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1. Introduction

Peyraube (1986, 1987, 1988a) identifies three main dative constructions in Archaic Chinese, viz:

Verb + Indirect Object (IO) + Direct Object (DO)
Verb + Direct Object (DO) + yu + Indirect Object (IO)
yi + Direct Object (DO) + Verb + Indirect Object (IO)

The following are some examples to illustrate the three dative constructions:

(1) 公賜之食 (左傳: 隱.1 Zuozhuan: Yin.1)
gong ci zhi shi
duke offer 3:SG food
‘The Duke offered him food.’

(2) 堯讓天下于許由 (莊子: 逍遙遊 Zhuangzi: Xiaoyao You)
yao rang tian xia yu xu you
Yao bequeath Empire DAT Xu You
‘Yao bequeathed the Empire to Xu You.’

(3) 孔子以其兄之子妻之 (論語: 先進 Lunyu: Xianjin)
kong zi yi qi xiong zhi zi qi zhi
Confucius INST 3:SG:POSS brother GEN daughter give-for-marriage 3:SG
‘Confucius gave him his elder brother’s daughter to marry.’

Among the three, the double-object construction is the most widely discussed grammatical construction, and an enormous literature has been accumulated in recent
decades. Although some of the works on this topic have since formed the foundation stone for our overall understanding of Archaic Chinese grammar (cf. Peyraube 1986, 1987, 1988a), certain issues remain controversial. In light of the advancement of cognitive linguistics, this paper hopes to explore the possibility of situating the study of Chinese historical syntax in a cognitive perspective through the following discussion on the double-object construction in Archaic Chinese. By Archaic Chinese, we refer to the Chinese language reflected in texts written between the 10th c. and 2nd c. B.C., following Peyraube’s (1988a, 1996) periodization which is based primarily on syntactic criteria. Some of the major works written within this period are Shujing, Zuozhuan, Lunyu, Mengzi and Hanfeizi. Archaic Chinese does not include the language found in oracle-bone inscriptions (OBI), as OBI is considered to represent a language predating Archaic Chinese (i.e. Pre-Archaic Chinese according to Peyraube’s periodization).

2. Some controversial issues

This section will present a brief overview of important findings about the double-object construction and highlight some pending issues. As the many works of Peyraube on Chinese dative constructions have congregated and formed an important landmark in our understanding of the history of Chinese grammar, it is natural that his analyses in regard to the double-object construction in Archaic Chinese are taken here as a starting point for our endeavor.

Generally, Peyraube equates the dative construction to the double-object construction and uses these two terms interchangeably without much distinction in almost all his works. This is clearly illustrated by one of his papers entitled “The Double-Object Construction in Lunyu and Mengzi” (Peyraube 1987), where he discusses the three main types of dative construction, and the general outline of his discussion is captured in Fig. 1:
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Fig. 1
The question at issue here is how wide the scope of the term “double-object construction” should be extended (cf. Li Renjian 1981, Xiao Hong 1999). This controversy can actually be circumvented if the term “double-object construction” is only used to categorize constructions having two non-prepositional objects, while the term “dative construction” is reserved as an encompassing term for all constructions in Archaic Chinese that are associated with the semantic domain of GIVE. According to this proposal, the dative construction is defined semantically, whereas the double-object construction is defined structurally. The two terms, though overlapping, are not entirely identical, as illustrated by Fig. 2.

Once this distinction has been made, it is hereby argued that the dative constructions with yu and yi are not instances of the double-object construction, although they both are instances of the dative construction. With this distinction in order, it also follows that a grammatical construction could still be a double-object construction, even though it is not a dative construction. Our proposal is sketched in Fig. 3:

1 Please refer to examples 1 to 3 for the English translations of the examples in Fig. 1 and Fig. 3.
The difference between our definition and that of Peyraube is significant, as it has implication for the way some crucial examples in Archaic Chinese are analyzed.

Peyraube (1998, 1999a) highlighted a lively debate that has been going on for decades with regard to the correct analysis of “Verb+zhi 之+Noun” in Archaic Chinese, as exemplified by the following two examples:

(4) 奪之牛 (左傳: 宣.12 Zuozhuan: Xuan.12)
    duo zhi niu
    ‘...robbed him (a) buffalo.’

(5) 立之君 (左傳: 襄.14 Zuozhuan: Xiang.14)
    li zhi jun
    ‘...established the monarch for the people.’

There have been serious disagreements among scholars on how to analyze the syntactic structure of the above examples, and two opposing camps, viz., the monotransitive camp and the ditransitive camp, have emerged over the past decades (cf. He Leshi 1980; Yang Bojun & He Leshi 1992; Peyraube 1998, 1999a; Liu Songchuan 1998, 1999; etc.). Peyraube (1998, 1999a) rejects examples 4 and 5 as instances of the double-object construction, while most Chinese scholars such as Yang Bojun & He Leshi (1992) and Liu Songchuan (1998, 1999) embrace them. Thus, depending on what analytical framework one subscribes to, the number of double-object construction types in Archaic Chinese can range from one to eight. Peyraube argues for the existence of only one type of double-object construction. According to him, only lexical dative verbs with an underlying semantic feature of [+give] are compatible with this grammatical construction. In contrast, Liu Songchuan proposes that there are a total of eight types of double-object construction in Archaic Chinese, and they are:

1. The GIVE Type 給與類型
2. The TAKE Type 取得類型
3. The ANNOUNCE Type 告示類型

Two different analyses have been put forward for this example. The English translation above is provided by Peyraube (1999a). There is another analysis which treats example 4 as a monotransitive clause and hence the example is translated as ‘rob his buffalo’ (Peyraube 1999a). In this case, the pronoun zhi 之 is read as the possessive qi 其.
As syntactic objects are not defined explicitly within the structuralist research paradigm that has guided the study of Chinese historical syntax since the 1970’s, it is unavoidable that a construction with two syntactic objects (i.e. double-object construction) cannot be defined exclusively either.

Coming back to the problem posed by the “Verb+\text{zhi}之+Noun” structure, Peyraube (1999a: 598) proposes the following solution:

In order to know if \text{zhi} is an IO dative pronoun or a genitive pronoun, one has to examine the semantic nature of the preceding verb.

According to him, only [+give] dative verbs can be accommodated into the double-object construction, while [+receive] dative verbs and extended dative ones are barred from this construction. Obviously, semantics has featured prominently in Peyraube’s decision to reject examples 4 and 5. Moreover, it is also evident that these examples are rejected as instances of the double-object construction as they are not instances of the dative construction, which, by definition, encodes an event of GIVE. Incidentally, Liu Songchuan also makes reference to semantics in his contradictory conclusion that the above two examples are instances of the double-object construction. Liu Songchuan claims that the examples should be categorized as the double-object construction as they share a common characteristic in their meaning with the unambiguous double-object dative.\footnote{Liu Songchuan (1998: 65): “雙賓語結構中述語一般由三向動詞擔任，在特殊語境中，它們同雙賓語在語義關係上具有交接和移位的特點，由於交接和移位上的具體差異，形成了雙賓語結構的8個不同類型。”}

We totally agree with Peyraube that examples 4 and 5 are not instances of the dative construction, but the more important question is whether these two examples qualify as instances of the double-object construction. To answer this question, we must go back to basics and examine those unambiguous instances of the double-object construction such as example 1, which is reproduced below as example 6:

