A corpus-based study of directives in Taiwanese Southern Min
[台灣閩南話指示行為：以語料庫為本的研究]

Miao-Hsia Chang [張妙霞] and Ún-giân Iûnn [楊允言]
National Taiwan Normal University [國立臺灣師範大學] |
National Taichung University of Education [國立台中教育大學]

This study aims to examine the subtypes of directives and their realization patterns in Taiwanese Southern Min (TSM). The data were drawn from a play script corpus published in the 20th century. Nine directive subtypes were identified: ADVICE, BEGGING, INVITATION, ORDER, OFFER, REQUEST, SUGGESTION, URGE, and WARNING. The realization patterns were analyzed in terms of the main components in the directives: alerter, discourse marker, politeness marker, subject, modal expression, verb phrase, and utterance final particle. The analysis reveals a number of features: (1) Alerters mainly take the form of an address term; (2) Utterance-initial discourse markers are mainly realized by *ta^n* 'now'; (3) The subject is either hearer-dominated or speaker- and hearer-dominated, with the latter expressing solidarity in casual situations; (4) the politeness marker *chhiá^n* tends to take an overt subject; (5) The modal verb *tióh* accounts for the majority of subtypes; (6) The dominant verb types include dynamic, stative, uttering, and ingesting verbs; (7) Complex verb constructions mainly include directional verbs, disposal markers, and benefactive verbs; (8) Directional verbs are pervasive across all directives. A metaphorical transfer is operative in the use of directional verbs. Those marking an action toward the speaker (e.g., *lâi* 'come') are strongly associated with a positive attitude, while those expressing movement away from the speaker (e.g., *khì* 'go') are highly connected to an adversative mood. The omnipresence of [*lâi* V] suggests that it has been conventionalized as a default bundle to express politeness.

Keywords: Taiwanese Southern Min, directives, speech act, request, corpus

關鍵詞： 台灣閩南話、指示行為、言語行為、請求語、語料庫

1.   Motivation and goals

Research on the functional and pragmatic aspects of language owes a great deal to the philosophers Austin (1962) and Searle (1969), who argue that people do not only mean what they say, but that an utterance can also be used as a speech act to perform an action, that is, to carry an illocutionary force, apart from its referential meanings. Among the speech acts investigated by Austin and Searle, "directives" refers to acts that are "attempts…by the speaker to get the hearer to do something" (Searle 1979:13). Requests, which are a type of directive speech act (Searle 1979:5), have attracted the most attention from pragmaticists, particularly in terms of the degree of politeness conveyed by this speech act and its associated social variables (power, distance, degree of imposition) (Brown & Levinson 1987). In light of Brown & Levinson's work, Blum-Kulka, House & Kasper (1989) conducted a cross-cultural pragmatics project analyzing requests in five languages in situations involving a number of social variables. Over the last four decades, the coding criteria developed by Blum-Kulka, House & Kasper have inspired pragmaticists to embark on studies of requests in L1 and L2. In research on Mandarin Chinese, for example, scholars have focused on the requestive strategies used by children (e.g., Su 1988, Y. Chen 2010) and adults (e.g., Zhang 1995), the perception of politeness (e.g., Lee-Wong 1994), the influence of power, distance, and the degree of imposition on the choice of requests (e.g., Yu 1999, Lin 2009, Rue & Zhang 2008, to name just a few). Another line of research, which is cognitively based, concerns the prototypicality of imperatives/directives (Thornburg & Panther 1997, Panther & Thornburg 1998, 1999, 2003, Takahashi 2012). Wierzbicka (1987) makes a finer distinction in her comprehensive analysis of the metalanguage used to define speech acts in terms of their semantic primitives. However, compared to the rich literature on requests in Mandarin, surprisingly little research has been undertaken to examine requests in Taiwanese Southern Min (TSM). Although K. Teng (2017) explores the syntactic structure, subject properties, modality and associated complements of imperatives, the focus is on negative imperatives in TSM. In this paper, we aim to elucidate the use of positive directives (hereafter, directives) in TSM. Using the data drawn from the play scripts in the corpus Digital Archive Database for Written Taiwanese (DADWT), the following research questions are addressed:

1.   What are the subtypes of directives in TSM?
2.   What are the linguistic realizations of different components of directives in each subtype?
3.   How are the linguistic components similar to and different from those used in Mandarin Chinese and English?

4. What is the significance of the linguistic characterization of TSM directives in terms of language use in general?

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews studies on requests and imperatives. As a full review would be beyond the scope of this paper, we discuss selected works relevant to the present study. Section 3 provides operational definitions of the subtypes of directive speech acts. Section 4 describes the data and the coding criteria used in this study. Section 5 presents the results and findings of the analysis. Finally, Section 6 concludes the study.

2.   Studies of requests

Requests are a type of directive speech act. Instead of "directives", the term "requests", however, has been used as a general term in L1/L2 pragmatics research to cover directive speech acts such as commands, orders, advice, suggestions, pleas, and warnings. Although not explicitly stated, these studies have in fact investigated strategies in making positive requests, as they require the hearer's "future effort" to *do* something (Blum-Kulka, House & Kasper 1989: 11–12).

Aimed at novice learners of Chinese L2 speakers, Shei (2014) presents a succinct list of the key features of directives. First, in Mandarin adverbs can be placed in front of the verbs, e.g., *Man zou* (slow-walk) 'Walk slowly', whereas adverbs tend to be placed post-verbally in English. Second, honorific terms such as *qing* 'please' and *qiu* '(I) beg (you)' are used in formal occasions, without which the request sounds impolite. Third, second person subjects are dominant. Fourth, the first person plural *women* 'we' can appear in a command or suggestion, e.g., *Women zou* 'Let's go'. As will be shown in Section 5, these features are also shared by TSM directives.

Rather than focusing on the linguistic realizations of components in directives, most research on requests has investigated requests in terms of degrees of (in)directness and politeness and their correlation with social variables. One of the most influential volumes is Blum-Kulka, House & Kasper (1989), which presents the results of a research project, i.e., the Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP), the goal of which was to investigate cross-cultural variations in requests and apologies. The data were drawn from Discourse Completion Tests (DCT) for two social variables (±Distance, ±Power) across five languages. Three components of a request sequence are identified: *alerters, supportive moves*, and *head acts*. An alerter is an opening element such as an address term or attention getter (e.g., *excuse me*). A supportive move is an external unit modifying the impact of a request (p. 276). The head act is the

central component which realizes a given speech act "independently of other elements" (p. 17).

Three levels of directness are distinguished: *direct strategies*, where "the degree to which the speaker's illocutionary intent is apparent from the locution" (p. 278), *conventionally indirect strategies* (suggestory formula, e.g., *How about cleaning up the kitchen?*, and query preparatory, e.g., *Can I borrow your notes?*), and *nonconventionally indirect* (strong and mild hints) (p. 18). It has been found that there is a universal tendency for conventional indirect strategies to be preferred.

Since the CCSARP coding scheme was introduced, it has been widely adopted by scholars of Chinese requests. Zhang (1995) conducted a study of direct and indirect request strategies in Chinese in 12 scenarios with varying social variables. The results showed that Conventional Indirectness, realized mainly by *zenmeyang* 'how about' and *neng* 'can', was favored in most situations except when there was an asymmetrical power relationship between the speakers, when direct strategies were preferred. Social distance was also noted to affect speakers' choices. As the participants in most of the request contexts were friends or colleagues rather than intimates, conventional indirectness was the dominant choice (p. 48). A study by Chen & Tseng (2015), which analyzes Chinese textbooks in addition to DCT results, also demonstrates a similar preference pattern, with indirect strategies favored in both data types while polite expressions differed in these two data sources.

In addition to DCTs, Rue & Zhang (2008) used role plays and natural conversations to investigate the effects of social distance and power in Chinese and Korean requests. Different from Zhang's (1995) and Chen & Tseng's (2015) findings, both the Chinese and Korean subjects used more direct, straightforward strategies in natural settings than in role-plays. A similar tendency is observed by Jang (2014) in her study of requests in Taiwan Mandarin TV dramas. Yu (1999), a more comprehensive survey undertaken to explore the universalistic and culture-specific features of requests used by Chinese/English L1 and L2 speakers, also yielded similar findings about the higher frequency of direct strategies by Chinese L1 speakers, especially when H is of higher power. However, the direct strategies, mainly found in want statements, "combine both direct and indirect elements" (p. 300), e.g., *I hope that you can let me take the exam on another day. Is that all right?* (*wo xiwang laoshi nin neng rang wo gaitian zai kaoshi, keyi ma?*) (p. 294). Overall, dominance is found to have greatest effect on the choice of request forms.

Despite the rich literature on requestive behaviors in Chinese, there remains a lack of studies on the realization patterns and subtypes of directive speech acts in TSM. In response to this gap, the current study investigates the subtypes of directives and their realization patterns. In the following discussion, we use the term

"directives" to refer to directive speech acts and their subtypes. The term "request", employed as a general term in previous studies to cover all subtypes, is used in this study to refer only to *one subtype* of directives (Searle 1979: 5). Specific definitions of directives and their subtypes are provided in Section 3.

