this reason cannot be reached at this moment. The change expressed in (26b) is actually a signal to change from the interlocutor’s perspective so that s/he can reach that someone later.

The third interpretation of (26c) is a report employed as either an initiative move or a reactive move according to Wu. Wu provides the situation involving a doctor or nurse, speaking about a hospitalized patient in a “food-inhibited” situation. The doctor reports that this patient has started to eat after a long time of being unable to eat. This report provided by le signals to the family members of the patient an update on the patient’s condition, and further instruct them to bring some food the patient might like to eat when they next visit. There are two kinds of change that take place in this situation: (1) change of the patient’s improved health condition, and (2) change of the addressee’s behaviors.

The last interpretation of (26d) is as a response to a question inviting the addressee to eat. It occurs in a situation when the recipient enters a host’s home at meal time. In the cultural context of the Chinese community, the host will invite the recipient to enjoy the meal with them, while the recipient conventionally answers with the utterance in (26) under the circumstance that s/he has already eaten, to politely decline the invitation. The social interaction context in (26d) is that the host’s invitation is customary, but also assumes that the visitor has not eaten. The use of le in (26d) indicates a change of the
assumption in the host's knowledge, and signals the host who invites to continue to enjoy the meal without the speaker.

The examples discussed lead to the following generalization: the aspectual marker 了–le signifies “the cue of a change and the necessity for updating the situation according to the change” (Wu 2001: 270). That is to say, when a situational change is construed, the addressee should also update his/her perception in order to respond to the new situation. The Chinese aspectual marker 了–le is “contextually efficient” in discourse (Wu 2001: 270).

With the notion of “cue of a change” expressed in the aspectual marker 了–le, I turn to example (27), which involves 了–le in the bā construction.

(27) 陈满小姐，你一定觉得我很不识相。

Chēnmǎn xiǎo-jǐě nǐ yì-dīng jué-de wǒ hěn bú shì-xiàng

Name Miss you must feel I very not understand-face

你已經把話講得很清楚了，我還要寫信來。

nǐ yī-jǐng bā huà jiāng de hěn qīng-chù le wǒ hái yào xiě-xìn lái

you already BA words talk EXT very clear ASP I still want write-letter come

‘Miss Chen Man, you must have felt that I am not tactful. You have already made yourself very clear, and I still write this letter to you.’

(Quartet 2003)

The letter to Miss Chen comes from the speaker, a persistent admirer. Miss Chen had previously told him in a straightforward manner that she cannot marry him unless he also accepts her late sister’s son, for whom she is responsible. This context reveals multi-aspects of Chinese culturally embedded expectations in that Miss Chen refused her admirer
based on the assumption that he would not accept a son who is not his own biological son, and with understanding that she feels sorry for the admirer even if he accepts the son because of her; the admirer assumes that Miss Chen refused him based on other reasons, yet he politely addresses her in the format of a letter to show his apology if she finds his persistence rude, and to indicate his understanding of her signal of change of situations.

colloca

In the utterance in (27) that contains 了–le, the speaker acknowledges that Miss Chen has already stated her position and expects him to leave her alone, a cue for as in his action: to stop seeing her. The sentence with the bā construction occurs after his polite apology, he says “you must have felt I am not tactful” and before he says “I still write this letter to you.” The context gives the subtle interpretation that he either gets or rejects the signal from her to update their situation.

Two key phrases are registered in this discourse segment, one preceding and one following sentence using the bā construction. The phrase 不識相 bú shì-xiàng ‘not-know/understand face’ translated into “not tactful, not knowing how to avoid embarrassments,” appears in the first sentence. To act based on what the speaker signals or implies is an important strategy of “face-saving” understanding in Chinese cultural context. The second key phrase is the adverbial in the sentence following the bā construction: 還要 hái yào ‘still want.’ Both phrases suggest that the speaker assumes that Miss Chen thinks the speaker does not get or rejects her cue or signal, and still acts in a persistent manner. The cue of change with respect to this situation is carried out through the use of the aspectual marker 了–le, which exhibits an important contextual value in relation to both the prior utterance and the following utterance. Her statement signals her admirer to update the circumstance of their situation and act accordingly, since there will
now be a little boy involved if they want to continue dating and get married. The resultant state is coded in the stative adjective 很清楚 hěn qīng-chǔ ‘very clear’ and the aspectual marker 了–le marks the discourse function of cue for a change in (27).

The next aspectual marker I will discuss is the tentative “V-一 yi-V”, “一 yi-V “ or “V-yixia 一下” construction that indicates the speaker’s wish for the indicated brief action to take place quickly, immediately. There are 14 tokens of this marker in the colloquial and cooking discourse corpus, two examples follow in (29) and (30).

The “V-yi-V” tentative construction in (28a), in which ‘一 yi’ means ‘one,’ in (29) can also render the reading in the form of reduplicated verbs 撿撿 ‘jiān-jiān’ (pick-pick) in (29b). This reduplicated form or V-yi-V tentative construction carries the couched message of the speaker: the chore of selecting the garlic will not take much time and therefore can be conducted quickly by the addressee. In other words, the event of selecting garlic is disposed of under a rather abstract notion of disposal.\(^9\) When the chore of selecting garlic is complete, then the chore will be disposed of. The collocated adverbial use of 趕快 gān-kuài ‘make haste, quickly’ also suggests the delimitative aspect of this construction.

(28)  a. 你趕快把大蒜頭撿一撿。  
       b. 你趕快把大蒜頭撿撿。

       nǐ gān-kuài bā dà-suàn-tóu jiān-jiān  nǐ gān-kuài bā dà-suàn-tóu jiān-jiān
you hurry BA big-garlic pick-one-pick you hurry BA big-garlic pick-pick

‘Quickly select the garlic!’ ‘Quickly select the garlic!’

(cooking show 2004)

\(^9\) Thanks to Dr. Michael Hegarty for helping me to clarify this concept. In addition, this type of abstract completion can be compared to the inseparable prefix of er- in German, which denotes the result is generated within brevity of time.
Li and Thompson note that reduplicated verb morphemes signal delimitative aspect, which indicates the performance of an action over a very short period of time (1981: 489-90). They also point out that “if the verb being reduplicated is one signalling an activity leading to a natural end point…the delimitive aspect may suggest ‘trying to (verb)’” (234). This statement implicitly supports my observation above from the collocated adverbial “quickly” because the speaker uses an imperative sentence with a tentative construction to suggest the addressee to try to select the garlic, since the chore of selecting garlic can be easily conducted, in the sense of temporal relation and degree of disposal. This also explains why in (28) the real entity that is disposed of is the chore of selecting garlic.

The expression of 一下 yi-xià ‘in a short while’ is used after a verb to indicate a brief action.\footnote{This brevity of action is parallel to the expression of mal in guck mal ‘take a look’ in German.} They both refer to a brief period of time, similar to English expressions ‘a bit’, ‘a while’, as indicated by Li Y. H. (2001). This is evidenced in (29).

\begin{Verbatim}[boxed]
(29) 去把桌子弄一下。
qù bā zhuō-zí nòng yi-xià

‘Go set the table.’ (Quartet 2003)
\end{Verbatim}

Setting: mother is almost done with cooking. Her daughter is in the dining room.
Participants: mother speaking to daughter

The mother asks the daughter to go set the table. The expression 一下 yi-xià ‘in a short while, (at) once’ in (29) also postulates cognitive operations on the part of the speaker: the act of setting the table does not take much time and can be done quickly. This construction
involves a cognitive imprint similar to the “have/take a N” construction in English. English has the expression of “have/take a sip” or “have/take a glance,” but not “*have/take an eat” or “*have/take a view” because the conceptual content of the activity of slipping and glancing is rapid and casual, rather than meal-length or panorama length.

Finally we consider the aspectual marker 著-zhe, a marker of durative aspect (Li and Thompson 1981, Liu 1997), which represents a continuous and stable situation without regard to endpoint. It conveys both stative and resultative meanings (Jaxontov 1988, Liu 1997, Sybesma 1999). Pan, Hoektra and Mulder, and Sybesma (all in Sybesma 1999: 94-6) conclude that 著-zhe is a result denoting predicate. Chao (1968) labels 著-zhe as a “phase complement,” due to its etymological relation with 著 zhao ‘putting on or wearing clothes.’ Both 著-zhe and 著 zhao are depicted with the same orthographic form. The extension sense of stative 著-zhe also performs the durative stative event – the phase of wearing clothes– but in the temporal domain. It is also this stativizing feature that allows the instantiation with 老 lǎo ’always.’ I will introduce this aspect with constructed examples in (30) and (31), and two examples from the colloquial data in (32) and (33). These two examples are the only two tokens in my corpus data.

(30)  a. 奶奶老把廁所佔著。

\[
\text{nǎinai} \quad \text{lǎo} \quad \text{bā} \quad \text{cèsuō} \quad \text{zhàn} \quad \text{zhe}
\]

grandma always BA toilet occupy-ASP

‘Grandma always occupies the bathroom.’
(31)  b. 奶奶把眼睛老閉著。

\[
\text{nǎinai bā yǎnjīng lào bì zhe}
\]

grandma BA eyes always close-ASP

‘Grandma always closes her eyes.’

(constructed examples)

No specific time at which the state described in (30) and (31) is mentioned. Rather, the habitual activity occurs at several temporal points referential to the time of the utterance or each encounter point between the observer (speaker) and observed, or at a “context-determined time period in the past” (Jaxnotov 1988). The use of 老 lào ‘always’ exhibits the grandma’s habitual performance of an event. My analysis of 著-zhe is visually displayed in Figure 4.6.

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 4.6: Two Interpretations of Aspectual Marker 著-zhe**

Both (a) and (b) in Figure 4.6 describe a resultative state denoted by the predicate and further emphasized by the adverbial element 老 lào ‘always’. The action can be ongoing, and 著–zhe usually co-occurs either with another adverbial adjunct 正 zhèng ‘be V-ing,’ or
auxiliary 在 zài ‘extential “at”’. I will not further discuss the progressive 著 –zhe here, since I focus on the resultative marker 著 –zhe in the bā-RC. To sum up, two different 著“-zhe”’s appear in distinctive contexts: one marks progressive and denotes an ongoing action and the other predicates a result. Most of the time, the latter one co-occurs with a bā-RC that has a stative reading.

(32) 你不能把老公小孩放著不管，把寺廟當成家啊！


nǐ bù-néng bā lāo-gōng xiǎo-hái fàng zhe bù-guǎn bā sì-miào dāng-chéng jiā a

you cannot BA husband child put ASP not-care BA temple regard as home PRT

‘You cannot put your husband and children aside, and regard the temple as home!’  

(Quartet 2003)

The mother tries to persuade her daughter to spend more time taking care of her family instead of practicing religion. The expression coded in (34) involves a spatial metaphor. It depicts a metaphorical scene of the agent’s volitionally putting her husband and children aside, i.e., ignoring them. The durative marker 著- zhe signifies a duration of time that the agent acts in such a way. The verb 放 fāng ‘to put’ that occurs with this durative marker profiles the degree of affectedness of the segment Y, i.e., the husband and children of the addressee, by construing the role of Y as physical objects that can be put away. The resultant construal of being put away for a period of time forms a metaphorical expression of ignoring.

(33) 我們現在把魚這樣拿著。


wǒ-mén xiàn-zài bā yú zhè-yàng ná-zhe

we now BA fish this (manner) hold-ASP

‘We take the fish like this now.’  

(cooking show 2004)
This durative marker 著 –zhe denotes not only durative but also progressive aspect because of the presence of the temporal modifier “now” in (35), where the chef instructs the addressee to hold the fish in the way he demonstrates.

4.3.2.2 Locative Complement

The resultative elements that constitute the bā-RC are also found in locatives. The locative construction element usually begins with 在 zài ‘extential “at”’, which Chen (in Sybesma 1999) argues functions like the aspectual marker 著–zhe, which stativizes the action. Sybesma followed Kung’s analysis, referring to 在 zài ‘extential “at”’ as “the result denoting predicate” (1999: 101) and categorizing it under “locative resultatives.” The corpus data contains 12 tokens of the bā construction, which 在 zài ‘extential “at”’ expression co-occurs. See Figure 4.7. for the distribution with the collocated verbs with 在 zài ‘extential “at.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collocated verbs with 在 zài ‘extential “at”’</th>
<th>distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>放 fàng ‘to put’</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>關 guān ‘to imprison (in)’</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>塗 tú ‘to apply (on)’</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>加 jiā ‘to add (onto)’</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>藏 cáng ‘to hide (at)’</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>留 liú ‘to leave (at, in)’</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.7: Collocated Verbs with 在 zài ‘extential “at”’ in the bā Construction

Six out of these 12 utterances are collocated with the verb 放 fàng ‘to put’: two construct a metaphorical location, and four are used for a physical location. The other collocated verbs are 關 guān ‘to imprison (in)’, 塗 tú ‘to apply (on)’, 加 jiā ‘to add (onto)’, 藏 cáng ‘to hide (at)’, and 留 liú ‘to leave (at, in).’ Notice that these collocated verbs require a locative
in order to construct a complete spatial construal. Follow the visual trace of how the chef holds the vegetable and then places it on top of the cutting board. All these uses suggest that the bā construction involves locational resultatives in the segment Z that are expressed through these verbs in combination with 在 zài ‘be “at”’ See example (34).

(34) 然後我們把菜放在沾板上面。

\[
\text{rían-hòu wǒ-men bă cài fàng zài zhān-băn shăng-miàn}
\]

then we BA vegetables put at cutting-board up-surface

‘Then we put the vegetables on the top of the cutting board.’

(cooking show 2004)

This example shows that the bā construction involves the notion of directionality or motion, which corresponds to the intrinsic meaning the morpheme bā has: [DO TO]. This notion of directionality allows locational resultatives in the bā construction. It also explains why the bā construction allows directional complements in segment Z, which I will turn to in the following section.

4.3.2.3 Directional Complements

There are 66 corpus tokens that contain directional complements in segment Z of the bā construction. The Mandarin Chinese directional complements consists of two elements shown as below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element 1</th>
<th>Element 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>shàng xià jìn chū qǐ huí guò</td>
<td>来 lái ‘come’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up down in out rise return pass</td>
<td>去 qù ‘go’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.8: Directional Complement Structure
In Figure 4.9, I list examples of the directional complements and also included the 7 tokens that have V+ 到 –dào ‘to arrive, to’ in the same category, because of the shared notion of directionality it involves.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directional Complement</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>起来 qǐlái ‘rise-come: be up’</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>出来 chūlái ‘exit-come: come out’</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>回来 huílái ‘return-come: come back’</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>下來 xiàlái ‘descend-come: come down’</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>過來 guòlái ‘pass-come: across, come over’</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>進來 jìnláí ‘enter-come: ’</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V 來 lái + V 去 qù</td>
<td>2 + 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>進去 jìnqù ‘enter-go: enter, go inside’</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>出去 chūqù ‘exit-go: exit, go out’</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>回去 huíqù ‘return-go: return, go back’</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>上去 shàngqù ‘up-go: go up’</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>過去 shàngqù ‘pass-go: across, go over’</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V 到 dào ‘to arrive (to/at)’</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V 進 N jìn ‘enter, in’ + V 回 N huí ‘return’</td>
<td>1+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.9: Directional Complements in the bā Construction Corpus Data**

Before I start to discuss the directional complements, the directionals 起 qǐ ‘to (get/stand) up, to rise’ (prototypically as facing toward the speaker) and 去 qù ‘to go’ (away from the speaker) cannot occur together because of the incompatible conceptual orientation they evoke. One cannot face toward the speaker, and move away from the speaker at the same time. Both 上 shàng ‘up’, and 起 qǐ ‘to rise, to stand up’ evoke a vertical rising scene in a spatial domain.
The example 上來 shàng lái ‘up-come: come up here,’ illustrated in Figure 4.10, is a command or invitation from the speaker in the tree; this example demonstrates that the speaker wants the addressee to come [UP] [TOWARD THE SPEAKER] in the tree. The image schema evoked in 上 shàng ‘up’ is that an entity moves or acts up toward the Construer, in this case the speaker. The motion or direction [UP] being viewed is construed from the Construer’s vantage point (see Figure 4.10 in bold). Notice two participants are involved in the example of 上來 shàng lái ‘up-come: come up here.’

In the example diagrammed in Figure 4.11, only one participant is involved in the scene. The image schema of 起來 qǐ lái ‘rise-come: stand up, get up’ evokes a rising up scene of an animate entity. The scene of rising is either from a seated or prone position to a standing position. Such a scene can also be applied to a four-legged animal moving from lying down to standing on four legs.
The major difference between the directional 上 shàng ‘up’ and the positional 起 qǐ ‘to rise’ is that the image schema of 上 shàng ‘up’ involves a goal or destination, such as “come upstairs,” or “come up (to the tree)” as Figure 4.10 suggests, while that of 起 qǐ ‘to rise’ does not. The image schema of 起 qǐ ‘to rise’ involves one animate participant rising from a seated or recumbent position.

I will demonstrate the notion of directionality in discussion of examples in (35), (36) and (37).

(35) 然後特別把牛肉的香味燉出來。

răn-hòu tè-bié bǎ niú-ròu de xiāng-wèi dūn-chū-lái

then especially BA ox-meat POSS smell stew-out-come

‘Then we especially (have to) stew until the aroma of the beef comes out.’

(cooking show 2004)

The bà sentence in (35) is cooking instructional discourse example that portrays the emergent motion of the aroma as a result of stewing the beef. The chef wants the addressee to take special notice to stew the beef until its aroma comes out in the air and can be perceived an aroma. The directional complement 出來 chū-lái ‘out-come: to come out’ construes a scene in which the smell first comes out of the beef as it cooks, and then comes toward the speaker. This analysis conforms to Tai’s Principle of Temporal Sequence rule (see discussion in Chapter 1, section 1.6.7.1).

The interpretation of (35) demonstrates that the directional complement also codes a resultant state that serves the purpose of instructional discourse. Kimura posits that directional complements demonstrate resultative aspect (1984: 291-3). The example in (36) involves literal movement, fictive motion, and culturally embedded expectations.
(36) 到時候大伯如果要把孩子全要回去怎麼辦?

dào-shí-hòu dà-bó yào bā hái-zi quán yào huí qù zěn-me bàn

till-then big-uncle if want BA children all want return go how do

‘What about if then the uncle wants to take all the children back, then what should we do?’