\footnote{“Dative construction” here refers to the construction that encodes a GIVE event.}
This is a clear instance of the double-object construction, and the decisive factor for this conclusion has nothing to do with the semantic nature of the preceding verb or the objective meaning of the entire clause, but is closely associated with the fact that this example has two syntactic objects. There is strictly no circularity in reasoning since we adhere to the procedure that the two postverbal objects encode participants lying downstream from the agent in the action chain (cf. Langacker 1987, 1991a, 1991b, 1999). It is beyond the scope of this paper to offer a full discussion of grammatical relations in Archaic Chinese, but what is evident is that there are altogether three participants in the event structure of examples 4 and 5, and two of them lie downstream from the agent in the action chain. In accordance with the tenets of Cognitive Grammar (hereafter CG), since these two downstream participants occupy two postverbal positions after the main verb, they are henceforth analyzed as syntactic objects. Upon comparison, this analysis is preferred over the one which treats both examples 4 and 5 as monotransitive clauses as it obeys the principle of parsimony. The two examples could be analyzed as monotransitive clauses if and only if the third person pronoun *zhi*之 is read as the possessive pronoun *qi*其. Not only is additional justification required, which makes such a solution uneconomical, it also fails to explain the contrast of *zhi*之 and *qi*其 after two particular TAKE verbs in *Zuozhuan*, the same text where examples 4 and 5 are taken from.

A comparison will now be made between two TAKE verbs in *Zuozhuan*, viz. *duo* 奪 ‘rob’ and *qu* 取 ‘take’. Although the two verbs invoke the same conceptual base (in Langacker’s terms), they have different grammatical behaviors when the pronoun *zhi*之 occupies the immediate postverbal position. For the verb *qu*取 ‘take’, there are a total of 46 instances where the pronoun *zhi*之 occurs immediately after it. But out of these 46 instances, only one has a second postverbal nominal immediately after the first postverbal nominal. The example is:

(7) 其取之公也薄，其施之民也厚 (左傳: 昭.26 Zuozhuan: Zhao.26)
qi qu zhi gong ye bo, qi shi zhi min ye hou
3:PL take PRN duke PART small, 3:PL hand-out PRN people PART large
‘They received small payments from the State, but they gave out large bounties to the people.’
Since the IO occupies the second postverbal position while the DO occurs immediately after the main verb, this example obviously does not fit the “Verb+IO+DO” structure and must be eliminated. Once this example has been taken out, an unambiguous contrast between these two TAKE verbs can be observed if we restrict the immediate postverbal pronominal to the pronoun \( zhi \):

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
\text{Duo 賊} & \text{V+} zhi \_ & \text{V+} zhi \_+\text{NP (Verb+IO+DO)} \\
\hline
\text{Qu 取} & \text{take} & 15 & 11 \\
\text{取} & \text{take} & 46 & 0 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

Table 1

This grammatical distribution might be just a fluke, but upon a closer examination, it can be further shown that for the verb \( qu \) 取‘take’, in place of the syntactic structure “\( V\text{TAKE}+zhi \_+\text{NP} \)”\), it has quite a number of examples which elaborate the following structural configuration:

\[
V + qi 求 + \text{NP}
\]

Here are some examples:

(8) 與我伐夷而取其地 (左傳: 莊.16 Zuozhuan: Zhuang.16)
    yu wo fa yi er qu qi di
    COM 1:SG invade Yi and take 3:SG:POSS land
    ‘Attack Yi with me, and take its territory.’

(9) 皆取其邑而歸諸侯 (左傳: 襄.27 Zuozhuan: Xiang.27)
    jie qu qi yi er kui zhu hou
    all take 3:SG:POSS city and give various marquis
    ‘[He] took all Wuyu’s cities and gave them to their owners.’

(10) 取其寶器而還 (左傳: 莊.20 Zuozhuan: Zhuang.20)
    qu qi bao qi er huan
    take 3:SG:POSS valuable thing and return
    ‘[He] took away valuable articles belonging to the Royal House and returned.’
The armies of the princes defeated the footmen of Zheng, took their paddy and returned.

Someone took his jade and wished to sell it.

Thus, the grammatical behavior of the verb *qu 取* ‘take’ in *Zuozhuan* can be summarized as:

\[ qu 取 + qi 其 + NP \]
\[ *qu 取 + zhi 之 + NP \]

Incorporating this observation into the table below, we have:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>V+zhi 之</th>
<th>V+zhi 之+NP (Verb+IO+DO)</th>
<th>V+qi 其+NP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duo 奪 ‘rob’</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qu 取 ‘take’</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

Two preliminary conclusions can be drawn from the table about the two TAKE verbs:

1. The verb *qu 取* ‘take’ is definitely monotransitive and cannot occur in the “Verb+IO+DO” structure;
2. The verb *duo 奪* ‘rob’ can occur in two different syntactic frames: “V+zhi 之+NP” and “V+qi 其+NP”.

One point clearly stands out in table 2. Apparently, there is basically not enough empirical evidence in *Zuozhuan* to suggest that the third person pronoun *zhi 之* can be read as the possessive pronoun *qi 其*. This is because if there were an actual confusion between the two pronouns, it would not be possible to observe the above pattern in table
2. The complementary distribution as shown in table 2 is highly suggestive about the grammatical relation of the immediate postverbal pronominal and the following postverbal nominals in “duo 豪 + zhi 之 + NP”. If the pronoun zhi 之 cannot be assigned a possessive reading, then it is definitely not a modifier of the second postverbal nominal. Thus, the verb duo 豪 ‘rob’ governs a pronoun and a full nominal. In view of this, the proposal which claims that the pronoun zhi 之 in examples elaborating the “Verb Non-GIVE + zhi 之 + NP” structure could be read as the possessive qi 其 is not supported.

There are further incentives for us to analyze example 4 as a ditransitive clause. Most discussions in the literature about the compatibility of the verb duo 豪 ‘rob’ and the double-object construction have revolved around examples such as example 14. These examples elaborate the “duo 豪 + zhi 之 + NP” structure with the pronoun which encodes the human source occupying the immediate postverbal position.

(13) 夺司寇亥政 (左傳: 哀 25 Zuozhuan: Ai.25)
    duo si kou hai zheng
    rob minister-of-crime Hai political-power
    ‘…robbed Hai, the minister of crime, of the political power.’

(14) 夺之杖 (左傳: 定2 Zuozhuan: Ding.2)
    duo zhi zhang
    rob 3:SG stick
    ‘…robbed him of the stick.’

Very few, except probably Li Zuofeng (2003a: 127-141), have paid sufficient attention to the type of examples such as example 13 which elaborates the “duo 豪 + NP1 + NP2” structure. The essential difference between the two types of examples is that in the latter, a full nominal encoding the human source, rather than a pronoun, occupies the immediate postverbal position. For example 14, He Leshi (1980) puts forth two arguments to support a ditransitive thesis, but both the arguments have been convincingly refuted by Peyraube (1998, 1999a), who instead argues for a monotransitive thesis. Peyraube (1999a: 604) has the following conclusion for the verb duo 豪 ‘rob’:

It is certainly a [+receive] lexical dative verb. -- And the fact that one finds at the same time “duo zhi N” and “duo qi N” would actually rather be an indication (but
not an argument) toward the possibility of a $zhi = qi$ solution, especially when the two forms can be found in the same passage.