3.   Directives: Definitions and subtypes

3.1   Directive speech acts

Directives are defined by Searle (1979) as "attempts (of varying degrees) by a speaker or writer to get the addressee to do something" (p. 11). They may be "modest attempts" that serve as invitations or suggestions. They may also be "fierce attempts" when the speaker insists that the addressee do something. In addition, the utterance must take place in an actual interaction between a speaker and the addressee (called "liveness" by K. Teng (2017)).

As a systematic account of the general rules of directives, Searle (1969) embraces the idea of "felicity conditions" of speech acts proposed by Austin (1962) and classifies the conditions of requests, the most common form of directive speech acts, in terms of their propositional content, preparatory preconditions, conditions on sincerity, and essential conditions, as detailed in Table 1 (Appendix II).

We can summarize the above conditions with four characteristics of directives (See also Wierzbicka 1991: 205, Stefanowitsch & Gries 2003: 231–233):

a. The speaker's "desire" that the hearer perform the act,
b. The hearer's "ability" to perform the act,
c. The speaker's "power" over the hearer to perform the act, and
d. The hearer being under certain "obligation" to perform the act

Note, however, that these components vary depending on the force of the request. For example, an order has a stronger degree of imposition than a request because the former implies that the speaker has authority over the hearer. In this study, we will examine all manifestations of directives in TSM, as detailed in Section 3.2.[1]

---

1. Before we define the subtypes of directives, a distinction in terminology needs to be made between "directives" and "imperatives". Whereas "directives" is defined according to the illocutionary meaning it conveys, "imperatives" is a grammatical term referring to utterances/sentences that are grammatically marked with the imperative mood (Bybee 1995). In this study, we will use the term "directives" to refer to their different speech act subtypes in TSM, despite the fact that most of their realizations take the form of an imperative.

3.2   Subtypes

All the directives count as an attempt for the speaker (S) to get the hearer (H) to perform a future action (A). Based on Searle (1969, 1979), Thornburg & Panther (1997), Takahashi (2012), and Wierzbicka (1987), we further distinguish them into nine types: REQUEST, ORDER, URGE, BEGGING, WARNING, ADVICE, SUGGESTION, INVITATION, and OFFER.[2]

REQUEST is a typical directive in which S expresses his/her desire for H to perform A and believes that H is able to do it (Searle 1979: 44, Takahashi 2012). By giving a REQUEST, the speaker (S) means that s/he does not want to say that the hearer (H) has to do an action (A) but assumes that S has reason to say that S wants it to happen (Wierzbicka 1987: 51). In other words, it is neutral with respect to the power relationship between S and H and the degree of urgency or imposition. To distinguish this subtype of directive from the general word "request", a small capital REQUEST will be used throughout this study. The following instance illustrates this subtype:

(1)   (To a friend)
Lí   thẹ̍h khílâi khòaⁿ tō   chai.
you take up   look   then know
'You will know (its weight) if you lift (it).'

As for ORDER, in addition to the conditions that hold for a REQUEST, it has the "additional preparatory rule that S must be in a position of authority over H" and is "a decision that something is to be so" (Searle 1969: 66). Therefore, the major distinction between ORDER and REQUEST lies in S's power over H. Failure to fulfill the desired act may result in unfavorable consequences for H.

(2)   (Master to servant)[3]
Lí khì iȯhpâng   kā goá thẹ̍h tāmpȯh tìnchīngê   iȯh   lâi   hōo góa,
2s go pharmacy KA 1s take a.little   tranquilizing medicine come HOO 1s
sòa   phâng chit poe chúi   lâi.
then hold   one cup water come
'Go to the pharmacy and get some tranquilizers for me. Then give me a glass of water.'

URGE is similar to REQUEST or ORDER. However, S does not seek a benefit for himself and S has no power over the addressee. Above all, the action that S wants to cause H to do is one of immediate relevance and S is "trying to infect" the

---

2.   A small capital will be used throughout the paper to refer to a given subtype of directives.

3.   Abbreviations used in this paper are listed at the end of this article.

addressee with his/her conviction" that it is necessary for H to do the action (Wierzbicka 1987: 61–62). For example:

(3) (To a friend)
     Kobia̍t! Lí chhinsin lâi   khòaⁿ i lah!
     PN   2s in.person come look 3s UFP
     'Ko-biat! Come look at him in person!'

Note that, in the above directives, S exerts a stronger force on H than usual to perform the desired action. These are regarded as prototypical imperatives by Takahashi (2012). In line with Taylor (1989: 59), Takahashi (2012: 76) treats the prototype as "an abstract representation of the conceptual core of a category". ORDER, REQUEST and URGE, can therefore be regarded as prototypical imperatives according to the following definition:

(4) Prototype of the English imperative
     a. The speaker exerts *a high degree of force* in deictic setting toward the addressee, who will thereby perform an action in a hypothetical setting.
     b. The speaker plays the semantic roles of Causer and Agent, and the *individuated* addressee plays the roles of Causee and Agent.

                                                              (Takahashi 2012: 76)

BEGGING, is a non-prototypical imperative. While a fervent desire is expressed by S for something beneficial to S to happen, S "feels helpless because he knows that he himself cannot cause [something] to happen", but it is H who can make it happen while he or she "evidently doesn't want to do it." Therefore, it suggests S's "humble, abject attitude", acknowledging "the potential giver's superior position" (Wierzbicka 1987: 53). Therefore, with BEGGING, S recognizes H's power, minimizes the importance of S and maximizes that of H (Pérez Hernández & Ruiz de Mendoza 2002: 265), e.g., (5):

(5) (A poor man is looking for a job in a factory.)
     Siansiⁿ chíū hōo góa chia̍h tō   kàugia̍h kiû   lí hōo góa ū   thâulōo kiû
     sir   only let me eat   then enough plead 2s let 1s have job   plead
     lí khóliân góa.
     2s pity   1s
     'Sir, I would be content with a minimum to feed myself. Please give me a job; please have pity on me.'

WARNING is an utterance whereby S is telling H that a current state of affairs or a future event is not in H's interest and that H should do something about it. By giving a WARNING, S has reason to believe a bad future event (E) will occur given the current situation or that there is an impending danger and that it is "not obvi-

ous to both S and H that E will occur" (Searle 1979: 28–29, 67). In (6), that there are many hypocrites is believed by S to have the potential to bring danger to H and therefore a warning is issued. WARNING can therefore be regarded as a special type of request when there is an associated danger looming before H.

(6) (A Pharasee to a passersby)
Chitkú chin chē ké sianti chhiá^n lín ài   chùi.
now   really many false prophet please 2s need.to pay.attention
'There are many hypocrites here. You need to take care. (Otherwise, they may find fault with you.)'

As with WARNING, ADVICE also tells H to perform A (Searle 1979: 29), something that the addressee should do (Wierzbicka 1987: 181). In ADVICE, S expresses a situation that only benefits H and in fact is in H's best interests (Searle 1969: 67). Furthermore, ADVICE imposes a strong obligation and high cost on H while there is little or no cost on S's part.

SUGGESTION invites H to imagine an action advised by S (Wierzbicka 1987: 181). It differs from ADVICE in that the action is more tentative and there is a "high degree of optionality" and H "can choose freely whether to carry out the proposed action or not" (Pérez Hernandez & Ruiz de Mendoza 2002: 279). It also differs from ADVICE in that the former points to a non-moral act that does not necessarily entail a beneficial A to H.

(7) (A woman is talking to his brother-in-law about her husband's condition.)
Sióiâ   chiàukhòa^n chitê chênghêng, lán tiòh   chhiá^n gōo ê sióiâ   lóng
brother seeing   this condition   1PI have.to invite five CL brother all
lâi   chūchip tī lāuiâ   sinpi^n sūhāu i.
come gather   at master side   serve 3s
'Bro, given the current situation, let's gather all the five younger brothers together to look after the master.'

INVITATION is performed when S uses an utterance to call H's attention to something pleasant that S wants H to do. It involves A that S believes would be good for H and conveys a polite attitude of S, and little imposition is implied. In the play scripts, INVITATION tends to be used to show hospitality or is a proposal for a public event:

(8) (A host is inviting a guest to breakfast.)
Gâuchá   chhiá^n lâi   sa^{n}kap chiàh chátǹg
good.morning please come together eat   breakfast
'Good morning, come have breakfast together.'

OFFER is closely related to ADVICE in that the former is also a kind of "altruistic" act. However, it differs from ADVICE in that OFFER involves some cost to S (Pérez Hernandez & Ruiz de Mendoza 2002:266, fn. 6). It expresses S's desire that H would accept the offered object (cf. Wierzbicka 1987:190). Unlike INVITATION, OFFER involves an entity that is given *away*, whereas the former involves action *toward* S.

(9)   (The host of a house is asking the guest to accept a gift.)
Chhiáⁿ lí siu   m̄bián khehkhì.
please   2s accept no.need polite
'Please accept (the silverware); make yourself at home.'

The definitions of directives given above are used in this paper as the criteria for identifying subtypes of directives in TSM. Before the results are presented, we first describe the details of the methodology adopted for the analysis.