(Quartet 2003)

Setting: in the living room
Participants: Grandparents and their daughters are talking about the grandsons

Both parents of the children being discussed have died, and children are with their maternal grandmother. Grandma is worried that their uncle, the elder brother of her late son-in-law, wants to take all the children back. The motion of 回去 huí-qù ‘return-go: go back’ not only shows the physical orientation of taking back but also indicates the cultural understanding that children belong to the paternal side in Chinese society. The use of 回 huí ‘to return’ indicates that children would be returning to a place where they traditionally belong not to a place from which they physically came; 去 qù ‘to go’ indicates that the children will move away from the speaker, i.e., their maternal grandmother. Grandma is worried about the possible result that might happen.

The use of the modal auxiliary 要 yào ‘to want’ provides further evidence to demonstrates that the bā construction in (36) is about an event of doing something. If we replace the bā construction with [DO SO], 這樣做 zhè-yàng zuò ‘this-do: do so’, and (36) will be translated into “what about if the uncle wants to do so, then we should we do” in (37). See the replacement of the bā construction with [DO SO] predicate in the underlying bold fonts below.
到時候大伯如果要這樣做，怎麼辦？

‘What about if then the uncle wants to do so, then what should we do?’

(Quartet 2003)

The conceptual content of the event is what is characterized in segment Z: taking the children back. This idea of [DO SO] seems to correspond to an imperative construction, for example in (38), conveys.

(38) 把這個紅包拿到裡面給園長說…

‘Take this red envelope to the inside and give it to the principal, and say …’

(Quartet 2003)

Setting: In dad’s car
Participants: Dad wants the son to take the red envelope inside to the orphanage

The example in (38) demonstrates four intrinsic semantic features involving motion and action: (1) [DO], (2) [DIRECTIONALITY], (3) [PATH -- RESULT], and (4) [SERIAL VERB], i.e., V-V-V. The first feature is intrinsic to the nature of an imperative sentence: the father asks the son to perform an action. The second feature is the directionality coded in 拿到 nádào ‘take-arrive: to take to’, with the direction being from inside of the car to inside of the orphanage. This term describes the path that is followed along the direction, and has the locational resultative as its goal, i.e., the inside of the orphanage. The fourth
feature is the serial verb construction employed in (40): (V-) take this to the inside, (-V-) give it to the principle, and (-V) say as requested. The serial verb construction also has iconic motivation and obeys Tai’s PTS rule (see Chapter 1, section 1.6.7.1).

4.3.2.4 Double Object Construction 給 gēi

Double object construction (39) 給 gēi ‘to give’ involves a giver, a recipient and an object being transferred from the giver’s sphere of control to the recipient’s sphere of control; see the schematic diagram of literal “give” in Figure 4.12. The result shown in the recipient’s sphere is a possession relation, which the beneficiary, i.e., the recipient, will HAVE the entity. This construction is similar to English examples “give” (40).

Newman (1993, 1996) has undertaken a cognitive linguistic study of the verb GIVE in several languages, including Mandarin Chinese. He defines the semantic primitive of GIVE as a person who possesses something or has something in his/her hand and transfers that thing to a recipient who then possesses it or has it in his/her hand. The sphere of transferal of a physical object from A to B is sketched in Figure 4.12.

![Figure 4.12: Literal Use of “Give”](modified from Newman 1996: 157)
The trajector, i.e., the giver, transfers a thing indicated as LM1 (landmark 1) to the recipient as LM2 (landmark 2). The heavy line of the arrow indicates the transferal that is profiled in the event of giving.

(39)  

a. 請給我一杯咖啡。

\[ qīng gěi \ wǒ yī bēi kā-fěi \]

please give I one cup coffee

‘Please give me a cup of coffee.’

b. 請把一杯咖啡給我。

\[ qīng bā yī bēi kā-fěi gěi wǒ \]

please BA one cup coffee give I

‘Please give one cup of coffee to me.’

c. 請把那杯咖啡給我。

\[ qīng bā nà bēi kā-fěi gěi wǒ \]

please BA that cup coffee give I

‘Please give/pass that cup of coffee to me.’

→ Please do the event for me.

←This event is passing the coffee to me.

(40)  Please give me a cup of coffee.

(41)  Please pass that/?a cup of coffee to me.

The Mandarin Chinese example in (39a) is a double object 給 gěi construction, in which 給 gěi is a verb to mean ‘to give.’ In terms of cognitive grammar, the trajector, the interlocutor/ giver, is requested to perform the task of transferring a cup of coffee, i.e., landmark 1, to the speaker/ recipient, i.e., landmark 2. During the transferal event
requested, the notion of [DIRECTIONALITY] or the cognitive path of the action (indicated in the heavy line of the arrow in Figure 4.12) proceeds from the giver’s hand to where the coffee is located, then on to the recipient.

The context for the appropriate utterance of (39a) could be a coffee shop, restaurant or at home where the speaker’s request for a cup of coffee is welcome. The sense of [DIRECTIONALITY] is not morphologically marked in Mandarin Chinese verb 給 gěi, but the meaning does involve a transferal event of [DIRECTIONALITY], which is further evidenced in (39c), the bā construction that incorporates the 給 gěi phrase. I consider that the gěi in (39c) as a verb ‘to give’ with both benefactive [FOR] and recipient [TO] interpretations. The speaker asks the interlocutor to do a particular thing for him/her, which is to pass a cup of coffee to him/her. Therefore, the notion of [DIRECTIONALITY] in (39c), in my opinion, can be interpreted on two levels: (1) performing a task that is benefactive to the speaker: [DO] this [FOR] the speaker; (2) this event of giving involves a mental trace of an object transferal [TO] the recipient who is also a beneficiary. The first sense of [DIRECTIONALITY] involves the imperative bā construction with the gěi phrase (39c), in which bā predicate presupposes an action of [DO] and this action is indicated in the co-predicate benefactive gěi phrase: [GIVE FOR]. The second sense of [DIRECTIONALITY] portrays a basic schematic representation of a transferal event shown in (39a) and (39c): [GIVE TO].

What differentiates (39b) from (39c) is the indefinite noun phrase, i.e., one cup of coffee. Li and Thompson posit that the bā noun phrase is generally either “definite or generic” (1981: 465; italics is original). Even when the bā noun phrase is indefinite, it
refers to a specific entity that the speaker has in his/ her mind, but the addressee does not necessarily know. The example I have mentioned in 4.2.5 is discussed in (42).

(42) 我不小心把一個小孩撞傷了。

\[ wō bù xiǎo-xīn bā yī gè xiǎo-hái zhùāng-shāng-le \]

I not careful BA one-CL child hit - injure-ASP

‘I injured a child accidentally by hitting him with my car.’ (Wu 1998: 139)

The \( bā \) noun phrase, i.e., a child, refers to a specific entity in the speaker’s mind since the speaker performed the act of hitting and this event involves a child hit by him. This child is not known by the addressee, but is known as a specific entity by the speaker. In such case, the \( bā \) noun phrase can occur in the form of an indefinite noun with a specific semantic value in the speaker’s mind. In (39b), the coffee referred to does not possess this specific semantic feature; therefore, it cannot co-occur with the \( bā \) construction. When an indefinite noun phrase without a specific entity being referenced, the form in (39a) and (41) is more natural. In (42), the event of passing an object to the speaker involves a presupposed specific entity; therefore, the co-occurrence with an indefinite noun phrase is infelicitous, and less natural.

Moreover, in order to show the dative element that registers in the verb \( gěi \), I will also compare to German \( geben \) in (43).

(43) Bitte geben mir eine Tasse Kaffee.

Please give to me one/a cup coffee

‘Please give me one/a cup of coffee.’

The verb \( geben \) always co-occurs with the dative case, in (43) \( mir \) ‘(to) me’. In general, the dative case marks indirect objects or nouns having roles of recipient, beneficiary, or
possessor of an item. I consider this dative element involves [DIRECTIONALITY] of receiving and obtaining the possession of an object. My view corresponds to Smith’s (1987) semantic analysis of dative and accusative cases in German. He states, “DAT[IVE] participants as entities which either gain or lose possession of a concrete physical patient” (1987: 366). In (43), the interpretation is about gaining possession of a concrete object, i.e., one cup of coffee. Smith further claims that this gain relationship is construed in an abstract sense, in which “the patient [is] conceived to abstractly move into DAT[IVE] entity’s realm of mental control” (ibid: 366-7; bold emphasis is mine). In my opinion, the gain relation moves into the dative element mir ‘to me’ in (43) and becomes “my” possession in (43). The sense of [DIRECTIONALITY] is even stronger in his use of the words of “move into,” which I emphasized in bold above. The dative element thus demonstrates the cognitive path as traced to the recipient.

The examples in (44) and (45) provide two colloquial uses of the gěi phrase in the bà construction. The example of (44) is an imperative sentence, and (45) is a declarative sentence that reports an event that the speaker doesn’t think it will happen in the current situation.

(44) 趕快把慈濟劃撥帳號給我。

găn-kuài bà cí-jì₁¹ huà-bō zhàng-hào gěi wǒ

quickly BA CIJI wire-account-no. give I

‘Give me the CIJI wire account number quickly.’ (Quartet 2003)

The speaker is the addressee’s elder sister; their relative positions in the family and societal hierarchy permits an imperative command in such a situation. The speaker asks her sister

---

¹¹ Tsz-ji (ciji) is a Budhist organization
to give her the account number so that she can donate some money to this particular organization; the wire account number has the status of shared activated information in prior discourse. Here, the [DO IT] bā event includes a verbal gěi phrase that demonstrates a cognitive path of a transferal event with a resultant construal of the speaker’s mental state, i.e., the desire to possess the wire account number.

However, I consider the example in (46) to show a definite benefactive reading in the morpheme 给 gěi that collocates with 嫁 jià ‘to marry (to a man)’, although it also overlaps with a recipient interpretation.

(46) 不過以我現在的經濟能力，老闆和老闆娘

*bú-guò yǐ wǒ xiàn-zài de jīng-jī néng-lì lǎo-bān hàn12 lǎo-bān-niáng*

but based on I now POSS finance ability boss and boss-wife

一定不肯把女兒嫁給我。

*yì-dìng bù-kěn bā nǚ’ér jià gěi wǒ*

sure not-agree BA daughter marry for/to I

‘But based on my current financial ability, the boss and his wife surely won’t allow their daughter to marry me.’

(Quartet 2003)

→ Boss and his wife won’t allow this event to happen/ won’t do this event for me.

← This event is that their daughter gets married to me.

The first reason for a benefactive reading is that the morpheme 给 gěi is never compounded with 娶 qǔ ‘to marry (a woman)’13 since when a man marries a woman, he

---

12 In Taiwan, most people pronounce 和 ‘and’ as hàn rather than hé.
takes her away from her natal family; as evidenced in the decomposed meaning in the written character: the upper part 取 qū ‘to take’ and the bottom part 女 nǚ ‘woman.’ That is to say, the agent is taking a woman away just as if she were a commodity, given to a recipient, and therefore in his possession. The term 嫁 jià ‘to marry (a man)’ is written by combining the characters for the woman 女 nǚ and home 家 jiā. This combination also has the man become a recipient and a beneficiary of marriage. This collocation of 嫁 jià ‘to marry (a man)’ and 給 gěi ‘to/for, to give’ exemplifies a relationship among Chinese culture, cognition, and grammar. Such a relation falls within the realm of ethnolinguistics (Wierzbicka 1979, Enfield 2002) because this relation demonstrates a “direct symbolization of culture-specific conception” (Langacker 1994).

Based on this concept, the speaker in (43) construes an imagic scene that his boss and his wife will not allow an event to happen, i.e., for their daughter to marry the employee. This scene is profiled on the resultant construal of the speaker’s mental space that the daughter is not going to be married to him because her parents will not permit. All of the intrinsic meanings that 給 gěi evokes seem to correspond to Newman’s interpretations of 給 gěi ‘to give’ (1993, 1996): to give, recipient ‘to’, benefactive ‘for’, passive marker, agentive marker.

13娶 qū ‘to marry (a woman)’ is only compounded with 到 dào ‘to arrive’ as in the example as follows. This example demonstrates that a woman is metaphorically portrayed as a commodity that can be possessed and held as her husband’s hand indicated as one’s possession. Also, the woman is married away from her own family, and “arrives” at her husband’s family.

他終於把她娶到(手)了。
他 shì 她 tā 娶-了 qǔ-dào (shǒu) le
he finally BA she marry-arrive (hand) ASP
‘He finally married her.’

14嫁 jià ‘to marry (a man)’ is also used when a more feminine male homosexual marries a more masculine one.
4.3.2.5 Inalienable Possession

Lü (1955) calls sentences like those in (47) “retained object constructions,” which were later labeled “part-whole” by Thompson (1973). I will use the term “inalienable possession” (Sybesma 1999) to refer to the postverbal constituent as participating in an inalienably-possessed relation to segment Y in the bā construction. For example, in (47a), the ‘leg’ 腿 tuǐ necessarily belongs to the person Li Si 李四 Lǐsì, just as in (47b) the ‘skin’ 皮 pí belongs to the tangerine 橘子 jú-zi. (47a) is adapted from Sybesma (1999: 137 example 15b) and (47b) from Lü (1955).

(47)  a. 他把李四打斷了腿。

\[ tā bā Lǐsì dā-duàn le tuǐ \]

‘He broke Li Si’s leg from beating.’

b. 他把橘子剝了皮。

\[ tā bā jú-zi bō le pí \]

‘He peeled the skin off the tangerine.’

Sybesma identified this type of sentences as “Inal.poss/ part-whole bā sentences” (1999: 136). The 斷腿 duàn-tuǐ ‘broken-leg’ resulted from the action of hitting and the 皮 pí ‘skin ’ was peeled off of the orange. Both small clauses denoted in (47a) and (47b), 腿斷了 tuǐ duàn le ‘leg-broken-ASP: leg was broken’ is construed as a result of the agent’s beating, and in (47b) 皮剝了 pí bō le ‘skin-peeled-ASP: skin was peeled’ is construed as a result of the agent’s peeling, denote a result.
Since my corpus data is Mandarin Chinese spoken in Taiwan, which does not have this type of ｂａ construction, there are no corpus tokens of this type of sentence. I mention this type of ｂａ –c because it provides further evidence for the resultant construal of the ｂａ construction, and it follows Tai’s whole-before-part conceptual relation: he-leg and orange-skin.

4.3.2.6 Durative and Frequentative

My analysis of the ｂａ-RC is further confirmed by the use of durative and frequentative expressions in the ｂａ construction to indicate the duration and frequency of time in performing an action with reference to the result; in other words, stativizing the event. The semantic interpretation in (48a) and (48b) presents the result as having a passive reading: (48a) “that page was read for three hours,” and (48b) “she was kissed once.” Jelina Li (1997: 192-4) claimed that the post-ｂａ is a passive verb that does not assign an external theta-role. I will not discuss the passive here, but it is necessary to point out that the reading into a passive sentence actually represents an embedded small clause that denotes a result.

(48) a. 他把那一頁看了三小時。

\[ \text{他 BA that one page read-ASP three hours} \]

‘He has read that page for three hours.’

b. 他把她親了一下。

\[ \text{他 BA she kiss-ASP one-quantifier} \]

‘He kissed her once.’

(constructed examples)
We can conclude from the discussion above that the \textit{bā} construction always carries the meaning of a resultative state, a stative state within a time frame, either describes an event at a pertinent point or an event that is ongoing at the time of its utterance.

4.3.2.7 Regard Predicate \textit{dāngchéng} “regard as”

Twenty tokens in the corpus have a predicate that consists of 當成 \textit{dāng-chéng} ‘regard-become: regard as, see as’, 當作 \textit{dāng-zuò} ‘regard as’, \textit{V 成 V-chéng} ‘(action)-become’, \textit{V 為 V-wéi} ‘(action)-be: V as’. I will tentatively label these verbal compounds as “regard predicates” since all involve one thing regarding another. Regard predicates involve two arguments: (1) the thing or event being regarded or done and, (2) the thing or event being regarded. That is to say, the regard predicates involve two mental spaces to which the speaker refers. This is evidenced in (49), where a husband instructs his wife about child-raising.

(49) 你如果把養小孩當作是一種生意，
\begin{verbatim}
ní rú-guó bā yǎng xiǎo-hái dāng-zuò shì yī zhòng shēng-yì
you if BA raise child regard-as be one type business
\end{verbatim}

我向你保證，這一定是全世界最賠本的生意。
\begin{verbatim}
wǒ xiàng nǐ bāo-zhèng zhè yī-dìng shì quán-shì-jìè zuì péi-běn de shēng-yì
I face you guarantee this must be whole-world most loss POSS business
\end{verbatim}

不過養小孩不是做生意，它是一種親情的體驗。
\begin{verbatim}
bú-guò yǎng xiǎo-hái bú-shì zuò-shēng-yì tā shì yī zhòng qīn-qíng de tǐ-yàn
but raise child not-be do-business it be one type feelings POSS experience
\end{verbatim}
‘If you see/ take raising a child like running a business, I guarantee it will be a losing proposition. However, child-rearing is not running a business; it is a family emotional experience.’ (Quartet 2003)

Prior to this utterance, the wife had complained about the ‘job’ of being parents. She considers this type of job to be meaningless if the children always disobey their parents, and make them worry. The husband tries to persuade his wife by adopting her analogy of being parents as a kind of job. He then compares the event of raising a child to that of running a business, using a bā construction. The mental image of holding an event to compare to another event creates the partial semantic retaining of “to take, to hold” in the morpheme of bā in (49). This interpretation is similar to ‘take…as, regard … as’ in English expressions. According to Fauconnier (1995), the if p, then q form, formulation sets up a hypothetical space in contrast to a reality space. In this case, the reality space involves the event of raising a child, and the hypothetical space includes a hypothesis and a result of a losing business. Langacker (2005) elaborates the conceptualization of the hypothetical space. I utilize his elaboration in order to explain the regard predicate in the bā construction in (49).

![Hypothetical Space of “the event of raising a child”](modified from Langacker 2005)

$p :$ raising a child as running a business  
$q :$ a losing proposition/ business
The counterfactual hypothetical space carries a presupposition, which corresponds to the metaphor [BEING A PARENT IS LIKE BEING A BOSS (IN A DIFFICULT BUSINESS)] in the wife’s prior utterance. What brings the presupposed metaphorical extension of ‘business’ or ‘job’ to the event of raising a child is the morpheme 子。Its pivotal function links the center of the prior utterance to the hypothetical space.

4.3.2.8 V-得到 de-EXT Resultative Construction

Mandarin Chinese V-得到 de-EXT construction “to the degree that” is a construction that profiles the result of a particular action: -得到 de is translated as ‘to the degree that.’ There are 9 tokens of corpus utterances that contain V-得到 de-EXT form in a 子 construction; one of these is (50).

(50) 他把我們三個畫得好快樂哦！

\[
\text{tā bā wǒ-men sān-ge huà de hǎo kuài-lè e}
\]

he BA we three-CL draw DE very happy PRT

‘He draws the three of us as/to the degree of being very happy [in the picture].’