The passage mentioned above is reproduced below from Peyraube (1999a: 604):

(15) (田恆)遂殺簡公而奪之政 -- 皇喜遂殺宋君而奪其政 (韓非子: 內儲說下 Hanfeizi: Neichushuo Xia)
(Tian Heng) sui sha Jian gong er duo zhi zheng -- Huang Xi sui sha Song jun er duo qi zheng
Then kill Jian Prince and seize his political power -- Huang Xi then kill Song Prince and seize his political-power

‘Then (Tian Heng) killed Prince Jian and seized his political power -- then, Huang Xi killed Prince Song and seized his political power.’

Apparently, there is confusion between the two pronouns $zhi$ 之 and $qi$ 其 in Hanfeizi, a text composed during the late Warring States period. Peyraube also makes reference to Tang Yuming (1994), who points out that the commentators of Han and Six Dynasties glossed the pronoun $zhi$ 之 as the possessive pronoun $qi$ 其. Taken together, these constitute a very strong argument for the monotransitive thesis. To counter the proposal that the pronoun $zhi$ 之 is read as the possessive $qi$ 其 in examples 14 and 15, one piece of evidence ought to be highlighted. The example is:

(16) 君以其言授其事 (韓非子: 主道 Hanfeizi: Zhudao)
jun yi qi yan shou qi shi
monarch INST 3:SG:POSS speech bestow 3:SG matter

‘The monarch bestowed on him other matters based on his speech.’

The verb $shou$ 授 ‘bestow’ is unmistakably a [+give] dative verb, and in the above example, the possessive $qi$ 其 is clearly read as the pronoun $zhi$ 之 and not the other way around. This example is important since it is taken from the same text as example 15. Hence, although the distinction between the two pronouns is blurred in Hanfeizi, one cannot jump to the immediate conclusion that the pronoun $zhi$ 之 is read as the possessive $qi$ 其 without an exploration of two key issues: at what point in Archaic

\[\text{[Footnotes]}\]

5 The gloss and translation for this example is provided by Peyraube (1999a).
6 This is not contradictory to our previous discussion that a complementary distribution is observed after two TAKE verbs in Zuozhuan, as a diachronic change could have taken place in texts written after Zuozhuan.
Chinese did this confusion actuate, and how did this confusion come about? Given that the two pronouns are also confused after [+give] dative verbs in example 16, it is more reasonable to argue that the possessive *qi* 其 in example 15 is instead read as the pronoun *zhi* 之. As a result, example 14 should be better analyzed as a double-object construction. This conclusion is in line with Li Zuofeng’s (2003a: 127-141) analysis of example 13. According to Li, since the two nominal phrases could not be in a possessive relationship, examples elaborating the “*duo* 豚+NP1+NP2” structure should be analyzed as instances of the double-object construction.

Based on the above discussion, this paper proposes to analyze both examples 4 and 5 as the double-object construction. Even though our conclusion in regard to the syntactic structure of these two examples is identical to that of Liu Songchuan (1998, 1999), our reasoning fundamentally differs from his. Liu further claims that there is an association in meaning among examples 4, 5 and 6, but elucidation of this association has not been forthcoming. One complex linguistic form for three different objective meanings is an issue that the structuralist research paradigm is not equipped with the necessary analytical tools to handle. Moreover, the theoretical preliminaries of the structuralist research paradigm, which place great emphasis on objective semantics and a verb-centered approach to lexicon-syntax mapping, have not helped either (cf. Lakoff 1987, Goldberg 1995). By incorporating the insights offered by cognitive linguists working in an alternative theoretical paradigm, a better solution is possible. Cognitive linguists contest that there is no real distinction between lexical items and grammatical constructions. This forms the basis for the symbolic thesis of grammatical constructions. According to this thesis, grammatical constructions are meaningful and exhibit polysemy just like lexical items (cf. Langacker 1987, 1991a, 1991b, 1999; Goldberg 1995; Croft 2000, 2001). Hence, although examples 4, 5 and 6 are instances of different grammatical constructions, the former two can be treated as an extension (or extended construction) conceptually motivated from the latter.

### 3. The issue of extended dative verbs

Peyraube, following Zhu Dexi (1979), sets up a category of verbs known as the extended dative verbs. We totally support Peyraube’s rationale for positing this category of verbs in his general framework to describe the evolution of the Chinese

---

7 It is possible that such confusion is an innovation that is not seen in earlier pre-Qin texts, such as *Zuo zhuan*, as demonstrated by the complementary distribution of the two pronouns *zhi* and *qi* after certain TAKE verbs.
dative construction across time, but the presence of extended dative verbs in Archaic Chinese remains a question which deserves further exploration. This is because positing this category of verbs in Archaic Chinese has not only created difficulty for the analysis of example 5 and other similar examples, but has at the same time trivialized the existence of constructional meaning and eroded the very foundation of constructional polysemy. Below, we will highlight the possible difficulty Peyraube’s conclusion about the dative construction in Archaic Chinese will encounter if this category of extended dative verbs is deemed to be present in Archaic Chinese.

Peyraube distinguishes two main types of dative verbs: lexical datives and extended datives. According to him, for lexical datives, “the dative function can be considered as being part of the lexical definition of the verb. Semantically, there is an exchange of the referent of the DO between two participants. This exchange is done in one way or in another.” For extended datives, “the dative interpretation is not linked to the verb, but introduced by the dative complement.” (Peyraube 1999a: 598-599) Lexical datives can be further divided into two categories according to the presence or absence of the underlying semantic feature of [give]. One important contribution of Peyraube to the study of Chinese dative constructions is with regard to the distribution of different categories of verbs in the three main dative constructions. Peyraube (1998, 1999a) notes that not all the dative verbs can enter indifferently into these structures. Only the [+give] dative verbs can occur in all the three structures, while the [+receive] dative verbs and extended dative verbs can only fit the structure of “Verb+DO+yu+IO”. In other words, only [+give] dative verbs can be admitted into the structure of “Verb+IO+DO”.

Let us now look at a specific example of extended dative verbs in Archaic Chinese. The example is taken from Peyraube (1987: 347):

(17) 施澤於民久 (孟子·萬章上 Mengzi: Wanzhang Shang)
    shi ze yu min jiu
    do good DAT people long-time
    ‘[They] had done good to the people for a long time.’

---

8 See section 4.
9 The English translation of example 17 is taken directly from Peyraube (1987) and it is debatable. A native English speaker suggested changing the dative to to the benefactive for in Peyraube’s translation. With this minor change, this example would be best considered to be an instance of the benefactive construction (i.e. the extended dative construction), and not an instance of the prototypical dative construction as claimed by Peyraube, even if we were to follow Peyraube in interpreting shi 施 as ‘do’. Hence, shi 施 ‘do’ cannot be treated as an
Peyraube considers the verb *shi* 施 ‘hand out’ in the above example to be an extended dative verb. Since he further claims that in such cases, the dative interpretation is introduced by the dative complement, and not the verb, this implies an implicit acceptance of a theoretical stance that is contradictory to that which warrants the existence of extended dative verbs. Moreover, if the dative interpretation is assigned by the dative complement, then the usefulness of this notion of extended dative verbs to the study of dative constructions in Archaic Chinese becomes questionable since it has been maintained that extended dative verbs cannot occur in either “V+IO+DO” or “yi+DO+V+IO” structures. Thus, the scope of this category of verbs is only applicable to the construction with a dative complement. Finally, the problem posed by the following example to Peyraube’s notion of extended dative verbs cannot be trivialized. The following example is taken from Peyraube (1999a: 600) and the gloss and translation by Peyraube is retained:

*(18) 子文飲之酒 (左傳: 僖.27 Zuozhuan: Xi.27)*
zi wen yin zhi jiu
Zi Wen drink 3:SG wine
‘Ziwen gave him (some) wine to drink.’