4.   Data, corpus, and coding

The data are drawn from play scripts in the DADWT,[4] which contains 2,580,000 syllables of written TSM, including poetry, prose, fiction, and play scripts, divided into three periods according to the date of publication: Qing Dynasty (1885–1945), Japanese rule (1895–1945), and the post-war period (1945–). The play scripts comprise 49 episodes of moral/religious plays which originally appeared in newspapers published by the *Taiwan Church Press* (formerly Chū-Tin-Tông", i.e., "Treasure Hall"),[5] containing 136,091 syllables, of which 33 were written by 11 identifiable authors, 13 by unidentifiable authors, and 3 by the editorial office. Four major themes can be identified: adapted Bible stories (BS), moral plays (MP), dialogues with personified animals (PA), and comic dialogues rich in rhyming lines (CM). To observe scripts that are closer to natural conversation, we excluded PA and CM from the search. Those texts with identical authors or topics, and those with an unknown year of publication were also excluded from the analysis. As a result, 20 play scripts were searched for directives, including ten BSs and ten MPs, a total of 59,380 syllables authored by ten different authors. Two of the 20 plays selected were published in the 1920s, seven in the 1950s, and eleven in the 1960s (Appendix I).

Three rationales underlie our selection of play scripts in the corpus to search for directives. First, as argued by Toolan (1994:2689), "many crucial structural

---

4. DADWT: http://ip194097.ntcu.edu.tw/nmtl/dadwt/pbk.asp

5. *Taiwan Church Press*: https://home.pctpress.org/?page_id=2319

and functional principles are at work just as much in fictional dialogue as in natural conversation". In other words, such a register provides a useful database for a search of features that are present in natural conversation. Second, although natural conversation is most representative of language in use, a preliminary analysis of a spontaneous TSM corpus established by one of the authors indicates that directives are rare in conversation. In one 2-hour natural conversation (5,612 intonation units), for example, only *one* positive and one negative directive were found. This is mainly attributed to the subjective nature of spontaneous discourse, which abounds in stancetaking through expressions demonstrating subjectivity from a first person point of view, e.g., *góa kā lí kóng* 'Let me tell you' (Chang & Hsieh 2017), or through narratives conveying speaker's negative appraisal of a non-present third party, e.g., complaining about a neighbor's greedy behavior. In such evaluative discourse, the addressee usually plays a listener's role. When the turn is taken over by the addressee, a new round of stancetaking by a current speaker, formerly the addressee ensues. Very rarely does a speaker attempt to ask the addressee to do something, since the requested action would entail discontinuity of the current topic and a change of scene. The result of the pilot analysis suggests that natural conversation may not always provide an optimal resource for directive research. The choice of drama scripts is further substantiated by the ubiquity of directives in the database. In the selected 20 play scripts, which contain 4,993 clauses and 59,380 syllables, a total of 408 directives were found. That is, on average, a directive occurs about every 10–11 clauses in the database.[6] Put differently, there are 6,871 directives per million syllables, a frequency which clearly fulfills the 10-per-million-word criterion for a recurrent sequence as defined by Biber et al. (1999:992). The above observations suggest that the play scripts constitute a useful source of directives.

The identification of the subtypes of speech acts was based on a thorough discussion between the two authors of the current study. Only after a consensus was reached was the coding of a given speech act finalized. With regard to the time of publication of the play scripts, our pilot analysis showed that although these texts were published in the early- to mid-20th century, the directives are not different from those in current TSM. To confirm our initial judgement, we asked two native speakers of TSM who could also read written Taiwanese to evaluate the 408 directives. Both raters agreed that these directives are not different from those used in

---

6. A clause is defined as one that is separated by a Chinese punctuation mark, including ",　", "。", "?", "!", and "…". Basically, the unit corresponds to the boundary of a clause except in utterance initial address terms, e.g., *Siansiⁿ, i lâi a.* 'Mister, here he comes.', which is considered as one single clause.

contemporary Taiwanese. Therefore, we believe that the uses reflect the general use of these speech acts in current TSM.[7]

The following components of a directive proper were coded for the analysis. Note that, unlike Blum-Kulka, House & Kasper (1989), who identify a request proper as composed of an alerter, a supportive move, and a head act, we do not include a supportive move as this alone does not constitute a directive.

a. Alerter
b. Discourse marker
c. Politeness marker
d. Subject
e. Modal expression
f. Verb phrase in the matrix clause
g. Utterance-final particle (UFP)
h. Question tag

An alerter is distinguished from a subject when there is an intonational break, indicated by a comma or an interjection marker such as *ah* between the alerter and the subject. A discourse marker is included in the analysis as it is within the scope of the directive when used. A politeness marker corresponds to the "explicit performative/hedged performative" strategy in CCSARP (e.g., *I'm* asking/*I'd like you to move the car*). It differs from a typical performative verb as Chinese usually employs a politeness marker/verb in a subjectless sentence to carry out the directive, e.g., [*chhiáⁿ li* +V]. A modal expression, e.g., *tióh* 'have to' in TSM, functions similarly to the "obligation statement" in CCARRP (e.g., *You'll have to move the car*). In brief, (d–f) together make up the head act of a directive. The UFPs and question tags, on the other hand, are included in the analysis as they are associated with stronger or weaker directive force. Example (10) illustrates the sequence of these components:

(10) Components and sequence of a directive speech act

Alerter	Polite marker	Subj	Modal	Modifier	VP	UFP	Q	tag
A-bêng	chhiáⁿ	lí	tióh ài	jīnchin	thàkchheh	leh	hó	bô?
PN	please	2s	have.to	industrious	study		UFP okay	not

'Abieng, may you please study hard, okay?'

A word of note is necessary before we report about the results and findings. Although the distinction between direct and indirect strategies has been focused on in L1/L2 pragmatics, it is surprising to find that indirect strategies, in terms of the CCSARP classification, account for only two percent of the directives in the play script corpus, realized as a statement or a question tag (e.g., *lán nā bô tékpi-át lâi sūhāu ī bōesái tit* 'We would be in trouble if we did not take special care to serve him'). Due to their low frequency, these indirect strategies are included as subtypes of directives according to the definitions presented in Section 3.2.

5.   Results

As mentioned in Section 4, a total of 408 directives were found in the corpus. Eight subtypes can be identified, as indicated in Table 2 (Appendix II), in order of their prototypicality of directive force.

Ranking first is the prototypical directive, REQUEST, which is delivered when there is no special power or distance relationship that is attached to the requested act. The high frequency of ORDER, on the other hand, can be attributed to the roles more commonly found in the religious and moral plays, e.g., in master-to-servant talk. Similarly, INVITATION, given by hosts to show hospitality and kindness are highly compatible with plays that promote moral values. The great incidence of BEGGING can be explained by the stereotypical roles in MPs, which usually portray beggars or poor people begging misers for money or food. In the following sections, each linguistic component is discussed in terms of their occurrence in the subtypes.

5.1   Alerter

Alerters are an important strategy in Chinese requests (e.g., Jang 2014: 38–39), usually appearing at the beginning of an utterance to draw H's attention and to express S's intention to maintain or establish a "social relationship" (Zhang 1995: 36). Consistent with previous research, most alerters are realized with an address term.[8] However, unlike previous studies which found a high frequency of alerters (38%–83%) (Zhang 1995, Jang 2014, Chen & Tseng 2015, and Geng 2015), they are infrequent in our corpus (11%).

As suggested by Table 3 (Appendix II), alerters are more likely to be used in URGE, INVITATION, or SUGGESTION, when S is eager to draw H's attention to the

---

8. All the 46 tokens of alerters in our corpus are realized by an address term except one, with the interjection *oe*.

speech act that follows. In (11), the first name is used to call a friend to help dismiss a stranger who is trying to approach him:

(11) (To two friends) (UG)
Atāi, Tāipítāi, lâi!   Pangchān góa kóaⁿ cháu i.
PN   PN   come help   1s   push away 3s
'**A-tāi, Tāi-pí-tāi**, come! Help me get him away.'

First names can also be used between intimates or from a superordinate to a subordinate (Gu 1990, Wardhaugh 2006: 268–269). In fact, they account for 34% (16/47) and are the most common address forms in the corpus:

(12) (A man to his girlfriend when he is about to go abroad to study)   (AD)
Lēná, Che sī bōethang siámpī ê   sūsit… Jînseng siôngsiông bōethang chiàu
PN   this is cannot   avoid   AC fact   life   often   cannot   follow
lísióng lâi   sengóah.
ideal   come live
'**Lena**, this is something you cannot avoid…It's impossible to always live a life according to one's own will.'

(13) (Master to servant) (OD)
Sūnsìn ah, lí tióh   koh ke chúnpī chitê lâng   hūn.
PN   **UFP** 2s have.to again add prepare one person share
'**Sunsin**, you have to prepare one more person's share.'

When addressing someone with greater power or of higher status, e.g., in BEGGING, S is asking H a great favor or to show politeness, hospitality or solidarity. Address terms like this include kinship terms or titles, which usually co-occur with a politeness marker *chhiáⁿ* 'please':

(14) (A woman begging her husband's younger brother to lend her some money)
Saⁿchek à, chhiáⁿ lí lâi   khui lí ê chûsim, hōo góan m̄bián   (BG)
uncle   UFP please 2s come open 2s AC kindness let 1P   avoid
hāmlóh tī chóatkéng sílōo.
fall.into at abyss   dead.end
'**Uncle**, please have mercy (on me) because of your big brother so that we won't fall into a hopeless state.'