→ He performed the event of drawing the three people.

← The result of this event shows three happy people in the picture.

*(Quartet 2003)*

| Setting: on the grass in the country |
| Participants: Miss Chen, and her admirer are talking about her nephew’s picture of the three of them |
I interpret the morpheme ｂａ in (50) as [TO TAKE THE INITIATIVE]. The 4-year-old nephew of Miss Chen takes the initiative to draw a picture, and the result of this deliberate activity is a happy family picture. The result reflects the way the little boy perceives the relationship. The stative complement in the V-de-EXT construction of (50) construes a resultant state of a shared happy situation illustrated in the boy’s drawing.

4.3.2.9 Conclusion

The subsections of 4.3.2.1 to 4.3.2.8 present discussions of colloquial data to postulate the resultant construals evoked in the ｂａ construction. They are construed in the form of an aspectual marker, locative complements, directional complements, double object construction ｇｅｉ, inalienable possession, durative and frequentative, regard predicate, and V-de-EXT resultative construction. The resultant construals involved in segment Z of the ｂａ construction demonstrate a stativized result described in a situation, a resultant location in space, a spatial-orientation result of an action being done, the recipient or goal as a result in space, a possession relation with respect to segment Ｙ ascribed to a result, the resultant duration or frequency in terms of measuring an event, the resultant hypothetical space, and a resultative construction that profiles the result of an event. All these resultant construals are in relation to the segment ｂａ Ｙ, and discussed in the next section.

4.4 Segment ｂａ Ｙ in Ｘ ｂａ Ｙ Ｚ

This section examines the semantic nature of the segment of ｂａ Ｙ using cognitive and centering approaches. In section 4.3.1, I challenge the view that the morpheme ｂａ is semantically empty in the ｂａ construction, and propose instead that the connection of agency, cause and result is central to the semantics of ｂａ in the ｂａ construction. In section
4.3.2.1, I investigate the discourse status of segment Y using the centering discourse approach. In section 4.3.2.2, I will discuss the cognitive status of referents evoked in the segment of Y. The examples I examine are mostly from colloquial data, which I present along with pertinent discourse, situational and cultural knowledge context, because I consider that contextual reading is pivotal and crucial to understanding the communicative uses of bā construction.

**4.4.1 Meaning of bā in the bā Construction**

In section 4.2, I reviewed the conceptualization of bā in the bā-c. Since this section deals with the meaning of bā in the bā-c, I organize the discussion around two categories of explanation. One understands the morpheme bā in the bā-c to have been bleached of semantic content (Hashimoto 1971, Li 2001); the other considers that meaning persists denoting ‘to cause’ (Wu 1996, Sybesma 1999), ‘to bring out a result’ (Ding 2001), ‘to (have) initiate(d) and be in control of a resulting state’ or ‘to (have) receive(d) and be in a resulting state’ and ‘to cause/make somebody or something to undergo a process and a state that is resulted from that process’ (Li 2003: 74-5). My position is that the meaning persists, in line with Li’s analysis of the semantics of the morpheme bā in the bā-c. Additionally, I propose that agency underlies the communicative uses of the Mandarin Chinese bā construction, as it correlates to the active zone of what lexical bā has evoked.

**4.4.1.1 Active Zone of the Morpheme bā**

To preface my analysis of the bā construction as resultant construal in 4.4.1.2 to 4.4.1.4, I will review some essential points regarding conceptualizations of bā that were introduced in Chapter 3, and highlight the active zone designated in the morpheme bā evoked in the
First, the physical action verb 把 bā ‘to take, to hold’ consists of three stages: (1) a pre-conditioned act [GOING TO HOLD]; (2) a volitional action of [HOLDING]; and (3a) the [MANIPULATIVE STATE] of the affected object or (3b) [MOTION] or [DIRECTIONALITY], depending on the context. These three stages are illustrated in Figure 4.14. When these three stages are mapped onto the abstract domain of conceptual bā, the following interpretation can be drawn: (1) to cause; (2) to control, to take initiative, or to do; and (3a) to bring out a result, or (3b) the oriented result of a particular action.

![Figure 4.14: Active Zone of the Morpheme bā in the bā-c](image)

The active zones designated in the physical action verb 把 bā are the hand, represented by a circle in Figure 4.14, directed and controlled by the volition and intention of the agent; the agent acts with his/ her hand. The landmark construed as an object is represented as a square. The depiction of the square with its corners touching the inside of the circle is designated to show that the object is tightly held in the hand. The pre-conditioned act, stage 1, is projected in a larger image schema based on the event of holding. The force-dynamic domain of 把 bā is the volitional energy of controlling or holding in stage 2. The manipulative state of the affected object is indicated by the use of heavy lines in stage 3 of Figure 4.14. Depending on the context, mostly as related to the role of the segment X, the profile is sometimes shifted to the pre-conditioned act, i.e., stage 1, which leads to a causative reading in bā construction.
4.4.1.2 Central Meaning: To Cause and To Do/Bring out a Result

Following Ding (2001) and Li (2003), I propose that the two central meanings of 把 bā in the bā construction are ‘to cause’ and ‘to do and bring out a result.’ The profile of 把 bā as ‘to cause’ is designated at stage 1 of the verbal meaning; the profile of 把 bā ‘to do or to bring out a result’ shifts to stage 2 and stage 3 of the verbal meaning, which is the protoscene of the verb. This perspectival shift depends on the role of segment X in the bā-c. When segment X is an abstract object that serves as a reason for the subsequent resultant event, the profile designates the cause that contributes to the result. The morpheme bā is consequently interpreted as ‘to cause.’ This profile is evidenced in example (48).

(48) 不知道是不是[因為前面幾個姊姊的結婚
不] zhī-daò shì-bú-shì [yīn-wèi qián-miàn jǐ-ge jiě-jūn]
not know is-not-is [because front some elder sister POSS marriage

造成家庭的風波]，把[阿滿][嚇壞]還是怎樣。
zào-chéng jiā-tǐng de fēng-bō] bā [ā-măn] [xià-huài] hài-shì zēn-yàng
cause family POSS problem] BA [name] [frighten-bad] or what

[if the elder sister’s marriage caused the family problem]

年紀都快三十歲的她，還是單身。
nián-jì dōu kuài sān-shí suì de tā hài-shì dān-shēn
age all almost 30 year-old POSS she still single
‘Who knows if the elder sisters’ marriage caused the family problems that
frightened A-man [caused A-man to become/get frightened] or what. She is
almost 30 years old and still single.’
(narration, Quartet 2003)

This is a commentary made by an elder sister about her younger sister, A-man. The
narrator construes a possible event – problems with her elder sisters’ marriage -- as a
reason that might lead to the result of A-man’s still being single at 30 (traditionally
culturally a late age for a woman to marry). Example (48) fits well into a bû causative
construction, in which the segment X serves as a cause, Y as the affected, and Z as a result.
The morpheme bû in (48) is translated into ‘to cause’ or ‘to make.’ In example (49),
although segment X is an animate person, what is actually understood as cause is
something he said or did that made the other person so mad. Therefore, when the
linguistic expression evoked in the segment X within the given context is an event, the
morpheme bû means ‘to cause, to make.’ This interpretation agrees with what Li’s
statement: “when subject NP is expressed as inanimate thing, it means ‘to cause/ make
somebody or something to undergo a process and a state that is resulted from that process”
(2003: 75).

(49) (A saw B’s eyes were red.)
A: 怎麼了?

zên-me le

what  ASP

‘What’s wrong?’
B: [他]把[我][气死了]。

[tā] bā [wǒ] [qì] sì le

[he] BA [I] [(be) angry-death-ASP]

X: [he (what he did)]; Y: [I/me]; Z: [being so mad]

‘He got me so mad (angry to the extreme).’ ‘He made me so mad.’

→ He did/ said something.

← What he did/ said made me so mad.

A: 他又干嘛啦?

tā yǒu gàn má la

he again (do) what ASP

‘What did he do this time?’ (colloquial spoken data 2004)

The speaker B in (49) replies to A’s inquiry that she is so mad because of what he has done or said. This type of reply is conventionally understood as to invite the interlocutor to inquire what happened to the experiencer, in this case, speaker B. The presupposed action is the focus of A’s follow-up question in (49). B’s utterance not only carries the sentential meaning, but when spoken in this kind of context, also expresses “ask me what he has done to me that made me so mad!” B’s utterance in (49) presupposes that SOMETHING has BEEN DONE TO the experiencer, 我 wǒ (I/me), by the agent 他 tā (he). The capitalized words in the previous sentence represent what the speaker invites the interlocutor to ask about, because it is this SOMETHING that has made the experiencer so mad. The presupposition of an event that occurred previous to the exchange in (49) or other utterances of this type of bā sentence, uniquely distinguishes the bā construction from the other non-bā sentences.
The proto-scene that the physical verb 把  ‘to take, to hold’ evokes is [HOLDING] and the [MANIPULATED STATE] of the affected object. The affected object is included in the active zone of the physical verb 把  bā. The parallel reading on the abstract domain is [DO (TO/UPON)], [PRESUPPOSITION], and [RESULT]. In (50), for example, cooking instructional discourse requires the introduction of the ingredients prior to instructions for the cooking procedure. The segment Y, i.e., the salmon, is presupposed in the immediate context from mention in prior utterances and the appearance of the salmon on the TV screen. In the context of cooking instructional discourse, it is also expected that we will DO something TO this particular salmon to achieve the result of its ending up in pieces.

(50) 然後[我們]把[鮭魚][切好]。

then [we] BA [salmon] [cut well/finished]

X: [we]; Y: [salmon]; Z: [cut the salmon up; cut up pieces]

‘Then we cut the salmon up.’ (cooking show 2004)

→ We do something to the salmon.

← We cut the salmon up into pieces.

When the segment 把 Y is presupposed, the new information is in segment Z, i.e., the result of what is done to the salmon, to cause it to end up into pieces. The meaning of [DO (TO)] or [TO TAKE INITIATIVE] denoted in the morpheme bā does not suffice for this type of sentence. Instead, the meaning of [TO BRING OUT A RESULT] accounts for the semantic feature of resultant construal registered in the segment Z of the bā construction.
This also explain why colloquial cooking instructional discourse contains a high frequency of occurrence of the bã construction, where the new information is introduced in sentential-final position, i.e., the segment Z. Higher frequency of the bã-c appears often in cooking instructional discourse because (1) many kinds of manipulated-state change processes are involved in cooking, (2) the (grammatically) new information is present in the visual context that the speakers can assume that the hearers see. This scenario corresponds to the schematic profile in the proto-scene of bã.

Another peripheral meaning denoted in the morpheme bã in the bã construction is [TO TAKE INITIATIVE]. Segment X is a person, and segment Y is an inanimate thing; X is the head of transmission of the energy, and Y is where this energy sinks. Segment X is characterized with a volitional energy, i.e., usually a person, that controls or takes initiative to perform an activity on the object Y. This activity is described in segment Z.

(51) [你們]把[東西][放到哪裡去了]?

[nǐ-men] bã [dōng-xī] [fang-dào nǎ-lǐ qù le]

[you-PL] BA [stuff] [put/stow-to where go ASP]

X: [you (plural)]; Y: [stuff]; Z: [stow where]

‘Where did you stow that stuff?’ (Colloquial spoken data 2004)

Utterance (51) is a complaint about the subject (you-PL) not having properly stowed the stuff, with the result that the speaker was unable to find it. This type of utterance profiles the relation between “you-PL” and “stuff” via the morpheme 把 bã ‘to take the initiative.’ It can be accounted for either through the idea of volition or correlated to the notion of agency.
4.4.1.3 The Notion of Agency in the *bā* Construction

Mandarin Chinese is a “patient-oriented” language (Tai 1984, 1989, 2003), which means that the viewpoint of the affected patient is the primary perspective, such as in (52a) a passive without *bèi* (See chapter 2). In contrast, English expressions are mostly from the perspective of an agent (see interpretations (i), (ii), (iii), (iv), and (v)). Chinese language profiles on the result of *what has happened*, and English focuses on *who does what* (Tai 1989: 199), which in English it mostly involves a complete process and a result. The lack of the notion ‘agency’ in Mandarin Chinese motivates the *bā* construction, where the meanings of [TO TAKE INITIATIVE], [TO CAUSE], [TO DO AND BRING ABOUT A RESULT] can be transformed toward conveying into the meaning of agency in Mandarin Chinese.

(52)  a. 車子洗了。

*chē-zi xǐ le*

car wash-ASP

‘The event of washing the car is done/disposed.’

(i) I washed the car.

(ii) I had someone wash the car.

(iii) I went to the Car Wash and the car is washed.

(iv) Someone washed the car.

(v) Someone went the Car Wash and the car is washed.

---

15 The translation of (52a) is not equivalent to the English passive sentence “the car is washed.” Although the syntactic form is similar to an English passive sentence, however, semantically it perspectivzes on the event regarding to the noun phrase is done or disposed.
Mandarin Chinese makes use of the syntactic structure NP-VP, like (52a), in which the NP is an inanimate entity. It is often translated into a passive voice in English. In my opinion, the passive interpretation in English invokes the implicit agent who has conducted the event of washing the car, and what is explicit is that the event happened to the NP (the car), disposed by the implicit agent (or Car Wash).

(52)  b. [老哥]把[车子]洗了]。

\[
\text{[l"ao-g"e] b"a [ch"ezi] [xi le]}
\]

\text{[old-brother] BA [car] [wash-ASP]}

\begin{tabular}{l}
X: [Brother]; Y: [car]; Z: [washed] \\
\end{tabular}

\[ \text{‘Brother washed the car.’} \]
\[ \rightarrow \text{Brother did this event.} \]
\[ \leftarrow \text{This event is washing the car.} \quad \text{(Colloquial spoken data 2004)} \]

The notion of agency is not inherent in the semantics of the Mandarin Chinese transitive verb 洗 xì ‘to wash’ in (51a) as compared to the equivalent translation expression in English. However, within the mechanism of the bā construction in (52b), this additional element, the morpheme bā, perspectivizes the agency of brother’s disposing the event of washing the car. An appropriate context situation for this utterance would be the father saying that the brother took the initiative to wash the car because his daughter had not washed it, even though she had promised that she would. The expressed agent is not the one who was expected to dispose this event, i.e., the daughter; the agency of the action in (52b) is performed through the action of the girl’s father, the speaker’s brother. [The

16 The morpheme “old” here does not literally mean “old,” but serves as a prefix, as in 老妈 l"ao-m"a ‘old-mom: mom,” 老爸 l"ao-b"a ‘old-pa: dad,” and 老师 l"ao-sh"i ‘old-teacher: teacher.’]
daughter promised to do it but didn’t, so {brother washed the car}. The interlocutor, brother is presented as a counter-to-expectation marked agent. The intrinsic meaning of bà enhances the notion of agency through the mechanism of the bà construction. It is the notion of agency that distinguishes bà sentences from non-bà sentences. Therefore, I term this type of bà sentence as the agentive bà construction.

4.4.1.4 Conceptual Overlap: To Cause and To Do

Langacker defines conceptual overlap as “correspondences between component structures” (2003: 260). These component structures represent “overlapping fragments of the integrated composite conception artificially extracted from the whole for purposes of linguistic symbolization” (ibid.). Langacker then compares a construction to a collage, where component structures “overlap extensively yet fail to cover the entire canvas” (ibid.). To demonstrate this idea, Langacker analyzes the auxiliary verb do as profiling a fully schematic process as exemplified in (53) and as sketched in Figure 4.15.

(53) a. Did he finish?
   b. He DOES like her.  (Langacker 2003: 261)

According to Langacker (2003), in the do V construction in (53) and its schematic component structures in Figure 4.15, certain correspondences hold between salient elements of these component structures. The elaboration site of do is exhaustive of its semantic content, and the correspondences holding between the component structures demonstrate that its semantic value is “effectively invisible” (ibid.). In other words, the content verb, i.e., finish in (53a) and like in (53b), is equivalent to the content and the profiling composite expression. This equivalence often leads to the misleading conclusion that do has no meaning. However, Langacker considers that the auxiliary do is meaningful in that
it still has a highly schematic meaning which overlaps fully with the co-occurring elements, *finish* in (53a) and *like* in (53b). The conceptual integration in this case is so tight that the meaning of *do* makes no distinct difference from the other, *finish* or *like*, more meaningful content verb.

![Conceptual Overlap of do V Construction](Langacker 2003: 262)

**Figure 4.15: Conceptual Overlap of do V Construction**  
(Langacker 2003: 262)

Another example Langacker examines, the verbal *do* in (54), also demonstrates the conceptual overlap. The verbal *do* takes a nominal complement rather than a verbal form, and this nominal complement “implies some measure of causation or responsibility on the part of the [agent]” (Langacker 2003: 268).

(54) He *did* *a study/a dance/something/it*.

The agent in (54) carries out the event described in the object complement. Here the agent is responsible for this occurrence of the event, and can be interpreted as causation. Langacker further distinguishes the notion of [CAUSE] and [DO] in (55).
The diagram corresponding to (55a) is Figure 4.16, and that for (55b) is Figure 4.17. In (55a), Joe’s causation leads to the event: Bill quit. This cause is above and beyond Bill’s quitting. The trajector is the cause that constitutes the event indicated in the oval, profiled as the abstract landmark.

![Figure 4.16: [CAUSE]](Langacker 2003: 269)

Joe is the trajector indicated in heavy line circle, Joe’s profiled act of causation is indicated in the heavy dashed lines, and the abstract landmark indicated by the square is something that Joe caused, i.e., Bill’s quitting. Within the eventual landmark, Bill is indicated as the unprofiled light circle, as the agent who conducted the event of his volitional quitting. The landmark is an abstract thing “that consists of the reification of an event which may itself involve an act of causation on the part of the cause (e.g., the volitional act of Bill quitting)” (ibid.).

In (55b), however, the agent Bill is the individual who carries out the event of quitting. What distinguishes (55a) from (55b) is that the act of [DO] is no longer above or beyond the event of quitting, quitting here is the act of [DO]. The profiled trajector in Figure 4.17 (a) is identical to the one within the abstract landmark, unlike the case in Figure 4.16, where the two trajectors are distinct individuals. The profiled dashed line represents Bill’s act of quitting, and this quitting is identical to that in the reified event of doing; namely,
quitting is doing. If we map the identical trajectors onto the ones within the reified event, diagram (a) in Figure 4.17 becomes the scene in Figure 4.17 (b). Langacker states that (b) is a notational variant of (a).