Peyraube accepts this example as an instance of “V+IO+DO”. By doing so, he must therefore make the claim that the verb *yin* 飲 ‘drink’, which by definition is never a lexical dative verb, “possesses the characteristic of [+give], in the sense that it is used here in its causative meaning: make to drink, give to drink” (Peyraube 1999a: 600). Upon closer examination, we cannot help but wonder whether this verb *yin* 飲 ‘drink’ is actually an extended dative verb since when used in its basic sense, this verb fulfills Peyraube’s definition that the dative interpretation is not inherent within its lexical semantics. There are two different scenarios here. If the verb *yin* 飲 ‘drink’ is considered to be an extended dative verb, then the conclusion that only [+give] dative verbs can occur in double-object constructions must be revised; if otherwise, that would mean that the verb *yin* 飲 ‘drink’ is analyzed in the example to be a lexical dative verb with an underlying semantic feature of [+give], and then the verbs in the following examples which can also receive a causative reading similar to that of example 18 must also be posited to possess the characteristic of [+give].

---

extended dative verb since the construction it occurs in does not convey a meaning of GIVE. We have a different way of getting around this problem. According to our analysis, *shi* 施 is analyzed as a GIVE verb meaning ‘hand out’.
(19) 枕尸股 (左傳: 襲.25 Zuozhuan: Xiang.25)
      zhen shi gu
      rest corpse thigh
      ‘…made the corpse rest on another person’s thigh…’

(20) 生民心 (左傳: 隱.1 Zuozhuan: Yin.1)
      sheng min xin
      born people mind
      ‘…make people have the mind of ….’

Peyraube (1998, 1999a) has not discussed these two examples but nevertheless, in order to achieve uniformity and consistency in his framework, these examples have to receive the same treatment as example 18. Thus, additional verb senses must be posited for the verbs in examples 19 and 20. Positing additional verb senses for the verbs zhen 枕 ‘rest’ and sheng 生 ‘born’ is not tenable, since it is not possible to follow the English translation in example 18 and interpret the two clauses compositionally as ‘to give the corpse the thigh to rest’ and ‘to give the people the mind to create’. Theoretically, this is not a good solution either. A more appropriate solution is to adopt a constructional approach as advocated by Goldberg (1995), who illustrates that one of the advantages of this approach is that it avoids the problem of positing implausible verb senses to account for examples such as the following:

(21) She baked him a cake.

Although this English example is different in meaning from examples 19 and 20, the same problem is highlighted since some grammarians working on the English language have posited an additional verb sense for the verb bake. In her argument against this approach, Goldberg (1995: 9-10) points out that:

To account for [the above example], such a theory would need to claim that there exists a special sense of bake that has three arguments: an agent, a theme, and an intended recipient. This in effect argues that bake has a sense which involves something like ‘X INTENDS TO CAUSE Y to HAVE Z’. If additional senses were involved, then it would follow that each of these verbs is ambiguous between its basic sense and its sense in the syntactic pattern above. Therefore we would expect that there would be some language that differentiates between the two senses by having two independent (unrelated) verb stems. … However, to my
knowledge there is no language that has distinct verb senses for any of the meanings represented [above].

According to Goldberg, the constructional approach allows us to understand aspects of the final interpretation involving intended transfer for the above example to be contributed by the respective construction. She further highlights that:

That is, we can understand skeletal constructions to be capable of contributing arguments. For example, we can define the ditransitive construction to be associated directly with agent, patient, and recipient roles, and then associate the class of verbs of creation with the ditransitive construction. We do not need to stipulate a specific sense of bake unique to this construction.

Similarly, there is no need for us to posit additional verb senses for the verbs like *yin* 飲 ‘drink’, *zhen* 枕 ‘rest’, *sheng* 生 ‘born’, as their causative reading can be attributed to the construction, and not the verb. One may question the feasibility of adopting the stance that the dative construction can contribute a causative reading to the verbs it admits. This is absolutely practicable if we adhere closely to the theoretical preliminaries of CG. According to Langacker, grammatical constructions are pairings of form and meaning, and they exhibit construc
tional polysemy in the same way as any lexical item will do.

In a highly original discussion about the GIVE morpheme from a cognitive perspective, Newman (1996: 133) characterizes “the prototypical meaning of GIVE

---

10 I am grateful to an anonymous reviewer for pointing out that both the verbs *yin* 飲 ‘drink’ and *zhen* 枕 ‘rest’ have different tones in Lu Deming’s *Jingdian Shiwen* 經典釋文. As rightly observed by the reviewer, if the verb *yin* 飲 is pronounced with the original *shang* tone when used in its ordinary sense ‘to drink’ and with a *qu* tone when used in a causative sense ‘to water, to make (animals) drink’, then obviously the causative meaning of *yin* 飲 should not be attributed solely to the construction. We totally agree with him/her on this point, but would also like to add that derivation by tone change alone could not account for all verbs that occur in the double-object causative construction, such as the verbs *zhen* 枕 and *sheng* 生 ‘born’. Even though *zhen* 枕 has the alternative tonal readings of *shang* and *qu* in *Jingdian Shiwen*, the *qu* reading does not signify its use as a causative verb, but merely as a denominal verb which means ‘to pillow oneself on’ (Chou Fa-kao 1994: 54). As for *sheng* 生 ‘born’, since it does not have tonal alternation, its causative reading in example 20 can only be attributed to the construction, and not the verb. Taking into account that derivation by tone change in Archaic Chinese remains a controversial issue (cf. Zhou Zumo 2004: 81-119; Chou Fa-kao 1994), and that this alone could not account for the causative usage of all verbs which occur in the double-object causative construction, a constructional account is therefore more economical and preferable.
with reference to a particular type of interaction between humans” and at the same time, reviews “the range of additional meanings which may be associated with the GIVE morpheme in languages.” These meanings involve something other than the transfer of some concrete object from one person to another. Some of the extended meanings of the GIVE morpheme are:

Interpersonal communication
Causative/purpose
Permission-enablement
Recipient/benefactive marking

Based on the theoretical assumption that grammatical constructions are inherently meaningful and exhibit constructional polysemy, we can observe a striking parallelism in the semantic extensions between the GIVE morpheme, which is a lexical item, and the GIVE construction, which is represented here by the double-object construction:

![Diagram of GIVE morpheme and GIVE construction](image)

Incorporating examples of the double-object construction taken from Zuozhuan into Fig. 4, a much clearer picture emerges:

![Diagram of GIVE morpheme and GIVE construction with examples](image)

---

11 Please refer to examples 1, 19 and 36 for the English translations of the examples in Fig. 5. For gao zhi gu 告之故, the English translation is “to tell someone the reason”.

---
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4. Constructional polysemy

By bringing back those examples which have been ruled out as instances of the double-object construction by Peyraube (1998, 1999a), a unified explanation based on the idea of constructional polysemy, which is amply supported by cross-linguistic evidence, could be advanced. First, let us look at the structural configuration of “wei 為 +NP1+NP2”, as exemplified by example 22.

(22) 不如早為之所 (左傳: 隱 1 Zuozhuan: Yin 1)
    bu ru zao wei zhi su
NEG compare early do 3:SG place
‘It would be better to provide them with houses quickly.’