As discussed above, alerters are mainly used to address an acquaintance to call his/her attention to something of immediate relevance (UG) to indicate S's polite attitude (IV or BG). Although they are not obligatory in a directive, they serve as an expressive medium to yield a more effective speech act.

5.2   Discourse marker

After the alerter, a discourse marker may be used to indicate S's stance or denote the logical relation between the current utterance and the previous turn. Similar to the case of alerters, a discourse connective is not common, accounting for only 10% of the total of directives.

As indicated in Table 4 (Appendix II), the utterance-initial ta^n accounts for a substantial portion of the discourse markers (33/48). According to X. Chen (1991:1724), ta^n indicates a current situation that is undesirable, e.g., *Ta^n hāi a* (now-bad-UFP) '(We're) in trouble now.' or *Ta^n ū chî^n bô?* (Now-have-money-not) 'Do you have money or not?'. It also resembles the English adverbial *now*, which, in addition to serving as a time adverbial, encodes a procedural meaning and "frames" the following utterance (McCarthy 1991:13–14) "in which *now* occurs as communicating something that is in part continuous with what is already in view but also in some way distinct" (Schourup 2011:2117) and "that contrasts with already communicated information" (p.2120). In the directives in our corpus, ta^n functions similarly to the English utterance-initial *now*. It does not necessarily preface an undesirable situation but introduces a directive which moves the conversational topic forward by highlighting the relevance of the current proposition and to direct the addressee to carry out a requested action. It occurs in almost all the subtypes, though all with relatively low frequency:[9]

(15)   (A miser woke up from a nightmare and felt relieved to see it was a construction worker not the god of death standing in front of him.)   (OD)
    Oh, lí sī saihū   tiȯh bô, lí lâi   chin túhó!   Kámsiā siōngtè,
    oh 2s be maestro right not 2s come really coincidental thank   God
    hókachài lí ū   lâi   chia, nā bô góa chitmiã ká^n tiȯh   oohooaichài, **ta^n**
    lucky   2s ASP come here if not 1s now   dare would die   **now**
    chhiá^n lí kā góa thin chit poe léng chúi lâi   hōo góa.
    please 2s KA 1s   pour one CL   cold water come give 1s
    'Maestro, is that you? What a relief. Thank God! How lucky I am to have you here. Otherwise, I would be taken away by the god of death. **Now** please give me a cup of water.'

---

9. Although WARNING involves a desired act which is urgent, the non-occurrence of ta^n in WARNING may be due to the low frequency of this type of directive. More instances of WARNING are needed in future research to explore its correlation with ta^n.

(16) (A wife is talking to her husband after he is back from helping some kids.)
Sī, i hiah ê gínná chin koai, koh chin phahpià^n,   ánni chin hó,   (RQ)
yes 3s there AC child really good and really hard.working thus very good
ta^n kóa^{n}kín khì séék, siochúi íkeng sio lah.
now hurry go wash hot.water already hot UFP
'Yes, the children there are really good and hard-working. Good, **now**, go and take a shower. Some hot water is ready.'

The other discourse elements include expressions in the form of a semantically weak lexical bundle composed of a first person subject and an evidential verb (*goá khòa^n* 'I see') or an epistemic verb (*goá siū^n* 'I think') (cf. Kärkkainen 2003), a sequential marker (*soah* 'then' and *tēit hoan* 'first'), an attitudinal marker (e.g., *soahbēhiáu* 'How do you not know') (Chang 2015), or a consequential marker (e.g., *sóoyí* 'so'). As indicated in Table 4 (Appendix II), these markers are most frequent in SUGGESTION, which might be due to the mild tone they convey. Extract (17) is an illustrative example:

(17) (Wife to husband, suggesting that their maid and her son stay overnight with them)   (SG)
Góa siū^n êàm tiòh kiò Málī kap i ê kiá^n, chhōa lâi chia khùn
1s think tonight have.to ask PN and 3s AC son bring come here sleep
khah anchôan.
more safe
'**I was thinking** that it might be safer for Mary and her son to come over and sleep here tonight.'

Generally speaking, the discourse marker *ta^n* is used in most directive subtypes, used to encode the relevance of the situation or S's hope that A be performed, a feature closely related to the nature of a directive. By contrast, logical markers are less pertinent to S's intent, as they denote inter-sentential propositional relationships.

5.3 Politeness marker

A politeness marker may be used after the discourse marker to strengthen S's sincerity for a given act to be performed. Of the 408 tokens, 120 (29%) contain a politeness marker, 90% of which are composed of the honorific form *chhiá^n* 'please' (Table 5, Appendix II).

The distribution of *chhiá^n* is more pronounced when the directive underscores the importance of H and S's eagerness for the action to be performed, such as in BEGGING, INVITATION, OFFER, REQUEST and SUGGESTION. For example, in

BEGGING, in particular, S is in a disadvantageous position and is fervently asking someone who has the ability to carry out a desired act. The addition of a marker of politeness may make H more willing to carry out the act. In the cases of INVITATION and OFFER, *chhiá^n* is more inclined to take the formula [*chhiá^n chē*] 'please sit' or [*chhiá^n chiảh hun/iōng tê*] 'please smoke/drink tea' to extend S's hospitality when H visits:

(18) (A beggar to a rich man)   (BG)
      Góa sī chitê pichhám kàukẻk sìbīn   chỏatlōo ê khitchiảh, **chhiá^n** lí
      1s be one pathetic extremely four.side dead.end AC beggar   **please** 2s
      lînbín lâi   siásì góa!
      pity   come give 1s
      'I'm a tragic, destitute beggar. **Please** have mercy and give (some food) to me.'

(19) (Host to guest)   (IV)
      Lâu siansi^n **chhiá^n** chia chē.
      PN mister **please** here sit
      'Mr. Liu, **please** be seated here.'

The other politeness markers mainly take the form of a performative verb, used by S to explicitly express hope *ńgbāng* 'to hope' or to beg H earnestly for a huge favor *páithok/kiû* 'to plead' (cf. Jang 2014: 69), the former being prevalent in ADVICE and the latter in BEGGING:

(20) (Principal to a student who was just enrolled in the school)   (AD)
      Hoangêng lí thảkchheh, **ǹgbāng** lí phahpià^n thảk, chionglâi ittēng ē   chòe
      welcome 2s study   **hope** 2s work.hard study future   surely will be
      chitê gâulâng.
      one capable.man
      'Welcome (to our school). **I hope that you** can study hard, and you will surely
      be a successful person in the future.'

(21) (Servant to master)   (BG)
      Góa ê chúlâng ah, **kiû** lí lînbín góa chitê pibîê   thângthōa!
      1s AC master UFP **plead** 2s pity 1s this worthless worm
      'My master! **Please** have pity on me, a worthless worm.'

Divergent results have been observed in the use of optative/want statements in requests in earlier studies. Yu (1999: 294), drawing data from DCTs, argues that *hope* is often used by speakers when addressing someone of higher social status, e.g., *Wǒ xīwàng nín néng ràng wǒ gǎitiān zài kǎo shì, kě yǐ ma*? 'I *hope* that you can let me take the exam on another day, is that all right?'. Chen & Tseng (2015: 135) note a reverse trend, as only 10% of the speakers use *xīwàng* when addressing a teacher, one of a higher social status. Comparatively, we have not found cases

where S addresses a dominant H with a hope statement. This might be due to a cross-dialectal difference between Mandarin and TSM or because of the type of data used for analysis.

Simply put, the predominant politeness marker is *chhiáⁿ*, which is more inclined to take an overt subject to form a bundle. Though not obligatory, it is preferred when S shows respect for H and expresses a strong desire for an intended action to be carried out, as in BEGGING, REQUEST, and SUGGESTION, or when S is receiving a guest with a friendly welcome, as in OFFER and INVITATION.

5.4   Subject

The subject refers to the agent of the action requested. An overt subject can be found in about half of the directive instances (53.9%, 220/408) (see Table 6, Appendix II), which is consistent with the findings of Zhang (1995) and K. Teng (2017).

Overt subjects can be classified into three major types: H-dominance (e.g., *lí* 'you' (sg.), *lín* 'you' (pl.), S-dominance (e.g., *gòa* 'I'), or S&H-dominance (*lán* '(inclusive) we') (Kohnen 2008) (see Table 7, Appendix II). Most of the subjects take an H perspective (*lí* or *lín*), agreeing with the general tendency reported in the literature (e.g., Blum-Kulka, House & Kasper 1989, Zhang 1995, Lin 2009). Ranking second on the subject type is the H&S-dominated, first person plural (inclusive) *lán*, used to signify S's respect (Brown & Levinson 1987: 180, 200).

In concert with its mitigating tone, as can be seen in Table 7 (Appendix II), *lán* occurs in directives with an affiliative attitude and displays a tentativeness regarding the requested action: ADVICE, INVITATION, OFFER, and SUGGESTION. Examples of these subject types are given below:

(22)   (Host to a visitor) (H-dominance)   (IV)
Chhiáⁿ **lí**   m̄bián   khòalū chò lí ansim   tòa, taⁿ   hia   chē. Àmtǹg liâmpiⁿ
please   **2s** no.need worry   do 2s relaxed stay now there sit   dinner soon
ē   pīpān   hó.
will prepare well
'Please do not worry and stay overnight with us. Now be seated there. Dinner will be ready soon.'