![Diagrams of [DO] and [CAUSE]](image)

**Figure 4.17: [DO]**
(Langacker 2003: 269)

I compare the notion of [DO] and that of [CAUSE] in Figure 4.18 in order to clearly identify the roles within the reified event construed as the abstract landmark. I will later use this notion to further investigate the Mandarin Chinese *bâ* construction.

![Diagrams of [DO] and [CAUSE] with examples](image)

**Figure 4.18: [DO] and [CAUSE]**

In the diagram of [DO], the doing and what is done overlap conceptually, and this tight conceptual integration is indicated in Figure 4.17 (b). In Langacker’s words, “*do*
highlights the causative facet of some action and reifies that action overall as its landmark” (2003: 269). I use this notion to clarify the denotation of [DO] in bā; this doing and its manipulative state are conceptually reified overall as its landmark in segment Z in the Mandairn Chinese bā construction. In the diagram of [CAUSE] in Figure 4.16 or Figure 4.18 (b), the causation and the volitional act of doing are from different trajectors. The thing that Joe caused is Bill’s volitional act of quitting. This case can be applied in the bā analysis when the subject is the one who causes the reified event to occur. See further analysis is section 4.6.1.

4.4.2 Centering and Cognitive Referents of Segment Y

Segment Y in the bā construction is typically discussed in relation to the notion of “topic” (Chen 1983, Tsao 1987, Wu 1998). The analysis I present here, however, refutes the syntax based on “topic-comment” interpretation because it has resulted in confusion at the syntactic and pragmatic levels, and as such, has restricted a broader understanding of the grammar, meaning, and use of the morpheme bā. In section 4.4.2.1, I incorporate the centering discourse approach of Grosz, Joshi and Weinstein (1995), in order to model the local coherence of discourse in the discourse contextual uses of the bā construction. In section 4.4.2.2, I use theory Assumed Familiarity (Prince 1981, 1987) to approach the cognitive constraints of segment Y in the bā construction.

4.4.2.1 Centering Discourse Approach to Segment Y

To exemplify the application of the centering discourse approach, I return to the example (56), which discussed above in section 3.4.3 in Chapter 3. The context of this utterance is that the elder sister (O) inquires from her hospital bed about her children’s
situation; the youngest little sister (L) responded. The question the speaker O utters is a conventional question of parental concern, which implicitly involves both the situation (status of well-being) and the location of the children.

(56)

O: 孩子呢？

\textit{hái-zi ne?} \hspace{1cm} (QUESTION)

\textbf{kids PRT(question)}

‘What (and how) about kids?’

Y: 這個時間差不多快到家了。你放心，你在醫院的

\textit{Zhège shíjiàn chábùduō kuài dào jiā le. Nǐ fāngxīn. Nǐ zài yīyuàn de}

\textit{this-CL time almost soon arrive home ASP. you put-heart. you be at hospital DE}

這段時間噢，我會把他們都照顧得好好的。

\textit{zhè duàn shíjiān o, wǒ huì bā tā-men dōu zhào-gù de hǎohao de} \hspace{1cm} (ANSWER)

\textit{this-CL time PRT, I will BA them all take care EXT well DE.}

‘They will arrive home soon at this time. Don’t worry. During your stay in the hospital,

I will take good care of them.’ \hspace{1cm} (\textit{Quartet 2003})

| Setting: in O’s hospital room |
| Participants: L is the youngest little sister. Parents and siblings of the elder sister O visiting her in the hospital |

The question in (56) is comprised of a noun phrase \textit{孩子 háizi ‘kids’} and a question particle \textit{呢 –ne}. This question is uttered by the elder sister O, who is sick and
hospitalized. She inquires about her kids out of her concern and worry about them. The question uttered in context implies that the inquiry is about both the situation and the location of the children. The details that her younger sister supplies addresses both the location of the children – on their way home – and their state – about to be safely home. The youngest sister L wants to comfort her elder sister O, so that she will recuperate more quickly without having to worry about her children. The phrase 孩子 háizi ‘kids’ receives the immediate focus that is mostly centrally concerned in both conversational participants’ utterances. Speaker L further elaborates on the children’s situation when she instructs her elder sister not to worry because she will take responsibility to provide good care for her kids.

In (57) as below, I extend the analysis of the question-answer sequence in (56) further to show the centers to highlight the different demands for the inferences in these referred expressions, I separate the two parts of the answer with regard to the focus center “kids” in (57). The center of the discourse, 孩子 háizi ‘kids,’ is not overtly referenced in utterance (57L1), and is referred to with pronominal form 他們 tāmen ‘they, them’ in the bā construction in (57L2). Example (57) also includes the utterance by the middle sister (M), which immediately follows the bā construction utterance spoken by L, in order to examine the interaction among the forwarding-looking centers C_f and the backward-looking center C_b in the coherent sequence of conversational discourse. The social hierarchy of the speakers is ranked as follows: O > M > L. Speaker O is the eldest sister, speaker L is the youngest little sister, and speaker M is the middle sister.
R1: What and how about kids? [the location and situation of the kids]

L1: [I] will BA [them-kids] all [take care EXT well DE]

X Y Z

C_b

[pronoun-kids] taking good care

'I will take good care of them.' [situation of the kids]

M: 对啊！

duì ah

right PRT
[Ø] 說不定比你這個親生媽媽照顧得還好呢！

Ø [-kids] shuōbúdǐng bǐ nǐ zhège qīnshēng māma zhàogù de hái hǎo ne

‘Right! Maybe she can provide much better care [for the kids] than you, the birth mother (right now in your situation)!’

[C_b = the entity of kids = referent “them”]

The prompt for the utterance (57O) is situationally evoked in that the speaker has been separated from her kids because of her illness and hospitalization. The inference differences from the referred expressions for the kids are distinguished: the nominal form 孩子 háizi ‘kids’ in (57O), the optionally deleted form in (57L1), the pronominal form 他們 tāmén ‘they, them’ in (57L2), and the implied or optionally deleted form in (57M).

The information packaged in 孩子 háizi ‘kids’ in (57O), unlike the Ø and pronominal forms in (57L1) and (57L2) involves more than the meaning of “kids” themselves; it includes the conventional concern about both the location and situation of the kids that is implicit in the question asked in (57O). Both the omitted form marked as Ø in (57L1) and the pronominal form 他們 tāmen ‘they, them’ in (57L2) refer to the entity of “kids,” in response to the question in (57O). The entity ‘kids’ referenced through the pronominal form 他們 tāmen ‘they, them’ in (57L2) can be considered as C_b in this discourse sequence, because this center links utterance (57L2) with utterance (57L1), made in
response to the utterance O. The $C_b$ in (57L2) connects with the forward-looking center, i.e., 孩子 háizi ‘kids’ in utterance (57O), and realizes the status of the center. Segment $Z$ is the elaboration site in response to the question posed in the utterance by O, and profiles the relation between segments $X$ and $Y$ ($C_b$) of the $bā$ construction in utterance (57L2).

To sum up, I have demonstrated that segment $Y$ of the $bā$ construction can be treated as $C_b$, the backward-looking center, when applying the centering discourse model to contextualized conversational sequences. In this way, I have shown the operation of cognitive phenomena at the discourse level, through the cognitive constraints imposed on segment $Y$ of the $bā$ construction. The next section explores those constraints.

### 4.4.2.2 Cognitive Constraints of Segment $Y$

The cognitive constraints of segment $Y$ in the $bā$ construction can be situationally or textually evoked, and they can be either non-containing inferables or anchored brand-new discourse entities. Evoked entities are those entities available in physical context of a situation or in the textual ground of discourse. In (57) above, the prompt of the question about the kids is situationally evoked because the parent’s kids were absent from the situation of visiting; because of the culturally salient mother/child relationship, the speaker asks about the status of this discourse entity, her kids.

In terms of the discourse genre of a cooking instructional show, most of the discourse entities in segment $Y$ of the $bā$ construction are textually evoked or visually present on the on TV screen, because all the ingredients must be introduced in the (con)text before the cooking procedures can be applied.

An example that demonstrates a non-containing inferable in segment $Y$ of the $bā$ construction is exemplified in (58).
(58) ...免得妳糖吃太多，把牙吃壞。

\begin{align*}
miăn-dé & \quad [nǐ tāng \quad chī tāi duō], \quad bă \quad [yá] \quad [chī huài] \\
X & \quad Y \quad Z
\end{align*}

just in case [you candy eat too much] \ BA \ [teeth] \ [eat-bad]

‘Just in case that you ate too much candy, which causes your teeth to rot/ get bad.’

‘If you eat too much candy, your teeth will rot/ get bad.’

A teenage younger sister reading a letter from her elder sister in the context of a letter

(Quartet 2003)

The discourse entity of 牙 yá ‘tooth, teeth’ is not mentioned in prior context; however, it is inferred from the discourse segment of “eating too much candy.” The segment Y 牙 yá ‘tooth, teeth’ in the bă construction is inferable from the concept already evoked, which is “eating too much candy.” I have found no example to support a containing inferable in segment Y of the bă construction.

Prince’s brand-new entities (see section 1.6.2) have two subtypes: (1) unanchored, (2) anchored. For example, “a priest I met” is anchored, while “a priest” is unanchored. I will show this using the example in (59) of the bă construction which is used in Mainland Mandarin Chinese but not in Taiwan.¹⁷

¹⁷ There is dialectal difference in Mandarin Chinese spoken in Mainland and Taiwan. Native speakers from Taiwan find utterance (59) weird, but can guess what it means. The major difference is that MC speakers in Taiwan tend to pronounce z-, c-, s- rather than the retroflexes zh-, ch-, sh-. A distinct syntactic pattern marks the speakers from southern part of China, including Taiwan. Southern speakers tend to say “yău-méi-yŏu ‘have-not-have’ + VP” “have you/ did you VP?” while northern speakers say, “VP-ASP-méi-yŏu ‘not-have’” “Have you/ did you VP?”
(59) [他]把[個爸爸][死了]。

[tā] bā [ge bàba] sī le
[he] BA [CL father] [die ASP]

‘His father died.’
‘The father of his went/ up and died on him! (colloquial English).’

→ Something happened to him.

←The event is that his father died.

I consider the segment Y in this example to be an anchored brand-new discourse entity. This segment Y in the form of a classifier and a noun demonstrates a relation between Y and X through the morpheme bā. The reading of (59) does not include the possibility that the speaker had several fathers, one of whom died. I consider that the NP 個爸爸 ge bàba “a father” is linked to another NP 他 tā, “he” through the morpheme bā is interpreted as “the father he has.” This anchored relationship emphasizes the [POSSESSION] relation between “a/that father” and “he”/the son, and a resultant state ascribed to the father. No unused brand-new discourse entities are registered in segment Y of the bā construction.

4.5 Segment X in X bā Y Z

I have categorized four major semantic features that are employed in segment X of the bā construction throughout the corpus data: (1) animate, (2) inanimate event, and (3) collective agent, or zero Ø. The animate entities in segment X are either agents, or refer to entities that represent something the animate entity said or did. The inanimate events are

18 Professor Jill Brody provides this example.
denoted in the noun phrases that evoke an eventual notion. The segment $X$ can be also characterized with a collective agent or zero-marked form $\emptyset$, you, in imperative $b\ddot{a}$ sentences. Following subsections will support the categorization with examples.

4.5.1 Animate

Eighty-one out of 235 $b\ddot{a}$ tokens involve animate entities in segment $X$. Seventy-six are archetypal agents, and five refer to something the agents said or did. When segment $X$ is archetypal agent, the interpretation of $b\ddot{a}$ is “to take initiative and perform an act, or perform an event that construes a resultant state.” The notion of [DO] or [TO TAKE INITIATIVE] and the result are both characterized in segment $Z$. See example (60).

(60) [你]已經把[話][講得很清楚了]。

[你] already BA [words] [speak EXT very clear ASP]

\[ X \quad Y \quad Z \]

‘You already made yourself very clear.’

→ You already did it.

← The event is that you made yourself so clear (to me). (Quartet 2003)

What the archetypal agent in (60) has done is to make her standpoint very clear to the admirer. The agent takes initiative to perform the event of speaking that involves a resultant construal, which is “to be clear.” The two-stage of the $b\ddot{a}$ construction translations allows a more complete understanding and the better interpretation of the meaning of the morpheme $b\ddot{a}$, and further elaborates what the agentive $b\ddot{a}$ construction means.
When segment X is interpreted as what the archetypal agent has done or said in a reporting genre, then the experiencer is not “I.” In this case, the morpheme bā means “to initiate an action that results in the state described in segment Z.” I distinguish the first person singular experiencer from others, because this role is related to a subjective construal that portrays what the speaker or construer feels. Often in that case, segment Z is characterized with a hyperbolic expression; see example (61).

(61) [你]把[大家]都[嚇一跳]。

[nǐ] bā [dà-jīā] duō [xià yī tiào]

[you] BA [everybody] all [scare-one-jump]

\[
\begin{align*}
X & \quad Y & \quad Z \\
X &= \text{[what you behaved/ did]} & Y/Z &= \text{[everybody was so scared]}
\end{align*}
\]

好好的一個人突然倒下去。

hǎo hǎo de yī gè rén tū-rán dāo xià qù

very well DE one-CL-person suddenly drop-down-go

‘You had all of us so scared. A very healthy person, just all of a sudden, fainted!!’

← What you did has resulted in our fear. (Quartet 2003)

When segment X is interpreted as what the archetypal agent has done or said in a subjective construal scene where the experiencer is “I,” the morpheme bā is quasi-translated into “to cause, to have got, to make.” In my opinion, this type of bā sentence can be interpreted as having a causative reading, because when it occurs in discourse context, the utterance invites a question about what the agent has done which is not
described in segment Z, i.e., the cause. In (62), the cause is what happened to make the experiencer mad.

(62) [他]把[我][氣死了]。

\[tā\] \(bā\) [wǒ] \[qì\] \(sǐ\) \(le\]

[he] BA [me] [angry-die-ASP]

\(X\) \(Y\) \(Z\)

‘What he said/ did got me so mad.’ (Contextual example (49) in section 4.4.1.1)

To sum up, Figure 4.19 shows that when segment \(X\) is an archetypal agent, the morpheme \(bā\) means (A), as exemplified in (60). When segment \(X\) indicates what the agent has done or said but in a reporting genre, the morpheme \(bā\) means (B) shown in (61). While segment \(X\) means what the agent has done or said but the experiencer is first person singular, it constitutes a very subjective construal, and the morpheme \(bā\) means (C) as in (62).

(A) to take initiative and perform an act or do an event that construes a resultant state

(B) to initiate and thus result in a state

(C) to cause, to have got, to make

Figure 4.19: The Meaning of the Morpheme \(bā\) in the \(bā\) Construction

4.5.2 Inanimate Event

Nine out of 235 tokens of \(bā\) involve the expression of an inanimate event in segment \(X\) in the \(bā\) construction. When segment \(X\) is expressed as an inanimate event, it mostly serves as a cause, and means, “to cause or make the experiencer or the patient undergo a process that carries a significant result.” This is shown in (63).
自从你去当兵之后，大师傅就拿对你的标准对我。

自從你去當兵之後，[大師傅就拿對你的標準對我]。

since you go serve in the army after [Master then take for you DE criterion for me]

$X =$ the event [that Master treated me based on his criterion for you]

把[我][累死啦]。

$bà$ [wǒ][lèi sǐ la]

BA [me][tired-die-PRT]

$Y Z$

‘Ever since you went to serve in the army, Master treated me based on his
criterion for you. It wore me out.’

(Quartet 2003)

Setting: laundry shop

Participants: one disciple talking another about Master’s high expectation

The event that Master treated the speaker in the same way he had treated his previous,
more talented disciple, is the reason and cause for the speaker’s struggle to cope with
higher expectations and the result is his great fatigue. In this case, the morpheme $bà$ links
one a causal event to a result derived from a prior event. The interpretation “to cause, to
make” here is much more natural than “to do and bring out a result.”

4.5.3 Collective Agent or $Ø$

In addition to animate or inanimate entities in segment $X$, a collective agent (first person
plural, second person plural), or zero-marked form $Ø$ (second person singular) can be also
found. The morpheme  \textit{bā} denotes an abstract semantic value of [DOING] a contextually appropriate action upon an object or an event. In cooking instructional discourse (64), the \textit{bā} construction involves a collective agent, first person plural and second person plural because the purpose of the discourse is to invite the audience to follow the procedures. In the imperative sentence (65), the \(\emptyset\) form is the addressee, the second person singular.

(64) 把薑切得小小的。

\textit{bā jiāng qiē de xiǎoxiāo de}

BA ginger cut EXT very small DE

‘Cut the ginger into very small pieces/dices.’

(cooking show 2004)

In cooking instructional discourse, the involvement of a collective agent is interpreted as “let’s perform an act upon the object \(Y\).”

A regular imperative \textit{bā} construction exemplified in (65), involves a zero-marked second-person singular, you.

(65) 趕快把病養好。

[ \(\emptyset\) ] \textit{gānkuài bā [bìng] [yǎng hǎo]}

[you] hurry BA [illness] [recuperate well]

\(X\quad Y\quad Z\)

‘Be better soon!’

(Quartet 2003)

Therefore, segment \(X\) can be also characterized with a collective agent or a zero-marked form representing “you.”
4.6 Comparative Studies with English and German

The semantic construal of the Mandarin Chinese *bā* construction captures notions that are shared with the English “get/have + NP + p.p. construction” and with German inseparable prefixes *be-, er-, ver-, zer-*: (1) agency, (2) result. The sphere of semantic value “possession” or the image schema “hand” are shared in the Mandarin Chinese morpheme *bā* and English “get” and “have.” Section 4.6.1 examines the English “get/have + NP + p.p. construction” and offers a comparative semantic study of this construction to the *bā* construction. In section 4.6.2, I will discuss the resultative nature denoted in German inseparable prefixes er-, ver-, zer-, and compare to the Mandarin Chinese *bā* construction.

### 4.6.1 “get/have + p.p.” Construction

The English “get/have + NP + p.p. construction” refers to the construction type that is considered the causative with *get* and a further participant (Downing 1996: 181-82), in which *get* and *be* are not interchangeable. See example (66) and the semantic parallel of the Mandarin Chinese *bā* construction in (67). Both denote a causative element of what he did or said and a resultant state of the speaker being confused.

(66) He got me confused.

(67) 他把我弄糊塗了。

`tā bā wǒ nòng hú-tú le`

he BA me do confused ASP

‘He got me confused.’
When the other participant is an inanimate entity, like a car, in the example (68) and a semantic equivalence of the بس construction in (69). I present two interpretations to compare the notion of agency in (68) and (69).

(68) He got/had his car repaired.

   (i) He asked someone to repair his car, and as a consequence his car was repaired.