According to Peyraube (1999a: 608), “due to the very fact of the high degree of polysemy of wei, [i]t is appropriate to distinguish different forms of wei.” There are altogether four different cases and we shall reproduce Peyraube’s analysis for the first two cases below:

(i) When wei is a verb meaning ‘to give’, there is no reason not to consider the form “wei+zhi+N” like a double-object form, where zhi is interpreted as an IO. For example:

   (30) 不如早為之所 (左: 隱 1)

   (31) 而為之田 (左: 宣 2)

This interpretation of wei = ‘give’, given by many (He Leshi 1980, Yan Jingchang 1980, Liu Li 1995), is not absolutely certain. It is not sure that wei, in Pre-Qin Chinese, has ever meant ‘to give’. But this does not imply that one could have dative forms “V+OI+OD” in sentences like 30 or 31.

I think that the interpretation given by Liu Baishun (1981) for sentence 30 is preferable: “to prepare houses for them”. Wei would thus be a preposition and the noun following zhi (object of the preposition wei) interpretable as a verb. A similar analysis can be proposed for sentence 31: “prepare the land for them”.

(ii) When wei means ‘to do, to make’, one cites examples like:

   (32) 四里為連, 連為之長 (國語: 齊 6)

   (33) 王將鑄無射, 而為之大林 (國語: 周下)

-----
In fact, such sentences must be interpreted with *wei* not as a verb, but as a preposition. Thus, for example 32: “Four li make a lian, and for each lian, one has a zhang”. In other words, the second *wei* is not a verb “to make”, but a preposition “for” and the following pronoun, *zhi*, is an anaphoric repetition of the noun *liang*.

(Peyraube 1999: 608-611)

Since the four examples in Peyraube’s analysis can be schematically interpreted as “doing something for somebody”, they are undoubtedly instances of the benefactive construction. Following the theoretical framework by Goldberg (1995), this benefactive reading is not contributed by the main verb *wei*, but instead by the construction which licenses an extra argument. By so doing, we avoid the problem of treating the verb *wei* as a preposition. Peyraube and Wiebusch (1994: 393-394) have acknowledged that the morpheme *wei* has a verbal usage:

(23) 是亦為政 (論語: 爲政 Lunyu: Weizheng)

    shì yì wèi zhèng

DEM also do government

‘This then also constitutes the exercise of government.’

(24) 取諸人以為善，是與人為善者也 (孟子·公孫丑上 Mengzi: Gongsunchou Shang)

    qu zhū rén yǐ wèi shàn, shì yù rén wèi shàn zé yě

take it-from other PURP do goodness, DEM give people do goodness NR PART

‘Following the example of others to practice goodness, this is to give them (encouragement) to practice goodness.’

The meaning of the verb *wei* can be schematically interpreted as ‘do’. An alternative analysis for the morpheme *wei* in all the four examples quoted by Peyraube would be to treat it as a verb meaning ‘do’. The main advantage of doing so is that we can avoid analyzing *wei* as a preposition when the structural configuration does not support such an analysis. A typical preposition introduces a nominal to the verb phrase, as evidently shown by *yì* and *yu* in the following examples:

(25) 王寢，盜攻之，以戈擊王 (左傳: 定.4 Zuozhuan: Ding.4)

    wáng qín, dào gōng zhī, yì ge jí wáng

king sleep, robber attack 3:SG, INST spear hit king

‘While the king was sleeping, some robbers attacked him and one of them aimed a blow at him with a spear.’
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(26) 楚子虔誘蔡侯般，殺之於申（春秋：昭.11 Chunqiu: Zhao.11)
Chu viscount Qian beguiled Cai marquis Ban, kill 3:SG LOC Shen
‘Qian, the viscount of Chu, beguiled Ban, the marquis of Cai and killed him at Shen.’

Thus, *wei* 爲 should only be analyzed as a preposition when it occurs before a verb phrase:

(27) (衛宣公)為之娶於齊而美，公取之 (左傳: 恒.16 Zuozhuan: Huan.16)
(Wei Xuan duke) PREP 3:SG marry ABL Qi and beautiful, duke take 3:SG
‘[In course of time,] Duke Xuan of Wei made an arrangement for his son with one of the princesses of Qi, but took her to himself in consequence of her beauty.’

In the four examples cited by Peyraube (1999a: 608), which are reproduced below as (28)-(31), since the morpheme occupying the second postverbal position is not a verb, but a nominal, it is not appropriate to analyze *wei* 爲 as a preposition.12

(28) 不如早為之所 (左傳: 隱.1 Zuozhuan: Yin.1)
NEG compare early do 3:SG place
‘It would be better to provide them with houses quickly.’

(29) 宦卿之適子，而為之田 (左傳: 宣.2 Zuozhuan: Xuan.2)
official minister GEN eldest son, and do 3:PL land
‘[When Duke Cheng succeeded to the States,] he gave offices to the eldest sons by their wives of the high ministers, and prepared land for them.’

(30) 四里為連，連為之長 (國語: 齊.6 Guoyu: Qi.6)
four li become lian, lian do 3:PL leader
‘Every four li makes a lian, and establish a leader for every lian.’

---

12 Peyraube (1999a: 608) interprets the second nominal (i.e. the noun following *zhi*) in example 28 as a verb. This analysis is not taken up in this paper, as it contradicts the principle of parsimony.
(31) 王將鑄無射，而為之大林（國語：周下 Guoyu: Zhou Xia)
king will cast Wu She, and do PRN cover
‘The king is going to cast a bell known as Wu She, and for it, he will make a cover.’

By attributing the benefactive reading to the interplay between the verb 为 ‘do’ and the construction (cf. Croft 2000 for the notion of verb-specific constructions), a better solution to the analysis of these examples can then be generated.

Once the above proposal has been made, it is now possible to offer a unified account for the following examples which have been treated differently in the literature:

(32) 百乘之家，可使為之宰也（論語：公冶長 Lunyu: Gongyezhang)
hundred chariot GEN clan, can make do PRN governor PART
‘In a clan of a hundred chariots, [Qiu] could be made governor for it.’

(33) 微子去之，箕子為之奴（論語：微子 Lunyu: Weizi)
Wei Zi leave 3:SG, Ji Zi do 3:SG slave
‘Wei Zi left him while Qi Zi became a slave for him.’

(34) 則天下之民皆悅而願為之氓矣（孟子：公孫丑上 Mengzi: Gongsunchou Shang)
then sky beneath GEN people all glad and willing do 3:SG people
‘Then all the people of the kingdom will be pleased, and wish to come and serve him as his people.’ (lit.: …become people for him)

(35) 吾不忍為之民也（戰國策：趙 Zhanguoce: Zhao)
I do not bear to serve Qin as its subject.’ (lit.: …become people for Qin)

Peyraube’s (1999) interpretation of these examples is reproduced below:

(iii) When 为 means ‘to be, to become’, it is simply impossible to interpret the
following *zhi* as an IO. The best solution is probably to consider *zhi* as equivalent of *qi*. For example:

(34) 百乘之家可使為之宰也 (論: 公冶長)

Another solution is to treat *wei* not as a verb, but again as a preposition, and *zhi* cannot be an IO in 34.

Such examples of “*wei+zhi+N*”, when *wei* means ‘to be, to become’, in fact, are extremely rare.