(23)   (A blind man telling the hearers to look at his healed eyes.) (H-dominance)
M̄sī, m̄sī, kinájit ê   góa sī   móa ū   ǹgbāng ê,   chhiáⁿ **lín** khòaⁿ góaê   (RQ)
no   no   today AC 1s   be full have hope   NOM please **2P** look   1s
bàkchiu leh.
eyeball UFP
'No, no. Now I'm a person full of hope. Please look at my eyes. (I'm healed.)'

(24) (A man to his girlfriend) (S&H-dominance)   (AD)
   Che sī bōethang siámpī ê   sūsit. **Lán** tiȯh   līkhui. Jînseng siôngsiông
   this is cannot   avoid AC fact **1P** have.to leave life   often
   bōethang chiàu lísióng lâi   sengȯah.
   cannot   follow ideal   come live
   'This is something you cannot avoid. **We have to leave**. It's impossible to
   always live a life at one's own will.'

Note that in (24), no UFP is attached to the utterance, while a corresponding
expression in Mandarin would require a UFP *ba* to mitigate the directive force,
e.g., *Lán tiȯh līkhui* in Mandarin Chinese is *zanman/women likai ba* 'Let's go'.
This suggests that UFPs may not play an equally important role in directives
across different Chinese dialects. As will be shown in the following discussion,
UFPs occur in less than 10% of directives in the corpus (See Section 5.6.2 for
details).

   The other types of subjects, in particular, *tȧkke* and *kokuī* 'everybody', which
indicate S's politeness, are exclusively used in INVITATION, a polite speech act in
which S asks H to take part in a joint, pleasant activity, as in (25):

(25) (Priest to people in the neighborhood)   (IV)
   Íāu   chhián **kokūi**   siôngsiông kàu góaê sió lépàitńg lâi   thian
   Later please **everybody** frequently come 1s   little church   come listen
   hokim.
   gospel
   '**Dear all**, from now on, please come to my small church to listen to the gospel
   whenever you can.'

The omission of subjects may be accounted for by the meaning inherent in the
directive subtypes. In the cases of ORDER and URGE, the subject omission can
be attributed to the immediacy of the action required, as a shorter utterance
registers an emphatic effect. The absence of the subject in INVITATION, on the
other hand, is related to the type of co-occurring verb. In INVITATION, there is an
extraordinarily high number of the verbs *lâi* and *lâikhì* (90%), both of which are
addressee-oriented and allow for a regular omission of the agent except in the
formula [*lán lâi*] or [*lán lâikhì*] 'let's go'. Examples (26) and (27) illustrate zero-
subject directives:

(26) (Head of bandits ordering his subordinate to answer his question)   (OD)
   Sī símmih lâng? Khah kín   kóng!
   be what   man   more hurry say
   'Who's knocking at the door? Hurry and tell me (who it is)!'

(27)   (A man is taking his friend's hand)   (IV)
      Lâi! Lâi! Lâi   khòaⁿ Bísàia   lah.
      come come come look   Messiah UFP
      'Come! Come! Come and see the Messiah!'

Overall, the most widely used subjects are H-dominated, whereas S&H-dominated subjects occur in more casual and relaxing settings. These findings largely mirror those of previous studies on the distribution of subjects in Mandarin Chinese. Directives with zero subjects, on the other hand, tend to take an addressee-oriented verb *lâi* 'come, hither', indicative of a casual tone, e.g., in INVITATION, or words such as *kín* 'hurry' to mark urgent matters.

5.5   Modal verb

A modal verb may follow the subject. On average, approximately one out of every five directives takes a modal auxiliary (85, 21%) (Table 8, Appendix II). Modals in directives fall into the category of deontic modality (Bybee 1995: 4, Nuyts, Byloo & Diepeveen 2010: 27), manifesting H's obligation or necessity (Bybee 1995: 4), including *tióh* 'have to, need to', *tióhài* 'need to', ièngkai 'should', and *ēthang* 'may, with *tióh* constituting a remarkable proportion (77/87, 89%) (see also K. Teng 2017 for a similar observation), especially in directives involving deontic modality such as ADVICE and WARNING. By contrast, INVITATION, which focuses on the "conditional wanting" of S when an invitation is given and the free will of H to decline it (Wierzbicka 1987: 82), is lacking in such modal verbs. A number of excerpts discussed above ((13), (17) and (24)) have demonstrated this marked density of *tióh*.

In addition to acting as a stand-alone modal, *tióh* also forms a bundle with the adverb *mā* 'also' or its variant *iā* 'also', or the auxiliary *ài* 'need to' or *ìngtong* 'should' to strengthen the deontic meaning. Among them, *mā tióh* is loaded with a strong opposition stance toward a given conduct by H:

(28)   (A friend encouraging communication between a mother and the daughter)
      Góa khòaⁿ lín nñg lâng   long tióh   ēng léngchēngê thâunáu lâi   (AD)
      1s   see   2P two people all   have.to use calm   brain   come
      chhúlí tāichì… **iā   tióh**   ēng chhamsiông ê   thàitō,   kóng kàu píchhú
      handle thing   **also have.to** use discussion   AC attitude talk   until each.other
      e   "hōosiong liáukái".
      will each.other understand
      'I feel that you have to handle this problem with a cool mind… you **need to** negotiate until you understand each other's perspective.'

(29) (Servant to master)   (AD)

Thâuke ah... lán ê sìⁿmiā kójiân bô gōakú, lán **mā tiȯh**   sí hōo lâng
master UFP 1PI AC life   really not long   1PI **also have.to** die HOO people
iúsóo thang   siàuliām lán, m̄thang sí hōo lâng   hoaⁿhí phahchhiú.
have be.able.to remember 1PI do.not die HOO people happy applaud
'Sir, ...our life is short, and we **have to** let people remember (our good deeds)
after we die. Do not let people applaud our death.'

5.6   Verb

The verb(s) is the crucial part of a directive indexing the desired action. The
action can be realized by either a single verb or a complex verb construction.
Based on Levin (1993), Traugott (1991), Kohnen (2008) and Takahashi (2012),
these verbs are classified into 11 types according to their semantic functions:
dynamic verbs, stative verbs, and verbs describing different body functions. The
occurrences of single verbs are discussed first.

5.6.1   Single verb

Single verbs constitute the majority of directive verbs (311/408, 76%). Table 9
(Appendix II) shows that they are primarily realized by dynamic verbs, including
displacement and directional verbs, followed by stative verbs (15%) and uttering
verbs (14%). The distribution of these verbs largely mirrors Traugott's (1991: 392ff)
findings about the semantic areas of speech act verbs (spatial, uttering, mental/
psychological, and vision).

Displacement verbs are used to denote actions that involve the spatial dis-
placement of H's actions. Verbs of this type include *phâng* 'to hold on hand',
tāngchhhiú 'to start action', *thîn* 'to pour (water)', *théh* 'to take', *thoa* 'to drag',
khǹg 'to place', *kiâⁿ* 'to walk', *tah* 'to paste', *chhoā* 'to bring', *chèng* 'to plant',
lîkhui 'to leave', *cháu* 'to run/flee', *chhōe* 'to look for', *kàu* 'to arrive', and *chhiūⁿ*
'to draw up (water)'. Displacement verbs are ubiquitous except in WARNING.
Excerpts (30)–(31) are cases in point:

(30) (Bandit to two people at the door)   (OD)

Lín nn̄g lâng   beh chòe símmih? Chiong línê búkhì **khǹg** leh, chìnchêng
2P two people want do   what   CHIONG 2P weapon **place** ASP advance
lâi   kóng tiâukiāⁿ.
come talk condition
'What are you doing here? Put your weapon there and come in to negotiate
conditions.'

(31) (A woman is inviting a stranger to draw water from a well.)   (IV)
Sī, che chíⁿ sī ūitióh tāike   chiah ū   ê, chhiáⁿ **chhiūⁿ**!
yes this well be for   everyone then   exist AC please **draw**
'Yes, the well was built for everyone. Please feel free to **draw (water)**.'

An important feature that distinguishes TSM from Mandarin and English direc-
tives is the use of directional verbs, composed predominantly of *lâi* 'come' and *khì*
'go'. Like displacement verbs, directional verbs are pervasive in most directive sub-
types except in WARNING and are used by S to invite H to a pleasant event, to order
H to move away from S, as an offer for something desirable, or to urge H to take
an immediate action. The different intentions of S are reflected in the directions
encoded by the verbs. Verbs denoting movement "away" from S (*khì*) are usually
found in directives such as ORDER, whereas those denoting actions "toward" S (*lâi*
and the compound *lâikhì*) are more common in INVITATION, OFFER, BEGGING,
and SUGGESTION. The respective distribution of the two types of verbs in actions
with positive and negative affect concurs with Lee Chen's argument (1997:107)
that *lâi* is correlated with a gentle, suggestive mood whereas *khì* implies an adver-
sative mood. The most prevailing occurrence of *lâi* is found in INVITATION, real-
ized in English by *let's* (Takahashi 2012:23), whereas *khì* and *khui* 'away' and verbs
characterizing actions away from S predominate in ADVICE, ORDER, REQUEST and
URGE, as in the following examples:

(32) (To a friend)   (IV)
Lán **lâikhì**.
1PI **come**
'Let's go.'