   (ii) *He repaired his car.\(^{19}\)

In (68), there is only one reading (i) regarding to the agent who fixed his car. The subject “he” is the agent who took initiative to dispose of the event: either ask someone or send his car to the Auto repair to have his car repaired. The result of this event is that his car was repaired. The subject “he” is not the agent who actually repaired his car; see (ii).

However, the Mandarin Chinese بس construction in (69) allows both readings. Example (69) is ambiguous and permits two interpretations with respect to the agent who actually fixed his car.

(69) 他把他的车修好了。

\[ tā bā tā  de  chē  xiū  hǎo le \]

he BA he POSS car  repair good ASP

‘He got/had his car repaired.’

(i) He asked someone to repair his car, and as a consequence his car was repaired.

(ii) He did the event himself, which was to repair his car.

In (69), the interpretation of the agent who fixes the car could be the subject “he” or somebody else, like a mechanic. This sentence means that he completes the event of

\(^{19}\) The (ii) reading is allowed in the context below (Brody, personal communication)
A: What did you get done today?
B: I got the dishes washed. I got the floor swept. I got the car repaired.
The parallel agent “I” permits the agentive reading in the event of repairing the car.
repairing the car; the event is either asking the other to do, or done by himself and which
result is the condition of the car is fixed and good. These examples profile more on the
result instead of the cause because the agent who conducted the event is implicit.

Examples (66) to (69) suggest a minimal energy transmission from the subject to the
predicate, i.e., the event. The transferal of energy is interpreted as “agency” in section
4.6.1.1, and the result denoted in the predicate is discussed in section 4.6.1.2.

4.6.1.1 Agency

Figure 4.20 demonstrates energy transferal, i.e., the notion of agency, denoted in the
morpheme get and have in example (68) and the morpheme bā in (69). Example (a) in
Figure 4.20 suggests two different agents: the agent “he” disposes the event of “fixing his
car” by asking someone else to do it or sending his car to the shop, and the agent who
actually repaired his car. Example (b) displays the conceptual overlap in that the agent
who volitionally disposed the event of repairing his car and that who actually repaired his
car are identical. The abstract landmark shown in heavy oval lines is a reified event
construed as the event of repairing his car.

(a) get/have/bā

(b) bā

Figure 4.20: The Notion of “agency” in “get/have” and “bā” in (68) and (69)

The notion of energy transferal is shown in heavy arrow lines. The most prominent
trajector (tr) is either excluded or included in the construed landmark (lm) of repairing the

car. When the subject is excluded in the landmark, the morpheme of \textit{get/have} in (68i) and that of \textit{bā} in (69i) are interpreted as the heavy dashed arrow in Figure 4.15 (a): the causation or the responsibility on the part of the subject to dispose of the event of repairing his car, i.e., the landmark. In (69ii), when the subject is identified as the agent who finishes the event of fixing his own car, the agent is the trajector that is construed in the abstract landmark as (b) in Figure 4.20. That is to say, the content of the morpheme \textit{bā} in (69ii), [\textit{TO TAKE INITIATIVE TO DO (SOMETHING)}], is effectively equivalent to that of the content verb described in segment \textit{Z}.

### 4.6.1.2 Result

The profiles in the landmarks of (a) and (b) in Figure 4.20 also suggest the semantic prime of the morpheme \textit{get/have/bā}, which is to denote a result. This resultant construal is interpreted as: (1) the completion state of a conducted event “repairing his car,” (2) the resultant state of his repaired car. Interpretations (1) and (2) correspond to (a) and (b) in Figure 4.20.

### 4.6.2 German Inseparable Prefixes

Blumenfeld (2001) did a comparative study between German inseparable and separable prefixes and the Mandarin Chinese \textit{bā} construction. The result of her study consolidates my claim of the resultant construals in the \textit{bā-c}: the resultant semantic nature is registered in both German inseparable and separable prefixes and in the Mandarin Chinese \textit{bā} construction. The resultant semantics of inseparable prefixes in German lies at the morphological level, and that of \textit{bā} construction lies at the syntactic level. In this section, I
will discuss the semantic value of the inseparable prefixes *be-*, *er-*, *zer-* in (70), which, like the Mandarin Chinese *bā*, are in a preverbal position. Generally speaking, both present the perfective viewpoint in aspect and telicity of an event. However, one distinct difference is that the resultative semantics of German prefixes are specific while that of the *bā*-c can be displayed in a more diverse field.

In my opinion, if we treat an event as an grammatical object, then both constructions take an event as an object, which in both cases presents a result. For the German inseparable prefixes, the combined conceptualizations of duration/ boundedness and intention are present in the activity scene of the prefixed verb (Sprang 2003), which is directed to the goal or resultative endpoint of an event. For example, both *be-* and *er-* point to goal-oriented activity that is understood by the native speakers, and both convey “the notion of activity moving through time toward a goal or outcome” (Sprang 2003: 74): in the case of *be-* words, the process is towards achievement of the goal or outcome, and in the case of *er-* words, it is at the point of of achieving the goal or accomplishing the expected outcome. In general, *er-* brings out the brevity of an activity, and *zer-* indicates “scattering.” When we parse *bā*-sentences, the results are couched in RVC or in a postverbal element. The Mandarin Chinese RVC requires the content of the event followed by the verb, but the postverbal element requires the content and the event of the result.

In subsections 4.6.2.1 and 4.6.2.2, I will discuss Kim’s (1983 in Sprang 2003), Blumenfeld’s (2001) and Spring’s (2003) studies, my own observations, and conclusion from Fleischer and Barz (1995: 323-7).
4.6.2.1 *be-, er-, ver-, zer-*

There are two prefixes in word-formation of German verbs: (inseparable) prefixes (die Präfixe) and separable prefixes (die Halbpräfixe im einzelnen). Examples of inseparable prefixes are *be-, er-, ver-, zer-* and I will provide their meanings in (70). I will follow Blumenfeld’s (2001) and Sprang’s (2003) studies, and focus on resultative semantics of *be-, er-, ver-, zer-* and discuss how they relate to the *bā*-c.

(70)  
*be-*: intentional, durative activity that is goal-directed (in *bedenken* ‘to think over’; *denken* means ‘to think’); making an intransitive verb into a transitive verb
*er-*: produce/generate something (by efforts), emphasis on beginning/brevity of action, die, kill
*ver-*: mistake/negative result in an action, sustain until end, change, obstruction
*zer-*: separation, breaking to pieces, scattering

(Keller’s *Dictionary of German Word Classes* from Blumenfeld 2001: 8; Sprang 2003: 71, 78)

I will demonstrate the metaphorical semantic shift of *be-, er-, ver-* inseparable prefix with the stem verb *greifen* ‘to grab, to hold’ in (71).

(71)  
*begreifen*  
be-grab  
‘to grasp, understand’

*ergreifen*  
er-grab  
‘to grasp, e.g., an opportunity, to hold down a job’

*vergreifen*  
ver-grab  
‘to make a mistake, to choose the wrong means’

The meaningfulness of these prefixes in (71) is metaphorical, and marks the semantic shift from the concrete to abstract meaning. Sprang (2003) proposes the image schemas of the *be-* and *er-* prefixes in Figure 4.16.
Sprang posits that the goal or outcome is “inferred as part of the domain of the image, [and]…always present in the Activity Scene” (ibid.) in the cases of the prefix be-. She further exemplifies with besprechen ‘to discuss’ and its stem verb sprechen ‘to speak’ in thinking for speaking. For a German native speaker, if the talk is intended to lead to an outcome, then the speaker will choose to use besprechen ‘to discuss’ since the outcome of an talk is foregrounded in besprechen ‘to discuss’ rather than sprechen ‘to talk’ (Sprang 2003: 83-4). In the case of the prefix er-, its function is to “encode the achievement of the goal, and that goal is quite often specified as the direct object” (ibid. 84). In addition, what is inferred in the prefix er- is the process that leads to the point of achievement of the goal or outcome. This suggests that this prefix er- conveys an inchoative aspect; however, Sprang points out that this inchoative reading is only true in the case of the past tense, because “the change in state is complete” (ibid.). She considers that the er- prefixed verb in the present tense denotes “the implicature of the fulfillment of intention” (Talmy 2000: 505). According to Sprang (2003), this denotation leads to her two interpretations for er- in Figure 4.16: one at the point of realizing the goal, the other on the goal.
The notion of achievement of a goal and outcome involving a process is similar to that of resultant reading in the Mandarin Chinese bā construction. Both constructions conflate senses of aspect, intentionality and result of an event or an outcome/goal of an activity that is conceived through a period of time. Examples with er- and zer- are instantiated in (72) and (73). I adapted the German examples from Blumenfeld (2001 examples (9)-(18)) and provide a bā example to illustrate the parallels. I choose the prefixed verbs in present tense to serve the purpose of comparing the process and the result rather than the past tense, which is only indicative of its outcome or goal.

(72) a. Er erschießt den Vogel.
   he  ER-shoots the (ACC) bird.
   ‘He shoots [and kills] the bird.’

b. Er schießt den Vogel tot.
   he  shoots the (ACC) bird dead
   ‘He shoots the bird dead.’

c. 他把鳥射死了。
   tā  bā niǎo shè sǐ le
   he BA bird shoot-dead-asp.
   ‘He shot the bird dead.’

I will discuss three aspects of the set of sentences in (72): word order, entailment, verbal semantics of result. In German example (72a), erschießen ‘to shoot and kill’ denotes the action of shooting in the verb stem schießen ‘to shoot’, and the resultant nature or outcome in the prefix er-. In the Mandarin Chinese bā-c (72c), the action and result reflect in different free morphemes, i.e., 射 shè ‘shoot’ and 死 sǐ ‘dead.’ The German example in (72b) exhibits a parallel example of word order to the Mandarin Chinese sentence (72c): both have a causative reading in that the agent causes the bird to become dead, the
resultative state of being dead, via shooting. The sequence of two morphemes 把...射 bā...shè ‘hold...shoot’ constitute a complete action, like schießen ‘to shoot’ in (72b). In (72c), 把 bā, which functions like er- in (72a), encodes the achievement of an outcome or a result and projects to a larger complement of results. In (72a) it focuses on the result because the verb erschießen denotes the telic state (dead) of the whole event: shooting something. The reading of (72a) entails “the bird is dead.” This entailment, nevertheless, has to be overtly shown in the morpheme 死 sī ’dead’ in (72c).

The verbal semantics of erschießen denotes an event and its result or outcome achieved as time unfolds, while the event of bā-c is postulated in the clausal complement and the result is evoked from the morpheme bā. Another set of parallel examples with the prefix zer- are shown in (73).

(73)  a. Sie zerreißt das Papier.
     she ZER-tears the paper
     ‘She tears the papers (into many pieces).’

b. Sie reißt das Papier durch.
     she tears the paper through
     ‘She tears the paper (into two pieces).’

c. 她把紙撕了。
     tā bā zhǐ sī le
     she BA paper tear ASP
     ‘She tore the paper.’ [Implication: the paper could be apart or into pieces]

d. 她把紙撕成兩半。
     tā bā zhǐ sī chéng liǎng-bàn
     she BA paper tear become two-half
     ‘She tore the paper into two pieces.’
The action of “tearing” something apart in German or Mandarin results in the state that the paper is torn apart. However, zer- in (73a) and durch in (73b) denote different degrees of the affectedness of the paper. In (73a), the prefix zer- indicates the resultant state of many pieces, while in (73b) durch ‘through’ suggests the resultant state of exactly two pieces. In (73c), bā co-occurs with an aspectual marker –le to show the event of tearing has been realized, and the result is accompanied. The result of the completed event could be that the paper is apart or into pieces. Hoekstra (1992) terms this realization phenomenon as “shadow interpretation” 20 (in Sybesma 1999). The idea is that our knowledge toward how the world is organized tells us something. The interpretation of “to pieces” or “apart” tells us the result of the tearing event. In German, it is clearly presented in zer- in (73a) and durch in (73b). However, in (73c) there is only the tearing event and the shadow interpretations of the result that might be. In Mandarin Chinese, an overt result needs to be spellt out in segment Z as in (73d) or (73e). In short, the prefixes er- and zer- carry the resultant nature of an action denoted in the verb form. The morpheme bā, however, evokes a resultative complement in bā construction.

4.6.2.2 Bā -V-R

Through comparison with erschießen ‘to shoot and kill’ and zerreißen ‘to tear into pieces’ sentences, like those in (72) and (73), I have reached a generalization regarding bā (verb) –V (main verb) – RC (resultative complement), which I outline in (74) as below.

20 For more on shadow interpretation, see pages 189-93 in Sybesma (1999).
In (74), both the German case of *erschießen* ‘to shoot and kill’ and the Mandarin Chinese *bā*-c contain a higher *bā* predicate or the prefix *er*- that achieves the outcome or result of an event: “death” is encoded in the German prefix *er-* and the manipulative result is encoded in the morpheme *bā* but needs to be spelled out in the main content verb 死 *sǐ* ‘to die’ in Mandarin Chinese. The process or manner to achieve this result is in the German stem verb *schießen* ‘to shoot’ and in the Mandarin Chinese action verb 射 *shè* ‘to shoot.’

To conclude, I confirm the status of *bā* as a verb (Benders 2000, Ding 2001, Li 2003) that has to be incorporated into the reading denoted in the main action verb. This is the same as what Li and Thompson call the “co-verb” (1981) and Chao’s “pretransitive verb” (1968). I hypothesize that the abstract semantic property of [DO] in the morpheme *bā* “to take, to hold” conceptually overlaps with the resultative complement by means of the verbal form in the RVC or the verbal empty predicate denoted in the small clause. This hypothesis is based on my cognitive account of the morpheme *bā*: rather than referring to a real object held in hand, the morpheme *bā* metaphorically “holds” an event as an grammatical object denoted in the small clause. Thus, the semantic value of *bā* shifts from a concrete domain to an abstract one (Dai 2001, Ding 2001).
CHAPTER 5

COGNITIVE RELATIVISM AND PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 Introduction

Chapter 5 consists of four major subsections. Section 5.2 provides the definition of cognitive relativism, raises the issue of linguistic relativism, and discusses its relation to cognitive relativism. The difference of profile emphasis in English and Mandarin Chinese provides evidence for both linguistic and cognitive relativism. Section 5.3 provides further support for both linguistic and cognitive relativism based on evidence in the Mandarin Chinese resultative verbal compounds (RVCs) and bā construction. Section 5.4 demonstrates how cognitive relativism can be productively applied to second language pedagogy, and presents a performance-based (Noda and Walker 2000) pedagogical model to demonstrate how to teach the Mandarin Chinese bā construction to non-native speakers of Mandarin Chinese based on the profile of the bā construction. Section 5.5 presents a conclusion.

5.2 Cognitive Relativism and Language Awareness

Contemplation about the nature of human conceptualization as linguistically mediated reflection of speaker’s perceptions of the world can be traced through the work of von Humboldt ([1836] in 1988), Boas (1938), Sapir (1949), Whorf (1956), and Lucy (1992) to flourish in the emergence of cognitive linguistics (Lakoff 1987, Langacker 1987, 1990 and Talmy 2000). Cognitive linguistics represents a modern conceptual approach for the re-examination of linguistic relativity, and how it further relates to cognitive relativism (Tai 2003).
5.2.1 Relativity: From Humboldt’s Weltansichten, through Sapir-Whorf, to Langacker’s Cognitive Grammar

Von Humboldt (1767-1835) posited his philosophical view on the correlation between language and thought as follows: “[i]hre Verschiedenheit ist nicht eine von Schälen und Zeichen, sondern eine Verschiedenheit der Weltansichten selbst” [von Humboldt 1903-36 IV: 27] ‘The diversity of languages is not a diversity of sounds and signs but a diversity of the views of the world’ (in Trabant 2000: 25). This statement suggests a relationship between language and thought that is reflected in the way we conceptualize our perceptions of the world, i.e., cognition. Von Humboldt further claims that “[d]as Denken ist aber nicht bloß abhängig von der Sprache überhaupt, sondern, bis auf einen gewissen Grad, auch von jeder einzelnen bestimmten” [von Humboldt 1903-26 IV: 21] ‘Thought, however, is not dependent on language in general but also to a certain extent on each individual language’ (von Humboldt 1997: 15). This statement can be interpreted to indicate that the cognitive functions involved in language and the conceptualization of perceived reality can create different views of the world; for speakers of different languages, it is this difference in cognition that leads to the discussion of linguistic and cognitive relativity. Trabant points out that relativity is expressed through Humboldt’s notion of “Weltansichten” ‘worldview,’ and discusses this relationship from six aspects: universality and relativity, structure and character, lexicon and grammar, relativism enthusiasm, relativity and perfection, and determinism (Trabant 2000: 30-40).

Gumperz and Levinson introduce the concept of “the essential idea of linguistic relativity, the idea that culture, through language, affects the way we think, especially perhaps our classification of the experienced world” (1996: 1). This essential idea of linguistic relativity in the American tradition was proposed in the work of Edward Sapir
(1884-1941), and Benjamin Lee Whorf (1897-1941): the language one speaks might not
determine how one thinks, but does influence the way one perceives and experiences the
world. Distinctions overtly encoded in one language may not be found in another language.
Linguistic relativity accounts for the same articulation in different forms of linguistic
expressions in different languages. For example, *masa’ytaka* in Hopi means everything
that flies except birds, including airplanes, insects, and pilots (Crystal 1987). For an other
example, the abstract universal conceptual content of [HOLE] has ten different kinds of
linguistic forms in Australian aboriginal Pintupi language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yarla</td>
<td>a hole in an object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pirti</td>
<td>a hole in the ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pirnki</td>
<td>a hole formed by a rock shelf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kartalpa</td>
<td>a small hole in the ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yulpilpa</td>
<td>a shallow hole in which ants live</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mutara</td>
<td>a special hole in a spear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nyarrkalpa</td>
<td>a burrow for small animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pulpa</td>
<td>a rabbit burrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>makarnpa</td>
<td>a goanna burrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>katarta</td>
<td>the hole left by a goanna when it has broken the surface after hibernation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Crystal 1987: 15)

The metaphorical extension shown in the Hopi example and the detailed specificity shown
in the Pintupi examples are the kinds of phenomena that have been labeled as reflecting
primitive thought on the part of speakers of primitive languages (Crystal 1987: 15). It is
interesting that this otherwise erroneous association still relies on the foundation of
relativism, both linguistic and cognitive. For determinations of linguistic and cultural relativism, systematic differences that are deeply embedded or intrinsic to linguistic and cultural systems provide the most convincing evidence.