(iv) Lastly, when *wei* means ‘to serve as’, ‘to fill the function of’, *zhi* can also be interpreted as a genitive pronoun, equivalent of *qi*. For example:

(35) 吾不忍為之民也 (戰: 趙)

(36) 微子去之，箕子為之奴 (論: 微子)

(37) 則天下之民皆悦而願為之氓矣 (孟: 公孫丑上)

This interpretation, given notably by Zheng Xuan 鄭玄, and taken up again by Wang Yinzhi 王引之 (in his Jing zhuan shi ci 經傳釋詞) for example 37, or by Liu Baishun (1981) – going back to Ma shi wen tong 馬氏文通 – for example 35, seems to me the most reasonable one.

Another interpretation is not to consider *wei* as a verb, but as a preposition: “I do not bear for it (the state of Qin) to be considered as (someone of its) people.”

No matter what the two possible interpretations are, the pronoun *zhi* is not an IO.

There are other cases, where *wei* was interpreted as a verb, followed by two objects, when it is obviously a preposition, and the construction in which this *wei* is used has nothing to do with a double-object construction. For example:

(38) 而為之簞食與肉 (左: 宣 2)

Certainly, in this sentence, *zhi* is not an equivalent of *qi*, but *zhi* is not an IO neither in a dative construction. He Leshi herself (1980) admits in fact that here, *wei* is a preposition, since she translates as: “to prepare for him a basket of food”.

Based on Peyraube’s interpretation, all these examples can clearly be analyzed as instances of the benefactive construction. Extending the same analysis to other verbs, we can also include the following examples as instances of the benefactive construction:
(36) 天生民而立之君，使司牧之 (左傳: 襄14 Zuozhuan: Xiang14)
tian sheng min er li zhi jun, shi si mu zhi
Heaven give-birth people and establish it prince make shepherd it
‘Heaven gives birth to the people and (it) establishes princes for the people and makes them shepherd the people.’

(37) 天佑下民，作之君，作之師 (尚書偽: 泰誓上 Shangshu-wei: Taishi Shang)
tian you xia min, zuo zhi jun, zuo zhi shi
heaven bless inferior people, do 3:PL ruler, do 3:SG tutor
‘Heaven protects inferior people; and (it) establishes rulers and masters for them.’

Based on the above discussion, it is clear that the double-object construction can be employed to encode both the dative event and the benefactive event. This observation is strongly supported by some recent cross-linguistic studies, which reveal a close affinity between the double-object dative and the double-object benefactive in a variety of languages. Take Modern English for example:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Modern English} & \text{Extension} & \text{Joe baked Mary a cake. I’ll get you a chair.} \\
Terry gives John a book. & & \\
\end{array}
\]

Fig. 6

The close affinity is motivated by a conceptual similarity between the roles of recipient and beneficiary, as illustrated in Shibatani, Zhang, & Lu (1994), where the authors argue that benefactive constructions of a large number of languages are based on the basic ‘give’-constructions within the these languages. Moreover, Goldberg’s (1995) analysis for the parallel between the double-object construction and the benefactive construction provides a further support for our claim. Since the sequence of nominals in a double-object benefactive is identical to that of a double-object dative, it constitutes a proof that the extension from the dative to the benefactive is via conceptual metaphor. The relevant metaphor is “FAVOR AS THING”.

Next, consider the following example:

(38) 猶欲其入而閉之門也 (孟子: 萬章下 Mengzi: Wanzhang Xia)
you yu qi ru er bi zhi men ye
Just-like wish 3:SG enter and close 3:SG door PART
‘[When a prince wishes to see a man of talents and virtue, and does not take the proper course to get his wish,] it is as if he wished him to enter his palace, and shut the door against him.’

Peyraube’s (1999a: 601-602) analysis is presented here:

As for sentence 16, it is also unlikely that we are dealing with a dative sentence. One can consider, as does Wang Guanjun (1982), that bi zhi men 東之門 comes from bi zhi yu men 門之於門 where zhi is the object of bi, and the phrase yu men a locative PP meaning “at the door”. One cannot talk about, under these conditions, double-object sentences, where zhi would be a dative IO. It should be a “Verb+Object+Locative complement” structure, where the locative preposition yu has been deleted. The deletion of yu in Classical Chinese is common.

Another interpretation, which contradicts also the thesis zhi = dative IO, is given by Zhao Qi (-201), who considers that zhi is equivalent to qi and who translates this example in Mengzi as:

(17) 欲人之入而閉其門 (Mengzi Zhengyi)
    yu ren zhi ru er bi qi men
    want someone part. enter and close his door
    ‘(It is) to want someone to enter and close his door.’

I prefer this last interpretation.

We disagree with Peyraube’s reading of the above example and propose to translate the sentence as ‘(It is) to want someone to enter but close the door on him’. The immediate postverbal nominal in this example denotes a participant that is not the beneficiary but someone who has been negatively affected by the act of closing the door. This is precisely what is known as malefactive. Here we wish to refer to a paper by Ole T. Fagerli (2001), entitled “Malefactive by means of GIVE”, which argues for a close semantic link between malefactive and benefactive. In the paper, Fagerli discusses semantic aspects of certain African languages – more specifically the benefactive and the malefactive, both in serializing languages using a word identical to the verb GIVE, and in languages using verbal extensions to express these semantic relations. In both language types malefactive events may be marked by expressions used also for benefactive events. Seeing both types of expressions as special instances of a cognitively and semantically basic GIVE relation, the author argues that the malefactive

---

13 Sentence 16 here corresponds to our example 38.
meaning may be seen as an extension of the benefactive marker, in combination with the semantics of the host verb and its complements.

There is another group of examples not discussed in Peyraube (1998, 1999a). Below are some of them:

(39) 枕尸股而哭 (左傳: 襄.25 Zuozhuan: Xiang.25)
    zhen shi gu er ku
    rest corpse thigh and cry
    ‘He made the corpse rest on his thigh, and wept.’

(40) 公衣之偏衣，佩之金玦 (左傳: 閔.2 Zuozhuan: Min.2)
    gong yi zhi bian yi, pei zhi jin jue
    duke wear 3:SG two-colours robe, put-on 3:SG golden semicircle
    ‘[When his eldest son took the command of the army,] the Duke made him wear a robe of two colors, and put on a golden semicircle at his girdle.’

These two examples have a causative reading (Liu Shizhen 1998; Liu Songchuan 1998, 1999); thus zhen shi gu 枕尸股 is interpreted as ‘to make a corpse rest on someone’s thigh’. Similarly, yi zhi bian yi 衣之偏衣 is also read as ‘to make him wear a robe of two colors’. Another example which can also be assigned a causative reading, just like examples 39 and 40, has been discussed by Peyraube (1998, 1999a).

(41) 晉侯飲趙盾酒 (左傳: 宣.2 Zuozhuan: Xuan.2)
    jin hou yin zhao dun jiu
    Jin duke drink Zhao Dun wine
    ‘The Duke of Jin made Zhao Dun drink wine.’

Peyraube accepts example 41 as an instance of the double-object construction, but has not discussed the status of the two preceding examples. He argues that the monotransitive verb yin 飲 ‘drink’ has an underlying semantic feature of [+give], thus it is used ditransitively in this example. This is consistent with his claim that only lexical dative verbs with the semantic feature of [+give] (i.e. our GIVE verbs) can occur in the double-object construction, thus although the verb in this example is monotransitive in its basic sense, it has acquired an additional sense and is therefore used ditransitively in this case, just like any other lexical dative verbs with the [+give] feature. This presents a problem: if both yin zhao dun jiu 飲趙盾酒 ‘make Zhao Dun drink wine’ and zhen shi gu 枕尸股 ‘make the corpse rest on someone’s thigh’ are said
to encode a transitive causative event, it is rather difficult to justify why they should be analyzed differently. We propose that these examples should be treated uniformly, and hence Peyraube’s claim that only lexical dative verbs with the [+give] feature can be admitted into the category of double-object construction would need further reconsideration.