(33) (An old man is urging a child to go home soon.)   (UG)
Lí tióh   kínkín **tńgkhì** m̄thang khì pàtūi   thitthô, tióh   khah siósim
2s have.to hurry **return** do.not   go elsewhere play   have.to more careful
leh!
UFP
'You have to go home soon. Do not hang out. You need to be more careful.'

Mental verbs describe activities that have no obvious spatial displacement of the
participants but involve mental processes or changes in cognitive states. They are
mainly composed of verbs such as *boēkì* 'to forget', *khóliân* 'to pity', *pótiōng* 'to take
care', *sìnkhò* 'to trust', *ióngkám* 'to be brave', *oànhūn* 'to hate', *kianchhî* 'to insist',
tàiliām 'to remember', *siūⁿ* 'to think', *chunsiú* 'to follow (rules)', *hoaⁿhí* 'to rejoice',
hiángsiū 'to enjoy', *siósim/chùì/thêhông/sèjī* 'to caution; to be careful', *kàmtok* 'to
supervise', and *kínsīn* 'to be cautious'. They are more frequently used in ADVICE,
BEGGING, ORDER, REQUEST, and WARNING, most of which refer to a given state of

mind that S intends H to maintain so as to invite a favorable outcome or to avoid a serious consequence of a given action.

(34) (Rich man to servant)   (WR)
Thòeāu! Lí tiȯh **kínsīn**   lí ê sóo chòe, nā bô tekkhak beh tiàusí lí tī
step.back 2s have.to **be.careful** 2s AC all do   if not surely   will hang 2s at
chhiūténg!
treetop
'Bug off! You have to **be careful about** everything you do. Otherwise you will be hanged on a tree until you are dead!'

(35) (A woman is asking a stranger to stay away from her.)   (RQ)
Tiāmtiām! Kiâⁿ khui khì hó   m̄?
quiet   go away go okay UFP
'Shut up! Stay away from me, okay?'

Uttering verbs such as "utter", "speak", "call", and "shout" are an essential speech act verb type in the history of English (Traugott 1991: 390, 392). In our corpus, we also observed a similar pattern. Almost as frequent (14%, 56/408) as stative verbs, uttering verbs focus on H's vocalized actions for fulfilling an interactional need, e.g., *chhiáⁿ* 'to invite', *hoanȧk* 'to translate', *kóng* 'say; talk', *tahȧng* 'promise', *chúi* 'to give ideas', *chhiùⁿ* 'to sing', and *iánsoat* 'to give a speech'. Despite the lack of movement in H's actions, these verbs convey processes (e.g., *hoanȧk* or *chhiùⁿ*) or changes of state (e.g., *tahèng*) and are more closely related to ADVICE, REQUEST, SUGGESTION, and URGE in single verbs:[10]

(36) (A matchmaker urging a woman to agree to a rich man's proposal)   (AD)
I   sī teh chòesenglíêlâng, ūsîâ   kap lâng tāmpȯh èngsiû;   lim
3s be ASP business.man   sometimes with people a.little socializing drink
kóa   chiú… che ū   siáⁿ iàukín? Góa khòaⁿ lí tiȯh   sûisî   **tahìng** i
a.little wine this have what matter 1s see   2s have.to anytime **promise** 3s
khah hó, inūi   kihōe   nā sitlȯh chiū bēthang koh tittiȯh lah.
more good because opportunity if lose   then not.able.to again get   UFP
'He is a businessman, so it is natural for him to socialize and drink a little…I feel that you should **accept (his proposal)** as soon as possible, because otherwise you might never have the chance again.'

---

10. However, uttering verbs are used in INVITATION in complex verb constructions in the pattern [*lai* V].

(37) (School president inviting an outstanding alumnus to give a speech)   (IV)
Chuūi tôngoh...   chhiá^n Chóchì tôngoh   **hoatpiáu iánsoat**.
every fellow.student invite PN   fellow.student **present speech**
'Dear all...(let's) invite (our outstanding alumnus) Chochi **to give a speech**.'

A benefactive verb takes a beneficiary as its object, including *hōo* 'to give', *pangchàn* 'to help', *chítō* 'to guide', *siu* 'to put away', *kiù* 'to save', *hû* 'to help (get up)', *chhōa* 'to take (someone)', *pun* 'to share', *sisiá* 'to give to charity', *chù* 'to inject', *siàbián* 'to forgive', *chioh* 'to lend', *chhià^n* 'to hire'. Such verbs are used as main predicative verbs with *hōo* additionally functioning as a disposal marker in the [*hōo* (NP) V] construction (see Section 5.7.2).

As shown in Table 9, a beneficiary-marking verb, when acting as a standalone verb in a directive, mainly appears in BEGGING and REQUEST. Such verbs usually maximize H's power to fulfill a desired action for the benefit of S, e.g., (38). In the other directives, the beneficiary may be H or a third party, e.g., (39):

(38) (A beggar to a rich man)   (BG)
Góa sī chitê pichhám kàukek sìbīn chóatlōo ê khitchiah, **chhiá^n** lí
1s be one pathetic extremely four.side dead.end AC beggar   please 2s
lînbín lâi   **siásì** góa!
pity   come give 1s
'I'm a tragic, destitute beggar. Please have mercy and **give** me (some food).'

(39) (Suggesting that his friend forgive a servant who fled and returned)   (AD)
Siatsú Onîsebóo nā hóekái, lán iûgôan tioh   **siàbián** i.
if   PN   if repent 1PI still   have.to **forgive** 3s
'If Onisebo is willing to repent, we have to **forgive** him.'

Ingesting verbs, or verbs of consumption, are found almost exclusively in OFFER, where S expresses his/her hospitality toward a visitor by offering food, drinks, or cigarettes.

(40) (To a guest)   (OF)
Tōa siàuiâ,   chhiá^n **ēng** tê.
big junior.master please **use** tea
'Big master, please **enjoy** your tea.'

(41) (An old man comforting a child)   (OF)
Gínná lí m̄bián háu... chit tè piá^n hōo lí **chiah**.
child 2s no.need cry   this CL pancake HOO 2s **eat**
'Child, don't cry. **Eat** this pancake.'

Verbs of vision, including *khòa^n(kì^n)* 'to see', figure as a major recurring verb type in directives. When used as single verbs, they only occur in REQUEST and always

take either the politeness marker *chhiáⁿ*, or an overt subject, or both to form a polysyllabic bundle, since the utterance would sound unnatural if it only contained a monosyllabic verb (see K. Lee 1976 for the inclination of Chinese to be polysyllabic). It will also be shown in Section 5.8.2 that verbs of vision are prone to co-occur with a directional verb *lâi*.

(42) (A young man to his friend)   (RQ)
      Eh! Lí khòaⁿ, hia   ū   chit pau mih, m̄ chai sī símmih, lán lâi   **khòaⁿ.**
      INTJ 2s look   there exist one CL   thing not know be what   1PI come **look**
      'Eh! Look, there is a package. I wonder what it is. ***Let's take a look.***'

5.6.2   Complex verb construction

About one-fourth of the directives (97/408) take a complex verb construction to denote the desired action. One particular feature that distinguishes TSM from other languages is the considerable proportion of directional complements (83%, 81/97) in these constructions. As discussed above, directional verbs constitute a preferred pattern of directives in TSM (see Section 5.6.1). Second to the directional component is a disposal construction marking an NP with a variety of semantic roles. Other benefactive verbs comprise the remaining directives with complex verbs. Table 10 (Appendix II) presents the distribution of these verb patterns in different subtypes, and a list of the major co-verbs in these constructions is given in (43):

(43) Recurrent co-verbs in complex verb constructions in directives
      a.   Directional
      b.   Disposal constructions:
            i.   *kā*-construction, with *kā* marking either a beneficiary, goal or source role
            ii.   *hōo*-construction, with *hōo* marking either a beneficiary or object NP
            iii. *chiong*-construction, with *chiong* taking a preposed object
      c.   Benefactive constructions.

Directional complements, typical of which are *lâi* 'hither', *khì* 'thither', and *lâikhì* 'hither', are used in complex verb constructions to indicate the intended action of moving toward or away from the speaker. As in the distribution of directives with single verbs, *lâi* and *lâikhì* are favored in actions that denote a mild, positively evaluated mood, as in (44) and (45), whereas *khì* and other verbs indicating actions away from S are preferred for actions that express urgency, as in (45), or adversity, as in (46):

(44) (The host invites a student from Germany to perform on stage.)   (IV)
      Tējīhoan chhiáⁿ Tekkok   lāu tôngȯh   Schubert siansiⁿ **lâi**   chhiùⁿ lí kakī
      second   please Germany old classmate PN   mister **come** sing   2s self
      chòe ê sèkài bêng   khek.
      create AC world famous song
      'Next, our old classmate from Germany, Schubert, please **come** and sing (for
      us) a world famous song that you wrote yourself.'