These two examples draw our attention to a view about the nature of the relationship between lexical concept/language and thinking. The Polish word *przyjaciel* reflects this relationship. This word is usually glossed into ‘friend’ in English; however, according to Wierzbicka, it means more than the English “friend.” The concept of *przyjaciel* ‘close friend’ is “more weighty” than just “friend” and is accompanied with the ethno-social, psychological and cultural value: “strong loyalty and attachment bordering on love” (1997: 92-3). Mandarin Chinese identifies levels of knowing and mutual understanding in friendship, and has expressions of this kind, such as 知己 *zhī-jǐ ‘know-self: a person/friend for whom one has profound friendship built on mutual understanding,’ 知音 *zhī-yīn ‘know-voice: a person/friend who is deeply appreciative of one’s talents,’ and 知心(朋友) *zhī-yīn-péng-yǒu ‘know-heart-friend: bosom friend.’ The expression “dear friend” in southern English parallels the Polish term *przyjaciel* the English translation.

The German concept *heimat* evokes manifold complex associations that the English translation “homeland” does not convey. I concur with Wierzbicka (1997) that *heimat* deserves a book-length study; her explication of ideas conveyed in this complex concept follows:

(a) a place  
(b) I was born in this place.  
(c) there are many places in this place  
(d) when I was a child I lived in these places  
(e) I felt something good when I lived in these places  
(f) I felt that nothing bad could happen to me  
(g) I can’t feel like this in any other places  
(h) because of this, when I think about these places I feel something good
(i) I think something like this when I think about these places:
(j) these places are not like any other places
(k) I was like a part of these places when I was a child
(l) I can’t be like a part of any other places
(m) this place is like a part of me
(n) (I know: some other people think the same when they think about these places)
(o) (I think these people feel the same when they think about these places)
(p) (when I think about these people, I feel something good)

(Wierzbicka 1997: 158)

*Heimat* does not merely mean a concrete physical place, but is associated with nostalgia toward one’s childhood and hometown. It is similar to the concept 老家 *lǎo-jīā* ‘old-home: hometown, birthplace, etc.’ in Mandarin Chinese in that the oldness 老 *lǎo* ‘old’ is that of nostalgic feelings toward one’s *heimat*.

Half a century ago, Ruth Benedict (1967) pointed out that the Japanese concept of *giri* 義理, commonly glossed as ‘duty’ or ‘obligation,’ has no equivalent counterpart in English, and owes nothing to Chinese Confucianism or Buddhism. Benedict compares *giri* to the European concept of “honor,” especially German concept of “Ehre.” She comments that “[n]o Japanese can talk about motivations or good repute or the dilemmas which confront men and women in his home country without constantly speaking of *giri*” (1967: 133) and “*giri* includes a most heterogeneous lot of obligation…ranging from gratitude for an old kindness to the duty of revenge” (139). Contrary to what Benedict claimed, I find this concept prevalent in Chinese martial arts and society.

Wierzbicka further explicates the concept of *giri* as follows:

(a) A thinks something like this about someone (B):
(b) I have to do good things for person B
(c) if I don’t do this it will be bad
(d) if I don’t do this, B will feel bad
(e) people will say bad things about me because of this
(f) I don’t want this
(g) because of this, I have to do good things for B
(h) I have to think about this

(Wierzbicka 1997: 270)

This explication includes the reflection of social obligations in Japanese culture, mutual considerations for the group participant, the anticipation of empathy, and social dynamic constraints based on *giri* in Japanese society.

These aforementioned concepts, Polish *przyjaciel*, German *heimat*, and Japanese *giri*, articulate the weighty cultural value and reflect that their cultural weight is rooted in facets of cognition in different speech groups. It is this very conceptual difference among diverse languages that support von Humboldt’s statement, “[i]hre Verschiedenheit ist … der Weltansichten selbst” (the diversity of language is … the worldview itself) (von Humboldt 1903-36 IV: 27 in Trabant 2001: 25; translation is mine).

Sapir (1949) and Whorf (1956) follow von Humboldt’s tradition of consideration of the diversity of languages and cultures. As Sapir points out,

Human beings do not live in the objective world alone, nor live alone in the world of social activity as ordinarily understood, ….. the ‘real world’ is to a large extent built up on the language habits of the group. No two languages are ever sufficiently similar to be considered as representing the same social reality. The worlds in which different societies live are distinct worlds, not merely the same world with different labels attached. … We see and hear and otherwise experience very largely as we do because the language habits of our community predispose certain choices of interpretation. (Sapir 1949: 69)

I interpret Sapir’s association of perception – how “we see and hear and otherwise experience” – with the “language habits” as referring to what Langacker (1987, 1991) calls differences in cognitive patterns between different languages. It is this cognitive difference that forms, or, for Sapir, “predispose[s] certain choices of interpretation” across different languages.
A good example of linguistic relativity is Hockett’s (1954) comparison of how a person’s age is conventionally given in Chinese and English. In Chinese, to state a person’s age, a cardinal number is followed by the measure 岁 suì ‘age, year(s).’ In English, a person’s age is also given as in a cardinal number, but modified by the phrase with “years old” or “years of age.” I further interpreted Hockett’s presentation of the possible matchings of Chinese and English expressions with regards to stating a person’s age in Figure 5.1. For example, I am 32 years old in the solar calendar year of January 2005, but my mother says that I am already 34 岁 suì ‘age, year(s)’ during the part of 2005 before the lunar Chinese New Year is celebrated. After the Chinese New Year (Year of the Rooster) she says that I am 35 岁 suì ‘age, year(s).’ The customary expression 压岁钱 yā-sùi qián ‘press-age-money: age-reduced money, wishful or lucky money (in a red envelope)” is a traditional act of the Chinese New Year’s celebration where Chinese elders give money in a red envelop to the children on Chinese New Year’s Eve, to symbolize their desire to stop the children from getting older, since everyone becomes one year older on Chinese New Year’s Day.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>一 yī ‘1’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one</td>
<td>二 èr ‘2’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two</td>
<td>三 sān ‘3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three</td>
<td>四 sì ‘4’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>four</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5.1: Stating a Person’s Age in English and Chinese**  
(modified from Hockett 1954: 112)
This corresponds to the concept matching to that of “one year-old” in English might actually be two or three 岁 suì ‘age, year(s)’ in Chinese. I concur with Hockett’s claim that the “absence of exact matching can be accounted for in terms of the meaning of the measure [岁 suì ‘age, year(s)’]” in Chinese (1954: 113). Further support for this claim can be found in the Mandarin Chinese expressions 实 岁 shísuì ‘concrete-age: actual/ exact age’ and 虚 岁 xūsuì ‘void/ empty-age: age.’ To provide my age in both systems, I would say the utterance (1).

(1) 我虚岁 35，实岁 32。

wǒ xū-suì 35 shí-suì 32

I void-age 35 concrete-age 32

‘My age is 35, and actual age is 32.’

The contrasting concepts of concrete precision and abstract emptiness comes from Chinese philosophy, and are related to Hockett’s interpretation of “absence of exact matching” between Chinese and English. In this case, the meaning difference resides in the conceptualization of 岁 suì ‘age, year(s)’, which brings our attention to the two different systems for calculating one’s age within the time frame. Both of these two systems have yearly measures beginning at the date one was born and numbers of years of living – a child is one year old after having been alive for one year since birth. The English system relies on the solar year. The Chinese system measures according to the lunar year. The difference between these two calculation systems reflects how the people within the speech community project or view something that is relatively important to them. In other words, the factors of cognition and culture play important roles in measurement of one’s age in English and Chinese. If we conceive of an ancient astrological system that we have
nothing to keep track of, it is rather scientific to measure within a relative system that has no absolute scale. In my opinion, the way to state one’s age in Chinese reveals that this expression reflects a way of speaking and thinking that is customary and easy for Chinese. My analysis corresponds to what Hockett concludes, “[l]anguage differ not so much as to what can be said in them, but rather as to what it is relatively easy to say” (1954: 122).

To sum up, “years old” or “years of age” in English are calculated according to the number of the cycles of solar calendar years during which one has been alive; 歲 sui ‘age, year(s)’ in Chinese is construed in the perspective of the temporal points of one’s birth date, each birthday, and each Chinese New Year. I consider this example to reveal the Sapirian predisposition of interpretation choices between these two speech communities. Both expressions for stating one’s age in English and Chinese are “as accurate, by and large, as the other” (Hockett 1954: 113).

Here I will point out one verbal category that is overt in Chinese, but absent in English; this distinction can shed light onto Whorf’s much-quoted passage about linguistic relativity.

We dissect nature along lines laid down by our native languages. The categories and types that we isolate from the world of phenomena we do not find there because they state every observer in the face; on the contrary, the world is presented in a kaleidoscopic flux of impressions which has to be organized by our minds – and this means largely by the linguistic systems in our minds. We cut nature up, organize it into concepts, and ascribe significances as we do, largely because we are parties to an agreement that holds throughout our speech community and is codified in the patterns of our language. The agreement is, of course, an implicit and unstated one, BUT ITS TERMS ARE ABSOLUTELY OBLIGATORY; we cannot talk at all except by subscribing to the organization and classification of data which the agreement decrees.

(Whorf 1956: 213-4)

The metaphor in the passage above of the perception of the world as a “kaleidoscopic flux of impressions” (ibid: 213) refers to perceptions unfiltered by cultural and linguistic categories. Although the powerful evocation led to later interpretations of linguistic
determinism and a “strong form” of the so-called “Sapir-Whorf hypothesis” (Gumperz and Levinson 1996, Slobin 1996), but “no one with genuine cross-cultural experience could deny that it also contains a great deal of truth” (Wierzbicka 1997: 6). For example, Chinese grammar contains a category of “static verb” or “stative verb,” which is similar to the English expression of the BE verb in combination with adjectives. I exemplify with a Chinese static verb 高 gāo ‘be tall’ in an adjacency pair (2).

(2) A: 他 高 不 高 ？
     B: 他 高 高。 OR 他 不 高。

   tā gāo-bù-gāo            tā hěn gāo   tā bù gāo
   he (be) tall-not- (be) tall  he very (be) tall  he not (be) tall

   ‘Is he (relatively) tall or not?’  ‘He is very tall.’ ‘He is not tall.’

(constructed example)

According to Hockett (1954), Chinese scalar measurements are always given in relation to the scale, never as absolutes. The question in (1A) correlates to the relativistic use of static verbs in Chinese. This question presupposes or expects an answer that he as relatively tall, as measured on a shared scale of height norms. To meet Speaker A’s expectation, Speaker B can answer with a degree modifier along that scale of expectation in 他 非 常 高 tā hěn gāo ‘he very tall: he is very tall’ to meet the “one direction on that scale as ‘positive’” (Hockett 1954: 121). Or to fail her interlocutor’s expectation, Speaker B can respond with a negation marker “not”, as in 他 不 高 tā bù gāo ‘he not tall: he is not tall.’ This static tall predicate in (1A) evokes an image of a man who is relatively tall on the scale, or portrays the stative existence of a relatively tall man. This agrees with what Hockett concludes, “Chinese [static verbs] most normally handle qualities overtly as matters of degrees of difference, rather than as matters of kind” (ibid.). This habitual relativism in Chinese use
of static verbs correlates to “the doctrine of the mean” in Taoism: one cannot be too happy nor too sad; moderation is all things. The doctrine of the mean is “codified in the patterns of our language” of the Chinese speech community. Language does influence how one perceives or construes the world, at least in the case of Chinese language.

A similar idea prevails in Langacker’s view of linguistic structure despite the fact that he never references Sapir-Whorfian relativism as an empirical issue (1994). Linguistic relativism is implicit in Langacker’s statement “if one language says I am cold, a second I have cold, and a third It is cold to me, these expressions differ semantically even though they refer to the same basic conceptual content” (Langacker 1987: 47). In other words, Langacker considers that “meaning is language-specific to a considerable extent” (ibid.), and that “full universality of semantic structure cannot be presumed even on the assumption that human cognitive ability and experiences are quite comparable across cultures” (ibid.). In this way, the enterprise of cognitive linguistics can be seen to provide another avenue to explore the issues of linguistic and cognitive relativism.

5.2.2 Language Awareness

The concept of language awareness was developed in the 1980s (Niemeier 2004), and its application to SLA provides a new perspective on pedagogy. Language awareness is based on linguistic and cultural relativism, and on becoming aware of the “idiosyncrasies and thus of the underlying systems of values and attitudes of a foreign culture” (Niemeier 2004: 96). In other words, it is the operationalization of linguistic and cultural relativism. This approach shifts the goal of SLA from the traditional one of advancing the learner’s performance, i.e., correct pronunciation and grammar, to enhancing the learner’s awareness of the worldview and cultural reasoning that speakers of the target language
take for granted. Worldview is an overall cognitive perspective from which one sees, understands and interprets the world; the concept harkens back to von Humboldt (1836, 1988), and is picked up through Whorf (1940). In this way, the language awareness approach provides “a cognitive and affective asset” (Niemeier 2004: 96) to language-learning, in order to strengthen the learners’ intercultural competence, and to assist the learner in construction of another worldview. The construction of a different worldview other than one’s own consolidates or deepens the second language learner’s understanding of the cognitive and cultural differences that are linked to language, culture, and conceptualization. The language awareness approach offers insight into the interrelation of language, thinking, cognition, and culture as proposed in linguistic relativity as articulated by Sapir and Whorf, and more recently, Lucy (1992). Here I relate language awareness to cognitive relativism through the example of pedagogical issues involved in teaching non-native speakers to correctly use the Mandarin Chinese bā construction.

5.2.3 Cognitive Relativism, Culture and Grammar

To elaborate the concept of cognitive relativism, I start with a perspectival cognitive difference in translating the name of the monumental Chinese historical structure (萬里)長城 (wàn-lǐ) chǎng-chéng ‘(10,000-kilometer-)long-wall’ as the Great Wall of China in English. The translation into English with the adjective “great” reflects cognitive dimensional differences between English and Chinese not only in terms of perception of the physical size or length of the wall, but also involving its magnificence in comparison to other fortress walls in the world. The Great Wall was constructed during Qin dynasty (265 A.D. -420 A.D.). The measurement matrix of 長 cháng ‘long’ in Chinese can only be
applied to horizontal length\(^1\). In China, the Great Wall is famous for being the longest of all the historic fortress walls, and because of its antiquity. In English, “great” can be applied to dimensions of volume, size and abstract achievement; both size and achievement are highlighted in the English translation. The different terms in Chinese and English derive from different cognitive domains of comparative scale, in the same way that age measurements differ, as discussed in section 5.2.1. This example shows that the same perceptual stimulus can evoke different linguistic expression. It also supports linguistic relativism, in that language reflects differences in conceptualization of reality.

Langacker (1994) holds that language and culture are both facets of cognition, shown in Figure 5.2. Per Langacker, neither language nor culture are bounded or self-contained as individual entities, but overlap extensively along multiple facets within the cognition domain.

![Figure 5.2: The Interrelationship of Cognition, Language and Culture](Langacker 1994: 26)

Vendeloise (1991) claims that the impact of cultural knowledge involves the conceptually grounded significance, exemplified in the French preposition à ‘at’ in (3).

\(^1\) An exception is the conventional expression 長人 chángrén ‘long-person: a very tall person’ mostly refers to those who are very tall, such as the basketball player Yao, ming or Michael Jordan. Other than that, the modifier for the height is 高 gāo ‘tall’ instead of 長 cháng ‘long.’
According to Vandeloise, to use ‘at’ appropriately “demands the shared knowledge of social routines” (1991: 182). The following examples (3a-d) involve être à table ‘be {at/on} (the) table’ construction, which represents a canonical situation of French cultural practice.

(3)  

a.* La cafetière est à la table.  a’. La cafetière est sur la table.

“The coffeepot is at the table.”  “The coffeepot is on the table.”

b. La cafetière est à table.

“The coffeepot is on the table.”  b’. *La cafetière est sur table.

“*The coffeepot is on table.”

c. Le prince est à table.

“The prince is at the table.”

d. Le camembert est à table.

“The camembert is on the table.”

(adapted from Vandeloise 1991: 175-6)

Vandeloise (1991) claims that (3b, 3b, 3d) are associated with an entrenched scene involving the social ritual of eating and drinking at a table, and that this scenario is so culturally entrenched and conventionalized that it results in “suppression of the definite article in the fixed expression être à table” (Langacker 1994: 42). This accounts for the otherwise surprising ill-formedness of (3a); compare the disallowed suppression of the definite article in a situation that is syntactically parallel but does not have the semantic, pragmatic, or cultural entrenchment in (3a’). For another syntactically parallel example where the definite article is required, see (3b’); this is the common pattern for prepositional phrases in French. The parallel examples of (3a, 3a’ and 3b, 3b’) demonstrate that the

2 This expression, may be exclusively regional, is not accepted by native French speakers from Canada and Senegal, where cultural practice also differ.
preposition *sur* is used in a canonical bearer/burden relation, in which the plane of the bearer is horizontal, as the table in (3a’). In (3b), Vandeloise asks, “what more obviously evokes a [French] social ritual than a table and a coffeepot?” (1991: 175). This scene “associates the target of *à* with the routine called into mind by the landmark” (ibid: 184). Examples (3a-d) show that cultural prominence contributes to the process of conceptual integration (Langacker 2003) of a grammatical construction.

Two more examples in (4) and (5) support the phenomenon of cognitive prominence. In Christian practice, the communion table is located in a prominent place in a sanctuary. The symbolic meaning associated with the communion table indicates the importance of the Lord’s Supper in their worship. The utterance in (4) is appropriate to refer to the offerings.

(4) The bread and the wine are at table.\(^3\)

The suppression of the definite article “the” in this example indicates with the cognitive saliency of this Christian practice in English religious discourse. The Portuguese examples in (5) also demonstrate cognitive prominence; as a great musician, Bach is highlighted by the suppression of the definite article, which is required for a less famous composer.

(5) a. Esta musica é de Bach.

    this music is of Bach

b. Esta musica é do [de (t)o] Liduino.

    this music is of the Liduino\(^4\)

Newman (2002) demonstrates the correlation of cognition, culture, and grammar in the verbal expression “give” in Japanese. Japanese verbal lexical choices of “to give” reflect

\(^3\) I thank Dr. Sarah Ross for providing this example.

\(^4\) Dr. Liduino Pitombeira provides this example.
the social hierarchy, which is encoded into the act of giving event (Nakane 1972, Newman 2002). Ranked social order regulates Japanese life, and influences linguistic choices in Japanese. Building upon Loveday (1986: 57-78), Newman categorizes the six verbs that are used for the Japanese event of giving into three types, based on whether the speaker identifies himself/herself (a) with the giver, (b) the recipient, (c) neither the giver nor the recipient (Figure 3).

