Compared with robust studies on Construction Grammar (CG) of Indo-European languages (Boas 2007), little attention has been given to the synchronic aspects of Chinese Grammar in terms of CG (Lien 2006). To bridge the gap, this study offers an in-depth examination of Chinese Concessive Construction “V1+Dou+V2+Le” (henceforth V1DV2L), based on CG. It is proposed that V1DV2L has intrinsic grammatical characteristics, which lead to some crucial constraints (e.g. semantic, syntactic and pragmatic facets), as shown in example (1), culled from corpora (Udndata news database), consisted of news and stories:

(1) Zuotian/ *mingtian chi-dou-chi-le, women ye mei banfa. (UdNews)

yesterday Tomorrow eat all eat Asp we also not methods

Lit. ‘We had already eaten something yesterday. We cannot change the situation.’

‘Something was eaten yesterday. We can do nothing about it. So, let it be!’

We can tease out the characteristics of (1) featuring the construction V1DV2L from semantic, syntactic and pragmatic viewpoints. Semantically, in keeping with semantic agreement, the stage-level predicate, such as activity verb chi ‘eat’ denoting semantic features [+Dynamic, +Telic] (hereafter [+D, +T]), can occur in the V slots of V1DV2L ([+D, +T]), whereas an individual-level predicate, such as stative verb gao ‘tall’ ([−D, −T]), is ruled out. Syntactically, a past time adverbial, zuotian ‘yesterday’ ([+past]), instead of mingtian ‘tomorrow’ ([−past]), can harmonically collocate with V1DV2L ([+past]) in the subordinate clause. Finally, pragmatically, the sui generis construction V1DV2L denoting the relation of protasis and apodosis carries a concessive sense: the protasis (we ate something) and the apodosis (we should accept the result of the eating event). In addition, one cannot deny the eventualities of protasis in the main clause, owing to the implicature effect.

As summarized in (2a-d), the architecture of the construction in question can be captured in terms of a pair of form and meaning as well as three dimensions:

(2a) **Form:** variables (V1 and V2) and constants (Dou and Le) are components of “V1+Dou+V2+Le”, where V1 equals V2

**Meaning:** V1DV2L presupposes a negative realis situation decoding ‘Something that is done cannot be undone! So, let it be!’ and embraces semantic features [+D, +T].

(2b) **Semantic facets:** possible V1/V2 candidates that can occur in V1DV2L are stage-level predicates ([+D, +T]) rather than individual-level predicates ([−D, −T]) in line with semantic agreement

(2c) **Syntactic facets:** V1DV2L imposes a realis event ([+past]) that pre-empts the occurrence of adverbials denoting future time ([−past])

(2d) **Pragmatic facets:** V1DV2L coerces a realis event that cannot be cancelled

In sum, the present study of the construction with V1DV2L yields two substantive results: (i) the construction in question can be given an adequate explanation in terms of CG and (ii) the data lends support to the claim that constructional aspects should be tackled in terms of various grammatical facets, detailed semantic, syntactic and pragmatic restrictions, indicated in literature (Boas 2007; Lien 2006).
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