(45) (Doctor to nurse)   (OD)
      Bíiông sióchiá, lâi   hùisîn lí **khì** chhiáⁿ hitê bē tōabėh môai   ê lāuapeh
      PN   miss   come bother 2s **go** invite that sell barley porridge AC old.man
      lâi   chitē hó bô?
      come a.little okay not
      'Miss Biiong, please **go** and ask the barley porridge vendor to come, would
      you?'

(46) (Master to Servant Khekliȧtkhek)   (OD)
      Khekliȧtkhek, lí tòtńg **khì** chòe lí kakī ê kang, m̄bián   chhap chitē tāichì.
      PN   2s return **go** do   2s self AC work no.need mind this matter
      'Clark, **go** back and do your own work. Don't mind the business here.'

In (44), *lâi* is used to politely invite a guest to sing a song on stage. As for (45), a
direct translation of the utterance would be 'Miss Biiong, please bother to come
and go asking the old barley porridge vendor to come, would you?', which sounds
odd and redundant. In this example, we observe a bleaching of the verb *lâi*,
which together with *hùisîn* 'to bother; take one's time' forms a formulaic expres-
sion to express S's politeness toward H. In fact, *lâihùisîn* is used recurrently in
TSM as a preface to minimize the imposition of a request, e.g., *Siansiⁿ, hùisîn
lí kā goá chittiám chítō, hó bô*? (sir-bother-you-give-me-a little-guidance-alright-
not) 'Sir, please take time to give me some guidance, okay?' The complement *khì*,
by contrast, usually takes a post-verb position to denote the direction iconic of
the requested action. It conveys an additional distancing tone on the part of the
speaker. The two directional complements function complementarily to signify
S's stance toward the directed act.

    The *kā*-construction, on the other hand, is a versatile pre-verbal morpheme
marking an NP as a beneficiary, maleficiary, goal or source interwoven with the
action denoted by the associated VP, with the construction [*kā* (NP) V] (S. Teng
1982, Huang 2015). Eighteen *kā*-instances are in the corpus, suggesting that it is a
recurrent pattern in directives, especially in those that carry a stronger directive
force, especially ORDER (65%) and REQUEST (20%). The thematic role of the com-
plement NP includes a beneficiary, maleficiary, source, or goal:

(47) (Carpenter to miser, about the construction fee the miser promised to pay)
 Thâuke ah, góa chaiiiá^n lí ê lâng   chin khiáu koh chiàmpângî,   sóoí (RQ)
 master UFP 1s   know   2s AC person very smart and take.advantage so
 ēng kóng ê   bōe ansim, chhiá^n lí tiȯh   **kā góa siá**   tī chóa siōng.
 use say   NOM not secure please 2s have.to **KA 1s write** at paper up
 'Sir, I know you are cunning and like to take advantage of others, so (I feel)
 insecure simply with a verbal agreement. Please **write** (the amount you
 promised to pay) **down for me** on the paper.'

(48) (The speaker asks his friends for help.)   (RQ)
 Oh! Hó   tōatá^n, kèng   ká^n tùi   chit tiâu lōo lâi!   Lán kā kóa^n i cháu.
 INTJ really bold   should dare from this CL   road come 1PI KA push 3s away
 'Oh! How dare (he) take this route! Let's **drive him away**.'

There is also a special use of *kā* that behaves like the so-called "unselected warn-
ing construction (UWC)", which expresses "negative emotion on the part of the
speaker" (Huang 2015: 66), where the complement NP of *kā* does not have a spe-
cific thematic role but alludes to S's negative appraisal. The stance-marking *kā* can
also co-occur with a formulaic, semantically void bundle *kā góa* (literally 'give-
me') or *lí chò lí kā góa* ('you-do-you-give-me') to strengthen the directive force:

(49) (To a stranger)   (OD)
 Lí **kā** góa cháukhui!
 2s **KA** 1s walk.away
 'You, go away.'

(50) (Miser to a construction worker)   (OD)
 Saihū ah, **lí chò lí kā góa** khí, m̄bián   koh   khòalū itchhèêsū.
 master 2s **2s do 2s KA 1s** build no.need again worry everything
 'Maestro, you go ahead and build (the barn). Do not worry about anything
 anymore.'

The third complex verb construction contains the disposal marker *hōo*. According
to H. Lee (2009), *hōo* occurs in ditransitive or resultative constructions (RC). The
ditransitive can be further distinguished by its dative and purposive uses, and the
RC tends to be atelic, realized by an adjective or a clause:

(51) Types of *hōo*:   (Lee 2009: 28–29, 30–31, 40)
      a. Dative: [S V OD *hōo* OI]
          Asam sàng chit pún chheh **hōo** Abí.
          PN   give one CL   book HOO PN
          'Asam gave a book to Abi.'
      b. Purposive: [S V OD *hōo* OI V$_2$]
          Asam sàng chit pún chheh **hōo** Abí khoann.
          PN   give one CL   book HOO PN   read
          'Asam gave a book for Abí to read.'
      c. Resultative: [[S (*kā*) O$_D$ V-*hōo* RC] V-*hōo* RC]
          Góa seng kā ōe   kóng **hōo** chhingchhó oh.
          1s   first KA word say HOO clear   UFP
          'I say the words first and make them clear.'

In the directives in our corpus, *hōo* is also preferred in BEGGING, ORDER, and REQUEST. They occur in situations when S is eager for the requested action to be carried out, as exemplified in (52)–(56). Note that *hōo* in (54) co-occurs with *chiong*, the fourth recurrent marker in directives. Similar to the case of *ka* and *hōo*, *chiong* is used in directives where S expresses his/her intent in a straightforward or determined tone, e.g., (55), where the mother is telling the bandit with strong determination that she doesn't want herself and her son to be torn apart. In (56), on the other hand, two formulaic sequences co-occur in one turn: the derogatory comment *lí chin gōng* 'You are so stupid' and the comment *sòah bōe hiáutit* 'How (do you) not know' with the counter-expectation marker *soah* (Chang 2015). These lexical chunks are used to demonstrate S's extreme irritation and contempt for H.

(52) (Old woman to a rich man)   (BG)
      Góa ê   pichhám chíu lí ēthang kā góa káikoat… Chhiá^n lí ê chî^n **pun**
      1s AC misery   only 2s can   KA 1s solve   please 2s AC money **give**
      hōo góa!
      HOO 1s
      'Yes, only you can solve my miserable situation. Your money will grow fungus and rust if you do not have pity on me. Please **give me** some of your money.'

(53) (Master to servant)   (OD)
      Lí khì iȯhpâng   kā góa **theȯh** tāmpȯh tìnchīng   ê iȯh   lâi   **hōo góa.**
      2s go pharmacy KA 1s **take** a.little tranquilizer AC medicine come **HOO 1s**
      'Go to the pharmacy and **get** some tranquilizers for me.'

(54) (A farming expert talking to peasants)   (RQ)
      Lín khì **chiong** hn̂g **lê**   **hōo chhengkhì**, āulâi chèng hanchû.
      2P go **CHIONG** field **plow HOO clean**   later grow sweet.potato
      '(Now) you go to **plow the field** and grow sweet potatoes (there) later.'

(55) (A mother begging a bandit)   (RQ)
      Lí nā m̄ hōo góa kap góaê kiáⁿ chòehóe, tio̍h   **chiong góan thâi sí.**
      2s if not HOO 1s with 1s   son be.together have.to **CHIONG 1PE kill dead**
      'If you do not let me stay with my son, **you have to kill me.**'

(56) (Miser to servant)   (OD)
      Lí chin gōng, chin pn̄gtháng! **Soah bōe hiáutit** chiong hiahê kū chhâliāu
      2s very stupid very incompetent **how not know** take   those old wood
      the̍h lâi,   kakī tahtah tèngtèng leh.
      take come self cover nail   UFP
      'What? Ah! You are **so stupid** and you are dumb! **Why did you not know that**
      you could take the old wood and use nails to do the woodwork yourself?'

The other benefactive cases include the verbs *thòe/thè* 'to (do something) for',
pangchàn 'to help', and *chiap* 'to pick up (someone)', in the form [S V$_{beneficiary}$ NP
V$_2$], with *thè* making up the majority, in BEGGING or REQUEST:

(57) (Farmer to a friend)   (RQ)
      Lí teh siūⁿ símmih? Tio̍h   kóaⁿkín **thè** góan siūⁿ pānhoat.
      2s ASP think what   have.to hurriedly **for** 1PE think way
      'What you are thinking about? (You) should think of a way **for us** (to deal with
      this problem).'

In (57), the benefactive verb *thòe* can be substituted by the coverb *kā*. Compared
with the *kā*-construction, however, the [S V$_{beneficiary}$ NP V$_2$] functions as a serial
verb construction with both verbs highlighted, whereas *kā* functions as a coverb
or preposition foregrounding the action denoted by the succeeding verb.

The other complex verb constructions are serial verb constructions with
dynamic verbs or stative verbs, e.g., the construction [*cho* NP V], as in (58):

(58) (Host to a visitor)
      Chhiáⁿ lí m̄bián khòalū **chò lí** ansim **tòa,** taⁿ hia   chē.
      please 2s no.need worry **do 2s** relaxed **stay** now there sit
      'Please **do not worry and stay** overnight with us. Now be seated there.'