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
(a) S \equiv G & (b) S \equiv R & (c) S \neq G \neq R \\
R > G & G > R & R > G \\
\text{sashiageru} & \text{kudasaru} & \text{sashiageru} \\
o-age itasu/ suru & \text{kudasaru/ kureru} & \text{ageru/ yaru} \\
\text{ageru/ yaru} & G < R & R < G \\
R < G & \text{yaru} & \text{yaru} \\
\text{yaru} & G < R & R < G \\
\end{array}
\]

\(\equiv\) identified with \(\neq\) identified with neither 

\(R=\) Recipient, \(G=\) Giver, \(S=\) Speaker

**Figure 3: Japanese “to give” Verbs**
(modified from Newman 2002: 84)

I have used a symbolic shorthand in Figure 3 to show the social ranking between the recipient (as R) and the giver (as G): G higher-to-lower status R is indicated as \(>\), and G lower-to-higher lower status R is as \(<\). When the speaker (S) identifies at the same status with, the indication is \(\equiv\), while lack of identification is symbolized as indicated \(\neq\). Figure 3(a) shows the lexical choices for an S and a G who identify with each other. Figure 3(b) presents the choices when the speaker is identified with the recipient. Figure 3(c) shows that the speaker does not identify himself with the giver nor the recipient. The examples in (6) all exemplify category (a) in Figure 3.
(6) **a1: sashiageru (R → G → Professor → Student)**

Graduate Student will give this to the professor

Professor:  
*Kore itadaitemo ii deska?*  
this receive-polite good-PRT

‘Can I have this?’

Student:  
*Hai. Sashiagemasu.*  
Yes. Give-polite suffix

‘Yes, I will give you.’

**a2: o-age itasu/suru (R → G → Buddha → worshiper)**

Mother will offer (give) the tea to Buddha.

Mother:  
*sono ocha-o hotokesama-ni oageshite*  
Offer the tea to Buddha.’

**a3: ageru (friends and family members)**

The woman gives this to her friend.

Female:  
*Kore ageru.*  
this give

‘I give this to you.’

**a4: yaru (used by males only)**

The man gives this to his friend.

Male:  
*Kore yaru.*  
this yaru

‘I give this to you.’  
(constructed examples by native Japanese speaker)

---

5 The form itadaiku is a polite word, roughly means “to humbly receive” or “to humbly partake.” It is usually used *te* form. *Itadaimasu* is the salutation form used in Japan before eating, and can also be used when receiving or taking something from someone.
In (6a1), the polite form of *sashiagemasu* indicates that the speaker, i.e., the graduate student, identifies with the giver through their student-professor relationship, and recognizes the relative higher status of the recipient, i.e., the professor. In (6a2), the speaker is identified by family membership with the giver, i.e., the mother, offers the tea to the recipient, i.e., the Buddha. This worship of the Buddha carries social verticality, which is encoded in the honorific prefix *o-* and the use of the full verb *o-age-suru*. The lexical choice of *ageru* and *yaru* in (6a3) and (6a4) depends on the politeness required for addressing the recipient, and the use of *yaru* is further associated with gender. The interactional frame in example (6a3) characterizes use among family or close friends. The sentence in (6a4) can only be uttered by a male. It conveys a rough or rude connotation, thus cannot be addressed to the elders. Women in Japanese avoid using the form *yaru*.

When the speaker is identified with the recipient or in the speaker’s group as indicated in Figure 3(b), the speaker will use the forms of *kudasaru, kadasaru/kureru, kureru* depending upon relation to the relative status of the giver. The symbol ≈ indicates the social ranking is about the same.

(7)  

**b1: kudasaru** (R > G --> Teacher > My brother)

Teacher gives my brother a camera.

\[ G \text{ ga} \quad R\text{ ni} \quad \text{kamera} \quad o \quad \text{kudasaru}. \]

\[ G \text{ NOM R DAT camera ACC give} \]

**b2: kudasaru/kureru** (R ≈ G --> I ≈ friend)

My friend will give me a camera.

---

6 The young female Japanese native speaker who constructed the examples in (5) recognized the form *o-age-itasu* as archaic; she reports that she never uses or hears it.
The child gives my aunt a camera.

The set of examples in (7b) demonstrate the relative usage of kudasaru, kadasaru/kureru, and kureru with respect to the roles of the giver and the recipient. I will not discuss the parallel uses in Figure 3(c). See Loveday (1986) and Newman (1996, 2002).

The multiple Japanese alternatives for the verb “to give” overtly demonstrate that the elaborate norms of etiquette to be observed in human interactions are deeply embedded in Japanese language (Newman 2002: 82). The relative status of participants in this interactional frame is distinctively cultural understandings, such as high status for teachers and elders, with license for vulgarity between male friends. The essential correlation of language, culture and cognition are revealed in selecting among the lexical alternatives in the social and situational norms used by Japanese speakers in the act of a giving event. The act of “gift-giving” is culturally significant in a Japanese society.

5.3 Cognitive Relativism: Result in Mandarin Chinese

The examples of the culturally embedded grammatical use of the etre à construction in French, the expression at table in a Christian communion, and lexical items for “to give” in Japanese provide evidence for the interrelationship among cognition, culture and grammar. Lucy (1992) and Zhang and Schmitt (1998) respectively support cognitive relativism with
experimental data from English and Yucatec Maya, and from English and Chinese. The result of Lucy’s experiment shows that English speakers categorize objects based on their shape while Yucatec Maya speakers classify on the basis of constituent materials.

Tai’s example of “marrying the wrong guy,” which I discussed in Chapter 2, demonstrates a systematic conceptual difference between English and Chinese in terms of construing the occurrence of a mistake. Tai (2003) interprets the difference as based on the ontological relativity involving events. He concludes that English is an agent-oriented language, with primary focus relatively on the process of an event; Chinese, on the other hand, is a patient-oriented language, with focus on the result of an event (2003: 306-11).

Zhang and Schmitt’s (1998) findings show that Chinese speakers group together objects that share the same classifier; the shared classifier makes it easier for them to recall the objects in a group. Nisbett, Peng, Choi, and Norenzaya (2001) refute the notion of cognitive universality and point out that Chinese attend to holistic cognition whereas Europeans attend to analytic cognition. Wierzbicka (2002) also notices the attention of causal relation to abstract ideas in English by examining the wealth of causative constructions in English, and she further builds upon Bally (1920 in Wierzbicka 2002) to claim that the analytical and causal cognition is more evident in English than in French, German, and Russian. Tai (2003) holds that Chinese native speakers focus on the result of an event, pending on further experiments.

In the case of Mandarin Chinese, evidence for cognitive relativism in relation to the concept of result in Mandarin Chinese also sheds insight on this interrelationship between cognition and grammar. Tai accounts for result as a semantic category in Mandarin Chinese by defining result in the sense of Talmy’s (2000) cognitive semantics, which
incorporates *result* either in the verb root or in its satellite. Talmy (2000) regards the semantic category of *result* as a co-event that accompanies the action or state in the main event. In contrast to Talmy’s analysis, Tai (1984, 1989, 2003) argues that the result element of V2 in the Mandarin Chinese action-result schema (V1-V2 pattern) is the center of the predication, i.e., the main event. According to Tai, V1 is the subordinate event that expresses the cause, while V2 is the main event that denotes the result (Tai 2003: 306-311). I agree with the part of Tai’s analysis that identifies V2 as the main event that represents the result in the occurrence of an event. However, while Tai restricts the role of V1 to CAUSE, I propose that it also expresses MANNER. My analysis in 5.3.1 shows that the role of V1 in the Mandarin Chinese action-result schema (V1-V2) accounts for either CAUSE or MANNER. I demonstrate that V1 can also show MANNER, i.e., the manner in which the result is brought about.

I follow Tai’s analysis (1984, 1989, 2003), and further expand the element of resultant construals in the Mandarin Chinese *bā* construction (see Chapter 4). The ubiquitous use of Mandarin Chinese resultative verbal compounds (RVCs) indicates the cognitive saliency of the construal of *result* elements. The resultant construals in the *bā* construction further support the argument that *result* represents a semantic prime in Mandarin Chinese. (See subsection 5.3.2 below).

### 5.3.1 Profile of Mandarin Chinese RVC

I concur with Tai’s claim that V2 is the center of the predication in the V1-V2 construction, as demonstrated in my analysis of example sentences in (8) and (9). The set of sentences in (8) demonstrates that the V2 components 進 *jin* ‘enter,’ 出 *chū* ‘out,’ 過 *guò* ‘pass’ incorporate the PATH element (see section 1.4.4). The element V1 describes
the manner by which the result V2 is accomplished, i.e., walking. The action verb V1 is 
not a CAUSE of the result of V2, as is the case of 殺 死 shā-sǐ ‘kill-die: to kill’ (see 
section 2.2.1), but is construed as the MANNER of the scene. The element V1 cannot 
stand alone even with the aspectual marker 了 –le, as shown in (8a’), (8b’), and (8c’).
However, when the V2 element serves as the main verb, the conceptualization schemata in 
(8a’), (8b’), and (8c’) are equivalent to those in (8a), (8b), and (8c). The only difference is 
the absence of information regarding MANNER. In Figure 5.4, I have provided a diagram 
of the parallel schemata.

(8)  a. 瑪麗走進了他家。

 málì zǒu-jìn le tā jiā

 V1-V2

 Mary walk-enter ASP he house

 ‘Mary walked into his house.’

 ‘Mary entered into his house by walking.’

 a’. * 瑪麗走了他家。

 * málì zǒu le tā jiā

 Mary walk-ASP he house

 a”. 瑪麗進了他家。

 málì jìn le tā jiā

 Mary enter ASP he house

 ‘Mary entered his house.’

 [Manner is not indicated since V1 is deleted. The MANNER of entering is open; 
it could be walking, or by wheelchair, etc.]
b. 瑪麗走出了他家。

*mǎlì zǒu-chū le tā jiā

V1-V2
Mary walk-out ASP he house
‘Mary walked out of his house.’
‘Mary exited his house walking.’

b’. *瑪麗走了他家。

*mǎlì zǒu le tā jiā
Mary walk ASP he house

b”. 瑪麗出了他家。

*mǎlì chū le tā jiā
Mary exit ASP he house
‘Mary exited/ left his house.’

[Manner is not indicated since V1 is deleted. The MANNER of exiting is open; it could be walking, or jumping out of a window, etc.]

c. 瑪麗走過了他家。

*mǎlì zǒu-guò le tā jiā

V1-V2
Mary walk-pass ASP he house
‘Mary passed his house by walking.’ ‘Mary walked past his house.’

c’. * 瑪麗走了他家。

* mǎlì zǒu le tā jiā
Mary walk-ASP he house
c”. 瑪麗過了他家。

麻木 guò le tā jiā

Mary pass ASP he house

‘Mary passed his house.”

[Manner is not indicated since V1 is deleted. The MANNER of passing is open; it could be walking, on a bike, or in a car, etc.] (constructed examples)

Figure 5.4: Parallel schematizations of examples (8a, 8b, 8c) and V2 Schema

The set of examples in (9) also shows an action-result schema of manner. In these examples, V2 is a static verb rather than a verb denoting PATH. The V2 element construes a situation that has resulted from V1, and so describes the resultative state that the agent experiences.

(9)  a. 他吃飽了。 ≈ a’. 他飽了。 ≠ a”. 他吃了。

tā chī-bǎo le  tā bǎo le  tā chī le

V1-V2  he full ASP  he eat ASP

he eat-full ASP  ‘He is full.’  ‘He ate/ has eaten.’

‘He is full/ He (has eaten) his fill.’

284
b. 他吃撑了。 ≈  b’. 他撑了。 ≠ b”. 他吃了。

\( tā chī-chēng le \)  
V1-V2 he stuffed ASP he eat ASP
he eat-stuffed ASP ‘He is stuffed.’ ‘He ate/ has eaten.’

‘He is stuffed/ He ate until he was stuffed.’

c. 他吃膩了。 ≈ c’. 他膩了。 ≠ c”. 他吃了。

\( tā chī-nì le \)  
V1-V2 he fed up ASP he eat ASP
he eat-fed up ASP ‘He is fed up.’ ‘He ate/ has eaten.’

‘He is fed up with eating [a certain food].’ (constructed examples)

The evoked scenes in (9a) and (9a’) are parallel, whereas that in (9a”) presents a different situation. In (9a’) and (9a”), the experiencer’s state of being full is due to eating. In (9b) and (9b’), the stuffed state refers to the implied noun “belly,” in that the agent “he” ate so much that his belly was stuffed with food. The elements V2 in (9a) and (9b) clearly construes the resultant state of the agent’s being full and feeling stuffed; they describe the main static event. A similar pattern is found in (9c) and (9c’): the implied object in this case is some kind of food that the experiencer is fed up with eating.\(^7\) The set of examples in (9) also demonstrates that the V2 element represents the result serving as the center of the predication.

These two sets of examples support Tai’s claim that V2 is the center of the predication (1984, 1989, 2003). They also demonstrate that the profile of the Mandarin Chinese RVC

---

\(^7\) The translating of (9c, 9c”) compares directly to the English colloquial expression ‘to be fed up with/tired of.’
construction is on the result element V2. The cognitive prominence of result is important, but the V1 may indicate either cause or manner.

5.3.2 Profile of the bā Construction

The high prominence of the bā construction accrues to the result element in segment Z, where it is characterized with disposal semantics or resultant construals. Various kinds of resultant construals in segment Z were discussed in Chapter 4. They can all be seen as representing conceptual content of a presupposed action done to the element in segment Y. This presupposed action implies the meaning of [DO (TO/UPON)], and is denoted in the retained central meaning of the morpheme bā. Additional central meanings of bā are [CAUSE], [DO TO] and [MAKE]; in these cases, the meaning resides in segment Z and does not constitute the conceptual content of doing something, but rather the resultant static construal of segment Y, where Y is a prototypically human animate entity. I therefore offer two basic interpretations of the Mandarin Chinese bā construction, as follows:

(10) a. X-bā-Y-Z  (e.g., (50) in 4.3.1.2)
X-[DO] -Y-Z [ACTION + RESULT]

b. X-bā-Y-Z  (e.g., (49) in 4.3.1.2)
X-[CAUSE] Y- Z [RESULT]

→ DID something to Y and MADE Y

Both (10a) and (10b) denote the element of result. Semantic type (10a) indicates the result element as the consequence of the action intentionally performed by the agent, reported by
the Construer. In (10b), the emphasis addresses the correlation of the cause-effect relation between the event of what the agent did and what the experiencer underwent, such that as a result of the agent’s action, the experiencer reacts, e.g., gets angry. The profile in the bà construction supports Tai’s claim that result as a semantic category in Mandarin Chinese. This semantic category of result is cognitively significant for Chinese speakers.

5.4 Cognitive Linguistics and Pedagogical Implications

Slobin relates linguistic relativity to language acquisition and second language learning:

> each native language has trained its speakers to pay different kinds of attention to events and experiences when talking about them. This training is carried out in childhood and is exceptionally resistant to restructuring in adult second language acquisition” (Slobin 1996: 89).

As applied to SLA, and given the goal of engaging optimal strategies for teaching non-native speakers of Mandarin Chinese in the appropriate use of the Mandarin Chinese bà construction, it is important to train adult learners to pay attention to both events and experiences.

In my model for instructing the bà construction, I highlight the cognitive significance of the result elements in the overall context of the performance-based pedagogical model (Jordan and Walton 1993, Walker 2000, Noda and Walker 2000). I combine the notions of cognitive relativism, language awareness, and performed culture pedagogy to address the instructional challenges of instructing U.S. adult learners in a U.S. university setting in the appropriate use of the Mandarin Chinese bà construction. The cognitive significance of result provides insight for constructing instructional strategies to sequence SLA instructional items, for enhancing the concept of action-result schema, and for segmenting the factual and actual components (see section 5.4.1 below). The performed-based
pedagogical model I adopt is modeled on cognition, and presents culture as a lived experience. It was specifically designed for instructing East Asian languages, like Chinese and Japanese, which are linguistically unrelated to and culturally different from English. Jordan and Walton (1993) have called Chinese and Japanese “truly foreign languages” (1993) from the perspective of English native speakers.

The following section introduces performance-based pedagogy in section 5.4.1, and a later section 5.4.2 presents my instructional design for the bā construction, based on the performance pedagogical model and on cognitive linguistics.

5.4.1 Pedagogical Model: Performance-based

According to Jordan and Walton (1993), foreign language instruction involves at least two kinds of knowledge about languages and cultures: the learners’ base language and culture, and the language and culture being studied – the target. Here I will refer to the base or native language and culture as L1 and C1, and the target or non-native language and culture as L2 and C2. The method Jordan and Walton encourage involves two major components: the actual and the factual. The actual component involves target-language native speaker interaction with L2 learners in authentic C2 manners; the factual component involves L1 native-speaking teachers explaining and analyzing L2/C2 behaviors. Building upon Jordan and Walton (1993), I further suggest that both target-natives and base-natives share the insights regarding the cognitive significance of differences between L1 and L2 as well as C1 and C2 to enhance the level of factual explanations, and to improve the quality of pedagogical methods and material development.

Walker (2000), Noda and Walker (2000) implement these methods into a model they call, performance-based pedagogy. They advocate that culture is dynamic and can be
learned via participation in C2. A similar voice is articulated by Brody: for the native
speaker culture is learned “in a process of enculturation” and for the non-native speakers
“in a process of acculturation” (2003: 44). In a SLA language classroom, Brody points out
that there are at least two modes of learning involved: native culture and language and
second language and culture (ibid.).

The operationalization of cultural learning involves performing culture, and per Noda
and Walker, the operational level of culture is – Just do it. Learning a L2 can be best
accomplished in the context of a C2, since culture is what we do (Noda and Walker 2000:
189). Noda and Walker suggest that learners can successfully learn cultural behaviors,
even as they are adults; the two conspicuous examples are Princess Diana and Japanese
Empress Michiko. Both of them were successful adult learners of C2 in a fairly short of
time. Princess Diana in Great Britain learned the royal culture and developed her royal
persona at her early adulthood in order to address and behave properly like royalty.
Japanese Empress Michiko adjusts to nobility and creates her royal self to meet the
expectation of the Japanese royal hierarchy.

There are norms of behavioral culture that can be taught, so that learners can participate
in the performance/ game of L2/C2 interaction. In the modal, the role of a language
instructor comes to approximate that of an athletic coach on the playing field: the learners
are the players, and the rules of the game are the different cognitive linguistic patterns and
cultural differences reflected in L1/C1 and L2/C2. A good coach should inform the
players of the rules of the game, model the moves, and instruct the players how to play
well. In the model of language instructor as coach, the instructor does not take over the
playing field her/himself.
Noda and Walker construct a cycle of compilation (2000: 196-8) in order to engage L2/C2 learners in a successful language learning process (See Figure 5.5). Noda and Walker incorporate Schank’s (1990) idea regarding the compilation of the cultural knowledge.