Finally, the question of whether TAKE verbs are compatible with the double-object construction also requires one further comment. Undoubtedly, this issue is highly controversial and has attracted considerable attention from the field.

(42) 牵牛以蹊人之田，而奪之牛 (左傳: 宣.11 Zuozhuan: Xuan.11)
qian niu yi xi ren zhi tian, er duo zhi niu
lead buffalo PURP tread people GEN field, and rob 3:SG buffalo
‘(He) led his buffalo to tread over other people’s field. As a result, the people robbed him of the buffalo.’

This paper argues that example 42 is an instance of the double-object construction, but with a caveat. The above conclusion is only valid for the TAKE verb duo 袭 ‘rob’, and it is a big mistake to assume that all TAKE verbs in Archaic Chinese would have the same grammatical behavior as the verb duo 袭 ‘rob’. This is seamlessly consistent with the typological evidence that GIVE verbs are unmarked for the double-object construction, while TAKE verbs are marked. For instance, although Modern English has double-object constructions, it disallows the inclusion of TAKE verbs. Another good example is Modern Chinese. While it is true that both GIVE and TAKE verbs can be admitted into the double-object construction, TAKE verbs nonetheless do not enter the construction with the same amount of ease as GIVE verbs. Moreover, diachronically it is only after a long process of evolution that a considerable number of TAKE verbs have finally attained the same status as GIVE verbs (cf. Peyraube 1988a, Xu Dan 1990). This long process, which possibly reflects a lexical diffusion mode of grammatical change (cf. Wang 1969), must have a starting point, and the verb duo 袭 ‘rob’ is hypothesized to be the lexical leader in the diffusion which sets the stage for TAKE verbs to move into the double-object construction.

5. Double-object as a radial category

In the previous discussion, it has been demonstrated that the double-object construction could be used to encode events of dative, benefactive, malefactive and causative types, and as mentioned earlier, linguistic form occupies a very special status
in the tradition of cognitive linguistics. It must further be pointed out that the grammatical construction, which is itself a complex linguistic form, is similar to any other category in exhibiting a categorizing relationship of schema and instances. The salient properties with regard to such a relationship can be summarized as follows:

Unit [A] is **schematic** for [B] and [C]; [B] and [C] **instantiate, or elaborate** [A]. An instance **inherits** the specifications of the schema, but fleshes out the schema in more detail. Different instances flesh out the schema in contrasting ways. Alternatively, we can say that the schema **abstracts** what is common to its instances. Below is an illustration of a more ‘schematic’ representation of the relation between a schema and its instances.

(Taylor 2002: 124)

This is illustrated by the diagram below:

![Diagram 7](image)

As for the relationship between the two instances [B] and [C], they are related by similarity; “[B] and [C] are similar, precisely in respect to the fact that they both inherit the specifications of the schema [A].” (Taylor 2002: 125) An illustration of the above figure is offered in Fig. 8:

![Diagram 8](image)
Fig. 8 simply shows that the complex linguistic form can be further elaborated in greater detail by having different verbs inserted into the slot “V” of the schema. Since *give* and *hand* are verbs of transfer, the relationship between these two instances is based on similarity. This is solely a categorizing relation of linguistic form and it must be highlighted that we have yet to incorporate the semantic pole of the various instances into the discussion. With the introduction of meaning into Fig. 8, the entire picture will now become very complex and complicated as sketched in Fig. 9:

![Diagram showing the relationship between form and meaning with specific instances of verbs and their meanings, including instantiation, dative meaning, and benefactive meaning.]

Fig. 9

Once the semantic pole is introduced into the picture, the three instances which elaborate the same schema cannot be treated as of equal status, since the relationship among them is not symmetrical. To accommodate the asymmetrical relations among these instances, we have to make some modifications to Fig. 7, and as a result, Fig. 10 is produced:

![Diagram illustrating the modification of Fig. 7 with the introduction of a schema, prototype, and extension, with arrows indicating the flow and specification of details. (Specified in lesser detail) (Specified in greater detail).]

Fig. 10
Do note that the arrow between [B] and [C] has now been changed to a unidirectional arrow in order to capture the asymmetrical relationship between the two instances. [B] is more basic and central to the category than [C], and [B] is known as a prototypical member while [C] is a peripheral member of the same category. As in Fig. 10, characterization of a category can be carried out at two different levels: the schematic level which is more abstract and the prototype level which is more concrete. This is best illustrated by the semantic characterization of the category “noun” in CG (Langacker 1991a). Similarly, the semantic characterization of a grammatical construction is no exception.

We shall first study Goldberg’s analysis of the ditransitive construction in Modern English from the Construction Grammar perspective, which could offer us new insights as to how to account for the data represented in Fig. 9. In short, Goldberg (1995: 31-39) suggests that the ditransitive construction (i.e. our double-object construction) is associated with a family of closely related senses rather than a single, fixed abstract sense. Thus, according to her proposal, the ditransitive construction has a central sense, which is “agent successfully causes recipient to receive patient”, as represented by the example *Terry gave Ben a book*. The central sense undergoes semantic extension to include a closely related sense, which is “agent intends to cause recipient to receive patient”, as represented by the example *Terry baked John a cake*. It is therefore quite obvious that Goldberg basically characterizes the ditransitive construction at the level of prototype and extensions. Nevertheless, she also makes the claim that the argument structure construction *Subj V Obj 1 Obj 2* encodes a basic event type of “X causes Y to receive Z”, which represents an abstraction of the two instances. According to this understanding, the following figure, which shows the symbolic relationship between the phonological pole and the semantic pole of the ditransitive construction in Modern English, can now be sketched:

![Diagram](image-url)

Goldberg’s thesis affords us lessons that merit attention, but since the data from the Modern English ditransitive construction do not include similar expressions of the double-object causative in Archaic Chinese, there is a problem here. There are two different ways to resolve the problem. The first is provided by Newman (1996). In accordance with his study on the morpheme GIVE across different languages, a
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semantic extension of the double-object construction can be posited from its dative usage. Hence, the causative meaning can be seen as one of the many closely related senses associated with the double-object construction. According to Newman (1996: 173-174),

One extension found with GIVE involves the manipulation of another person in order to have the person do something, a sense which we may render in English as 

*have someone do something, get someone to do something, arrange for someone to do something.*

This is what may be called the “manipulative” meaning. It is a meaning which is carried by GIVE in a number of languages --- there is not only a mapping from the GIVER onto the human causer, but also from the RECIPIENT onto a human causee. GIVER and human causer have in common that a person is involved and that a person is a volitional human agent, instigating an action. RECIPIENT and human causee have in common that a person is experiencing some change in their behavior due to the actions of another person. One might also see a parallel to the THING by construing the responsibility for the act as an entity passes over to the causee. Understood in this way, all three of the salient entities in the GIVE frame correspond to entities in the manipulation frame.