Knowledge, then, is experience and stories, and intelligence is the apt use of experience and the creation and telling of stories. Memory is memory for stories, and the major processes of memory are the creation, storage, and retrieval of stories…. We must understand the role that stories play in memory. We must know how events become stories and how these stories are stored and later retrieved.

(Schank 1990: 16)

Schank claims that “wisdom is often ascribed to those who can tell just the right story at the right moment and who often have a large number of stories to tell” (1990: 14). The incorporation of Schank’s idea of “stories” into the cycle of compiling culture is a major part of Noda and Walker’s model of performing a learned culture. Learning stories consolidates compilation of the cultural memories that support participation and ability to function in C2.
The triangle indicates the agent, the oval represents memory, and the rectangle stands for activity. Seven elements are involved in a cycle of compilation: ① persona, ② culture and language knowledge, ③ performance/game, ④ story (memory), ⑤ compilation, ⑥ cases and sagas, and ⑦ C2 worldview construction (Noda and Walker 2000: 196-206; see Figure 5.5). The next section integrates the component of “story” into the pedagogical model for the Mandarin Chinese ば甫 construction.

5.4.2 Pedagogical Model for the Mandarin Chinese ば甫 Construction

I have developed a performance-based pedagogical method that is central to recognize cognition as being embodied and contextually embedded for teaching the Mandarin Chinese ば甫 construction to non-native adult learners. I use stories/cognizable events as the basic units to form chunks of episodic memory, to facilitate the appropriate use of the construction. The story or event provides a meaningful context that serves as a prompt for L2/C2 learners to conceptualize in L2/C2 in the constructed world of an SLA classroom. For any given communicative event, the story conveys C2 as contextualized knowledge in the L2 code; as the instructor, I collect authentic cognizable events from real context of L2/C2, re-create them, edit and then for use in the language classroom. I will demonstrate two scenes from an oral prochievement test that I designed for an intensive course to account for the nature of using storyline as chunks of episodic memory. I have integrated two scenes of color-blind test and vision test in order to test students’ uses of colors, numbers, orientations, and syntactic construction, like “I cannot see clearly because that is too small” in Mandarin Chinese. The contextualization with nearly-authentic props in the classroom prompted students to proficiently use the achievement-based items I designed for them to answer if they are able to recall these items.
Performing or rehearsing the story helps the L2/C2 learners to consolidate the memory of both the context and the meaning of the structure in use, facilitating their ability to participate in this kind of event. To reach this pedagogical goal, and to realize the construction of C2 worldview in a language classroom, I posit that it is necessary for instructors to devise activities and tasks that motivate and initiate learners to compile C2 knowledge, so that the learners can later continue compilation of the C2 knowledge beyond their classroom memory.

In order for L2/C2 students to learn what is important to know in the story, four levels of knowing are involved: (1) don’t know you don’t know, (2) know you don’t know, (3) know you know, and (4) don’t know you know. For example, L2/C2 learners of Japanese may know what “sumimasen” ‘excuse me, sorry’ means, but they may not know that the interpretations of “sumimasen” can range from “I apologize for not …,” “I want attention” in a restaurant, “I want you to move over to make space for me” in a crowded train, and “thank you” pending on the social contexts of interaction (Noda 2001). Similarly, U.S. learners of Chinese may know “xiexie” ‘thanks’ is used to express gratitude in Chinese, but may not know that it is never used in response to a compliment; responding to a compliment in Chinese with “xiexie” ‘thanks’ would be comparable to the pragmatic awkwardness displayed in an interaction between characters in the U.S. television program Friends, when Ross declares “I love you” to Emily, who replies “Thank you.”

My experience in instructing the Mandarin Chinese bā construction show that L2/C2 learners can follow the S bā O V pattern presented in the textbook well, which leads them

---

8 This is from instruction by Professor Galal Walker, SPEAC at OSU, which notion of knowing he applied to pedagogy was presented by Robert Smith, an engineer, in a lecture on creative thinking in the late 1970s at Cornell University.

9 Class notes from Dr. Mari Noda, SPEAC at OSU, 2001.
to think that they know how to use this construction. However, the textbook pattern is flawed in suggesting that segment $X$ must be a subject, and segment $Y$ an object despite the fact that segment $Y$ can also be a subject in an archetypal role of an experiencer. As a result, learners (and even some instructors) do not realize the full semantic nature of the $bā$ construction as it occurs in authentic interactional contexts. U.S. learners of Chinese also make mistakes in segment $Z$, because they lack the knowledge of disposal semantics and how the semantic category of result operates in relation to the $bā$ construction.

In my pedagogical format, I suggest that elements that occur in segment $Z$ should be taught as item-based entities, i.e., lexicon and phrases, prior to the introduction of the $bā$ construction. Segment $Y$ can be introduced as vocabulary items, on the model of the way that ingredients are introduced. The cognitive prominence of the $bā$ construction in recipes or cooking instructional discourse, in the form of $bā\ Y\ Z$ and $X\ bā\ Y\ Z$, should be explained in the factual component of the class. The class that incorporates the actual model involves two steps: a scaffolding story-telling activity, and the pedagogical model of performance of C2 authentic task. After introducing the $bā$ construction, the instructor presents a story with pictures to teach the use of the $bā$ construction. Then the instructor elicits questions that involve $bā$ construction responses, in order to prepare the learners to engage in the next step. Learners are then asked to participate in a series of context-based tasks that involve the $bā$ construction: for example, cooking procedures and the use of imperative sentences that engage differences of social hierarchy. Finally, learners can report or narrate their activities while engaged in a task, using a $bā$ construction. The following subsections provide step-by-step instructional suggestions for this lesson plan.
5.4.2.1 Cooking Instruction Genre

I started with a story about a cooking instruction class\textsuperscript{10}. I chose this to start with because of the domain specific semantic significance of the $b\ddot{a}$ construction in cooking instruction discourse: do this upon the ingredients as action suggested. The $b\ddot{a}$ construction also occurs with notably high frequency in this discourse genre for reasons mentioned above (section 1.7). I instructed learners how to prepare the dish “stired fried tomatoes and eggs,” and modeled appropriate use of the $b\ddot{a}$ construction throughout the procedure.

I will use SLA pedagogical terms to discuss the lesson plan. T-model means that the teacher models first before learners perform, T-S model means that the teacher engages one student to participate in modeling a certain task, and the S-S model allows students to follow both the T-model and T-S model. Item-based instruction refers to discrete items of instruction, like vocabulary and phrases, that students need to memorize and rehearse before they can use them. Strategy-based items are sentences that learners use to elicit L2 items in L2, for example, thank you zh\textsuperscript{o}ngw\textsuperscript{e}n z\textsuperscript{\-}\textsuperscript{\-}nme shu\textsuperscript{o} ‘Chinese how say: how to say “thank you” in Chinese.’ Chorus repetition refers to the classroom situation when the instructor asks learners to repeat items as a group, while individual repetition is to ask a particular student to repeat. The sequence of my lesson plan is as follows.

(1) T model cooking and narrating (T = teacher)
   a. introducing the ingredients (segment $Y$)
   b. performing acts upon the ingredients
   c. narrating actions with the $b\ddot{a}$ construction

\textsuperscript{10}I have conducted this at University of California, Santa Barbara in 2003.
(2) item-based (phonological) back-formation

a. acts involve resultant construals, e.g., “put something into the pot,” or “break the eggs” (segment Z: fang-jin guō-zi lǐ ‘put-enter pot inside: put into the pot’)

b. perform an act upon the ingredient, e.g., “put the eggs into the pot” (using bā Y Z pattern: bā dàn fang-jin guō-zi lǐ ‘put the eggs into the pot’)

c. act while rehearsing the items backwards phonologically

lǐ → guō-zī lǐ → fang-jin guō-zī lǐ → bā dàn fang-jin guō-zī lǐ

inside → pot-inside → put-enter pot-inside → BA eggs put-enter pot-inside

d. chorus and individual repetition/ feedback

(3) T-S model T cooks, and S narrates

a. Teacher as the cook, and Student performs as the narrator of the Teacher’s action using the bā construction, as a review of Step (2).

b. Feedback

(4) Elicitation and Re-enforcing

a. Question that contains a bā construction to elicit an answer with a bā sentence.

b. Ask another student “who did what and how” to re-enforce the pattern.

Step (5) is to ask a student to report the procedure of preparing a similar dish.
5.4.2.2 Reporting (1) Based on Cooking Discourse

Ask student A to perform an act upon an ingredient using a *bǎ* imperative construction. Then ask student B to report what A has done to that ingredient using a *bǎ* construction sentence. This step makes students aware that the *bǎ* construction can be used both in describing and in reporting an event.

5.4.2.3 Imperative Construction

Authentic Mandarin Chinese discourse necessarily incorporates the obligatory use of linguistically and culturally embedded articulations of L2/ C2 social and power hierarchies. Every speaker always has a role within the social and power hierarchy in L2/ C2. Incorporating a role-play performance helps make learners aware of the appropriate of the L2/ C2 Mandarin Chinese rules about who can use the *bǎ* construction as a command to whom. Appropriate examples include a command from a teacher for students to turn in their homework in (11), an order from a mother to her son in (12), or a threat from a robber to the victim in (13), and a command from a policeman to a citizen in (14). All examples (11) to (14) demonstrate the social power hierarchy.

(11) 把功课交上来。

*bā gōngkè jiāo-shàng-lái* (teacher → student)

BA homework submit-up-come

‘Turn in your homework.’

(Typically uttered by the teacher from the podium)

‘Bring your homework up here!’
In examples (13) and (14), the role of the speaker possesses more power than the addressee.

5.4.2.4 Reporting (2) Based on Imperative Construction

Following the performance in the previous section, the instructors asks students to repeat what the performers of each of these roles said, and to report what the addressees will do. Both commands and reports contain *bā* sentences. This reporting (2) exercise raises the awareness of the high frequency of the *bā* construction in reportive discourse.

5.4.2.5 Tasks

After modeling, chorus/individual repetition, feedback and re-producing, authentic tasks that engage natural-occurring *bā* sentences are implemented. These enacted classroom performances aim toward preparing students to perform the authentic tasks.
This is accomplished by establishing a story that serves as a basic unit in the learner’s memory. For this purpose, I have designed a series of tasks in the context of a Chinese-operated airline where students take the role of passengers ready to land, pass through the custom, greet those who await them and express the exhaustion after a long flight. These tasks are suggested for uses in the language room.

Listening Task #1: Stewardess addresses passengers to fasten their seat belt and place their seat in the upright position.

請把椅背豎直，並把安全帶繫好。

qīng bǎ yǐ-bèi shù-zhí bìng bā ān-quán-dài xì hǎo

please BA chair-back place-upright and BA seat belt tie-well

‘Please place your seat in the upright position and fasten your seat belt.’

Listening/ Speaking Task #2: Passenger A asks someone for assistance in removing a suitcase from the upper compartment.

可以幫我把那個手提箱拿下來嗎?

kě-yì bāng wǒ bā nà-ge shǒu-tí-xiāng ná-xià-lái ma

may help me BA that-CL suitcase take-down-come PRT

‘May you help me taking down my suitcase?’
Listening Task # 3: Officer at Customs asks for the traveller’s passport.

請把你的護照給我。

qing ba ni de hu-zao gei wo

please BA you POSS passport give me

‘Please give me your passport.’

Listening Task # 4: Your friend/ family offers help to carry your luggage.

把你的皮箱給我，我來幫你提。

ba ni de pi-xian gei wo wo lai bang ni ti

BA you POSS luggage give me I come help you carry

‘Give me your luggage. I can help you carry it.’

Speaking Task # 5: You feel so tired after 15-hour flight.

坐了十五小時的飛機，把我累死了。

zuò le shí-wù xiāo-shí de fēi-jī bā wǒ lèi sì le

sit ASP 15 hour POSS airplane BA me tired-die-ASP

‘Taking 15-hour flight made me so tired.’

The instructor should encourage students in the performance-based classroom to take initiative, and engage themselves to speak Chinese whenever they have appropriate
opportunities. Learning these tasks in the language classroom will equip students with a compilation of future L2 knowledge that has practical uses.

5.4.2.6 Substitution and Interpretation Exercises

In my experience, many Chinese instructors use bā -- non-bā substitution exercises to first introduce the bā construction (usually in first year Mandarin Chinese courses). I am strongly against taking this approach at the beginning level of students’ exposure to this construction. This type of exercise not only shows the instructors’ lack of understanding of the semantic nature of the bā construction, but also has the consequence of leading to learners’ misunderstanding the construction. This same approach, in my opinion, can be exercised under the circumstances where learners have already grasped the central meaning of the bā construction and feel comfortable using it. I suggest that this strategy can be exercised in the second year of Chinese instruction while reviewing the bā construction. The aim is to make learners aware that some non-bā sentences can be transformed into a bā construction when they have resultative complements (or “resultant construal elements”), and segments X and Y (in non-bā sentences). Another aim is to raise awareness that segment Y can have been either situationally-evoked or previously mentioned in the discourse. These two aspects of awareness-raising make the substitution exercises more meaningful and helpful for later-stage learners.

I also recommend incorporating interpretation exercises of bā sentences into English. This exercise has the goal of making students aware of the “untranslatable” element within these sentences. This type of exercises are suggested for a later stage of learning the bā construction.
5.5 Conclusion

Taylor points out that “the challenge of applying cognitive linguistic insights to a pedagogical grammar lies precisely in searching for descriptively adequate, intuitively acceptable, and easily accessible formulations of these meanings” (1993: 20). Through my proposed instruction of the Mandarin Chinese bŭ construction, I thus adopt these easily accessible formulations of cognitive linguistics to the construction of performance-based tasks. Constructing authentic cognizable events prompts students utterances in L2, and further helps the learners to converse and interact in L2/C2.
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION AND FURTHER RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

Language is meaningful, and its meaning is equated with conceptualization. For all languages, and in the case of Mandarin Chinese explored here, cultural expectations are highly intertwined with conceptualization and language. Based on these assumptions, this work has nine major findings: (1) identifying the semantic category of \textit{result} in Mandarin Chinese syntactic constructions; (2) positing the resultant construals in the Mandarin Chinese \textit{bā} construction; (3) relating the element of \textit{result} in the Mandarin Chinese \textit{bā} construction to the conceptualization and grammaticalization of the morpheme \textit{bā}, and further constructing a polysemic lexical network of \textit{bā}; (4) advocating the notion of agency and result in the Mandarin Chinese \textit{bā} construction, the English get/have + p.p. construction, and the German inseparable prefixes; (5) analyzing the \textit{bā} construction as comprising two conceptually-overlapped semantic predicates; (6) disambiguating the conceptual substrates of [CAUSE] and [DO] in the \textit{bā} construction; (7) exploring the idea of iconicity exhibited in Chinese grammar, cognition and culture by using a cognitive grammar approach; (8) determining that segment \textit{Y} in the \textit{bā} construction is the backward-looking center; and (9) accounting for the cognitive saliency of \textit{result} in Mandarin Chinese on the basis of cognitive relativism, and incorporating this into pedagogical strategies for SLA instruction of the Mandarin Chinese \textit{bā} construction;

Using a cognitive approach reveals that the Mandarin Chinese \textit{bā} construction involves the semantic elements of \textit{result} in segment \textit{Z}. The semantic category of \textit{result} can also be found in other syntactic constructions in Mandarin Chinese, such as resultative verbal compounds, \textit{V-de-EXT} resultative construction, and \textit{bèi} construction. This investigation
further support Tai’s claim that Mandarin Chinese has a semantic category of result. I also note that the resultant construals occur in the final position of each construction; this finding obeys Tai’s cognition-based Principle of Temporal Sequence (PTS): action comes before result. In the high-frequency Mandarin Chinese bā construction, the directional complement also accounts for Tai’s PTS rule. The inalienable possession relation in the Mandarin Chinese bā construction demonstrates Tai’s cognition-based Principle of Whole-Before-Part.

I conclude that analysis of Mandarin Chinese grammar is greatly facilitated by using a conceptually-grounded cognitive approach that is sensitive to experiential prompts, conceptualizations, metaphorical transfer, and cultural expectations. Chinese conceives and portrays the world in a strongly iconic way, as exemplified in the newly-coined (1970’s to 1980’s) word and that is written:

![Character Diagram](image)

- semantic radical: woman 女 nǚ
- upper right part: (go) up 上 shàng
- lower right part: (go) down 下 xià
- pronunciation: shàng-xià

(character from Chang and Chang 1983)

This Chinese character is exceptional in that it is a disyllabic; it is pronounced as shàng-xià. It construes a scenario that a woman is up and down. The word was coined to apply to a concept imported from Japan: “elevator girl”, the woman who operates the elevator in a department store saying “going up” or ”going down” each time the elevator door opens.
This newly-coined word and its written character grab the semantic and cognitive features that are prominent in its semantic construal. Two more examples related to 上 shàng ‘up’ and 下 xià ‘down’ are 忐忑 tǎn-tè ‘apprehension, anxiety.’ These two characters share the same semantic radical at the bottom of each character: heart, i.e., the culturally-assumed source of emotion for Chinese. Chinese writing construes the iconic emotional and psychological aspect in a symbolic assembly.

I find iconicity to be present in the Mandarin Chinese 把 construction, where the meaning of the morpheme 把 bā ‘to take, to hold’ still persists in the construction. This finding further reflects the interrelationship of cognition, culture, and grammar, within the realm of Mandarin Chinese ethnosyntax. The double object 给 gěi ‘to give’ construction in the 把 construction (see example (46) in section 4.3.2.4), [老板 恨 老板娘 确定 把 女儿 给 我: the boss and his wife surely won’t allow their daughter to marry me] the boss and his wife will not hold (把) their daughter, seen as a commodity, and transfer her into (给) the control sphere of the man who wants to marry their daughter. This concept is revealed in the two words: 娶 qǔ ‘to marry (a woman)’ and 嫁 jià ‘to marry (a man)’.

Identifying and emphasizing the cognitive saliency of result in Mandarin Chinese gives direction to the pedagogical sequencing for teaching this instruction to non-native speakers of Mandarin Chinese. SLA pedagogy is enhanced by making students aware of the significance of cognitive construals and cultural expectations; this is especially the case when teaching English speakers Chinese, a linguistically-unrelated, culturally-distant, and cognitively-different language from English. Cognitive, linguistic and cultural awareness must not and cannot be ignored.
For further research directions, I plan to analyze the collocated auxiliaries and negation phrases in the Mandarin Chinese bable construction. I also plan to construct a concept group and a prime group for result based on cognitive relativism, to incorporate in the pedagogical sequencing strategies. I continue to build my corpus of conversational data to examine the element of result in colloquial interactive discourse data.
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