There is also another alternative in the tradition of cognitive linguistics to address the same question, and that is to posit a highly abstract and schematic meaning for the double-object construction. A subscription to this approach would first require us to take constructions, and not principles, to be the basic units of grammar. This view holds that the grammar of a language can be characterized as a “structured inventory of conventional linguistic units” and since a unit “constitutes for the speaker a ‘prepackaged’ assembly”, it “does not demand the constructive effort required for the creation of novel structures” (Langacker 1987: 57). Talmy (2000a: 1) provides a clear exposition of this idea:

A fundamental design feature of language is that it has two subsystems, which can be designated as the *grammatical* and *lexical* (as these are characterized below). Why is there this universal bifurcation when, in principle, a language could be conceived having only a single system, the lexical? The explanation in this chapter is that the two subsystems have distinct semantic functions, ones that are indispensible and complementary. To develop this account further, we must first note that we take a sentence (or other portion of discourse) to evoke in the listener a particular kind of experiential complex, here termed a *cognitive representation* or *CR*. The grammatical and lexical subsystems in a sentence seem generally to
specify different portions of a CR. Together, the grammatical elements of a sentence determine the majority of the structure of the CR, while the lexical elements together contribute the majority of its content. The grammatical specifications in a sentence, thus, provide a conceptual framework, or, imagistically, a skeletal structure or scaffolding for the conceptual material that is lexically specified.

More generally, across the spectrum of languages, the grammatical elements that are encountered, taken together, specify a crucial set of concepts. This set is highly restricted: only certain concepts appear in it, and not others, as seen later. The present chapter advances the position that this set of grammatically specified notions collectively constitutes the fundamental conceptual structuring system of language. That is, this crosslinguistically select set of grammatically specified concepts provides the basic schematic framework for conceptual organization within the cognitive system of language.

Two important points deserve to be emphasized here:

1. The image that a grammatical structure conveys serves as a skeletal structure or scaffolding for cognitive representation;
2. The set of concepts expressed by the grammatical elements taken together, i.e. the grammatical structure, is highly constrained cross-linguistically.

According to this approach, it is possible to suggest that the specific meanings at the level of prototype and extensions can be subsumed under a highly abstract and schematic meaning as sketched in Fig. 12:
But, how does this schematic meaning arise? According to Langacker (1987: 381-382),

Our characterization of schematic networks has emphasized their “static” properties, but it is important to regard them as dynamic, continually evolving structures. A schematic network is shaped, maintained, and modified by the pressures of language use. The locus of these pressures is coding, i.e. the interactive relationship – in the form of categorizing activity – between established conventional units and specific usage events they are invoked to sanction.

Langacker (1987: 382) has also made some important comments about the growth of a schematic network:

We must attribute to the language user various capacities that effect the evolution of a network. Most fundamental, perhaps, is the ability to extract schemas that embody the commonality of more specific structures. Without this ability every experience would remain sui generis; it enables the speaker to unite certain experiences as tokens of the same general type, through cancellations of idiosyncratic detail and adjustments in level of specificity. The emergence of an initial category prototype has been characterized as the extraction of a low-level schema. I have also claimed that schematization figures in the second basic capacity, namely the perceiving the similarities that motivates extension. The outward growth of a category from its prototype thus tends to be accompanied by upward growth in the form of higher-order schemas.

Langacker’s theoretical hypothesis about the growth of a schematic network can be further complemented by a piece of empirical research by Michael Israel (1996) about the growth of the Way construction. He (Israel 1996: 225-226) specifically points out that:

The basic developments that characterize the growth of the way-construction appear to be remarkably straightforward. Early predicates associated with the construction tended to be less unusual and more schematic, while later predicates include nonce forms --, onomatopoetic noisy verbs, and generally a variety of unusual and highly specific subordinate-level words. As usage began to include increasingly recherché sorts of verbs, the construction’s conceptual range gradually expanded: in early stages the construction was limited to verbs which were somehow directly related to motion or path creation; in later stages, the
construction allows verbs which are only marginally or incidentally related to the actual expressed motion.

Based on these insightful ideas, we now present our preliminary proposal about the categorizing relationship for various instances of the double-object construction in Archaic Chinese in Fig. 13:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORM</th>
<th>MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subj V Obj 1 Obj 2</td>
<td>Event structure with 3 participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Diagram](image)

Fig. 13

This proposal can account for a wider range of cross-linguistic data than that of Goldberg (1995). Do note that we are not suggesting that there is a universal association between a specific linguistic form and a specific schematic meaning; what instead is suggested here is that a grammatical construction associated with the semantics of ‘giving’ can be categorized with a certain degree of success using Fig. 13. There are two ways of looking at the schematic meaning at the highest order. The first way is to treat it as an abstraction of the three specific senses of the various double-object constructions; and the second way, though more complicated, aims to adopt a more dynamic view and attribute the outward growth of a category to the schematic meaning at the highest order. This is metaphorical extension, though not entirely similar to that in Lakoff & Johnson (1980). A ‘giving’ situation is basic to human experience and to encode this basic experience, a specific grammatical construction is employed. This construction is entrenched as a prepackaged unit in the inventory of a human language. A causative situation which involves three core participants (e.g. to make someone drink wine) is much more remote to human experience than a ‘giving’ situation. Thus, to code this situation, either a unique construction is created, or, for economy’s sake, a
speaker can use whatever is available in the inventory of his/her language to fulfill the task. According to this view, a grammatical construction which initially codes a ‘giving’ situation is chosen precisely because it offers a template for the coding of other non-basic experiences that involve three core participants. This view could find support in Kemmer and Verhagen (1994), a study on the grammar of causatives and conceptual structure of events. The authors, based on a wide range of cross-linguistic evidence, argue convincingly that the analytic causative constructions can be best described as extensions of simpler kinds of expressions. In particular, causatives of transitive predicates (e.g. *He had the servant taste the food*) are seen as modeled on simple three-participant clauses (like *I gave Mary a flower*, or *She broke it with a hammer*) – i.e. mainly ditransitive and instrumental clause types.

Incorporating Goldberg’s (1995) idea of constructional polysemy and Talmey’s (2000) view on grammatical organization, we conclude that it is owing to the following two reasons that expressions of dativity and causativity share the same syntactic structure:

1. Conceptually, there is a close association between the meaning of dative and that of causative, as shown by Newman (1996);
2. Structurally, the GIVE construction provides a grammatical template for the expression of other non-basic events involving three core participants with a transmission of energy among them.

It is possibly due to the interplay between these reasons that we see a syncretism in complex linguistic form for the expressions of dativity and causativity.

6. Conclusion

Bringing together what we have discussed so far, the following network model for the double-object construction in Archaic Chinese is proposed as a conclusion for this paper:
Fig. 14

Prototypical *give* construction
(e.g. 餘孔子豚)

Causative construction
(Non-prototypical dative)
(e.g. 飲趙盾酒)

Beneficiary construction
(Non-prototypical dative)
(e.g. 立之君)

Malefactive construction
(Non-prototypical dative)
(e.g. 閉之門)

TAKE construction
(Non-prototypical dative)
(e.g. 奪之牛)
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從構式語法看上古漢語的雙賓結構：
一個初步的討論

潘秋平
南洋理工大學

本文從構式語法 (Construction grammar) 和認知語法 (Cognitive Grammar) 的角度討論了上古漢語的雙賓語結構。我們首先對與格結構 (Dative construction) 和雙賓結構 (Double-object construction) 的定義做了一些限定，並指出這兩種結構雖然有重疊，但並不完全相等。在這個基礎上，我們進一步指出上古漢語的雙賓結構的不同類型，如給與類型、取得類型、為動類型和使動類型等，都有共通的語義結構，因此能從構式的角度獲得統一的解釋。

關鍵詞：上古漢語，雙賓語，構式語法，認知語法