In the above discussion, we have established important verbal patterns that are
recurrent in TSM directives: directional verbs, directional complements, disposal
constructions, and beneficiary-marking verbs. Regarding the use of directional
verbs, a cross-linguistic difference is observed between the use of *lâi/lâikhì* 'come/

let's' and *let's* in English, the latter of which was found to be the most frequently used English imperative in a story corpus. Disposal constructions with *hōo*, on the other hand, are unique to TSM as Mandarin may use *gei* 'give' to mark a beneficiary (Tsao 1988, e.g., (53))[11] while English resorts to transitive verbs (e.g., (54)) to express a similar idea. The *chiong* construction, on the other hand, corresponds to the *ba* construction in Mandarin (Tsao 1987).

5.7   Utterance-final particle

UFPs are not found to be an obligatory component of directives (36/408, 9%), most of which are realized by *le/leh* (Table 11, Appendix II). Basically, *le/leh* carries an emphatic tone and signals contrast (Li 1999: 211) between what S is directing H to do and what H is actually doing. In addition, several constructions or expressions are associated with *leh*: (i) delimitation or trivialization of a directed act such as reduplication of verbs, as in (56) (*tèngtèng* 'to nail') or the delimitation marker *chitē* in, e.g., (45), (ii) the comparative marker *khah*, e.g., (33), (iii) verbs denoting deceleration of an action such as *bānsī* 'hold on', e.g., (59a), (iv) verbs of imploring *pàithok* 'plead', as in (59b), and (v) the intentisification marker *mā* (Ni 1996), as in (59c). These expressions may co-occur with one another to reinforce the emotive tone, e.g., *Lí mā khah* pàithok *leh* 'please, would you (grant my request)?' The *leh*-attached directives are all implicative of a certain degree of contrast between S's assumption about what H should do and what H is actually doing.

(59)   Directives with *leh*
　　a.   Chhiá^n lí **bānsīlâi**　　leh!
　　　　　please   2s **slow.down** UFP
　　　　　'Please **take your time**.'
　　b.   Sianse^n, **khah**　pàithok leh.
　　　　　sir　　　**more** plead　　UFP
　　　　　'Sir, come on!'
　　c.   **Lí mā lâi　　tàu　koochiá^n leh**. Góa khòa^n chitê gíná　khàu kah bô sia^n
　　　　　2s MA come help comfort　UFP 1s　see　　this child cry　till　no sound
　　　　　lah!
　　　　　UFP
　　　　　'**You (hurry up and) come help comfort (the child)**! I saw the baby was hoarse from crying.'

---

11. As we focus on TSM directives, for a full discussion of Mandarin *gei* 'give', the reader is referred to Tsao (1988).

The other UFPs include *o/oh, la/lah, ho/ho^{n}, ah*, and *le-noh* and *m* in the form of tag questions. Compared to Mandarin UFPs such as *ba* and *a*, which are used to mitigate the force of a directive (Shei 2014), TSM may employ tag questions like *hó bô* 'okay?' to soften the commanding tone (e.g., (45)), though these are of low frequency in the corpus. Furthermore, as these non-*leh* UFPs are uncommon, they are not associated with a particular directive subtype. In general, UFPs "serve the indexical function" (Li 1999: 252) of addressing the H's assumption or knowledge so that S's communicative intent is more successfully conveyed.

5.8 Summary

So far, we have discussed the main components of directives in the corpus. The findings can be summarized as follows:

1. The nine directive subtypes are ADVICE, BEGGING, INVITATION, ORDER, OFFER, REQUEST, SUGGESTION, URGE, and WARNING.
2. Alerters are rare. They mainly take the form of an address term, especially first names, kinship terms, or titles. The latter two forms are strongly associated with a polite attitude.
3. An utterance-initial discourse marker *ta^{n}* 'now' is preferentially used to mark the relevance of the current situation.
4. A politeness marker, especially *chhiá^{n}* 'please', may be used to reinforce S's positive attitude. When used, it tends to attract an overt H-dominated subject, forming the bundle *chhiá^{n} lí/lín* 'please-you'.
5. Subjects are either H-dominated or S&H-dominated, with the latter expressing solidarity (Brown & Levinson 1987) in casual situations. Where the subject is omitted, the directive may include a modifier to show S's apprehension or the verb *lâi* to convey a friendly tone.
6. The default modal auxiliary form is *tióh* 'have to', used to denote obligation or the necessity of the requested action.
7. The most common verbs are dynamic (directional and displacement), stative, uttering, ingesting, and vision verbs.
8. Directional verbs and displacement verbs are pervasive across all subtypes except WARNING, for which stative verbs are preferred.
9. Directional verbs marking action toward S, e.g., *lâi* 'come' are strongly associated with a positive attitude toward H, e.g., INVITATION, OFFER, BEGGING, and SUGGESTION, whereas those expressing movement away from S, e.g., *khì* 'go' tend to denote an adversative mood, e.g., ORDER.
10. Uttering verbs comprise a significant proportion. They are used in all the directive subtypes except for OFFER and WARNING.

11. Ingesting verbs are used almost exclusively in OFFER.
12. Vision verbs are prone to occur with *lâi* 'come' and are used almost exclusively in INVITATION or REQUEST.
13. Benefactive verbs are most strongly associated with BEGGING.
14. Complex verb constructions mainly include (a) directional verbs; (b) disposal constructions, and (c) benefactive constructions, with directional verbs prevailing across 2-verb or 3-verb constructions.

Given the above summary, we propose a preferred usage pattern(s) for each directive subtype, as shown in Table 12 (Appendix II). Although these findings should be generalized with caution as they do not exclude the presence of the less common forms, they serve as an important reference for language teachers and learners.

6.   Discussion and conclusion

In this paper, we have probed an under-explored area of TSM pragmatics, focusing on directives in play scripts in TSM, thereby contributing to our understanding of the subtypes of directives and their preferred usage patterns based on corpus data. Generally speaking, while the preferred patterns in TSM reflect the sequence of requests discussed in the literature (Blum-Kulka, House & Kasper 1989), TSM differs from other languages primarily in terms of the use of utterance-final particles and in the frequency of its linguistic realizations. In addition, the results raise a few cross-linguistic and theoretical points that merit further discussion.

First, the frequency differences regarding alerters and tags between our study and previous research in Chinese (Zhang 1995, Jang 2014, and Chen & Tseng 2015) point to the influence of data sources on the frequencies of speech act components. For example, the greater frequency found by previous studies may be an effect of more homogeneous scenarios, e.g., interactions in academic contexts, used in the DCT questionnaires, whereas the TSM play scripts include interactions between speakers of different social statuses, different degrees of familiarity, and events of varying degrees of urgency.

In terms of the degree of directness, that there is only a limited number of indirect directives agrees with the finding of studies on Mandarin requests (Yu 1999, Rue & Zhang 2008, Jang 2014). A reverse trend, however, is noted in L1 and L2 English (Blum-Kulka, House & Kasper 1989). These divergent results call for future investigation of language-specific factors that influence the choice of speech act strategies.

Regarding expressions of politeness, one cross-linguistic difference found by the present study is that, in addition to *chhiá^n* 'please', TSM speakers use the directional verb *lâi* 'come; hither' to achieve the same communicative purpose following the formula [*lâi* V].[12] The process at work here is a metaphorical transfer of *lâi* from a concept in the spatial domain to one in the interactional domain (Lee Chen 1997). By drawing H closer to S physically with *lâi*, S acknowledges H as a member of the group, thus enhancing solidarity among them and rendering the directive act less forceful. The omnipresence of [*lâi* V] suggests that it has been conventionalized as a formulaic chunk for the expression of politeness. Such a mechanism tallies perfectively with the "approach-based" nature of positive politeness (Brown & Levinson 1987: 70).

The analysis also reveals cross-register difference in the verb types in the head acts. While we have observed a dominance of dynamic verbs in our play script corpus, Stefanowitsch & Gries (2003: 232) have found that stative verbs, e.g., *see, look*, and *listen*, which imply "low imposition", rank high on the imperative verb list in contemporary English. The distribution of speech act verbs, therefore, is an issue that warrants further exploration.

In conclusion, the directive patterns proposed in this study have pedagogical implications for Taiwanese learning and teaching. Specifically, when a speaker intends to produce a directive speech act, there is an inventory of words and phrases from which to select to fulfill the interactional goal. The suggested usage patterns further serve as important guidelines and as a reference for TSM language teachers.

Funding

Acknowledgements

---

12. According to Yu (1999: 293), speakers use the honorific pronoun *nin* 'you' and *qing* 'please' to show politeness.

List of abbreviations

a.   For directives:
Dir   Directive(s)
AD   Advice
BG   Begging
IV   Invitation
OD   Order
OF   Offer
RQ   Request
SG   Suggestion
UG   Urge
WR   Warning
b.   For morphemic gloss:

1S	1st person singular
1PI	1st person plural inclusive
1PE	1st person plural exclusive
2S	2nd person singular
3S	3rd person singular
AC	associative marker *ê*
ASP	aspect marker
CHIONG	the marker *chiong*
CL	classifier
COMP	comparative
HOO	the marker *hōo*
INTJ	exclamatory marker
KA	the marker *kā*
MA	the marker *mā*
PN	proper name
UFP	utterance-final particle

References

Austin, John L. 1962. *How to Do Things with Words*. London: Oxford University Press.

Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad, and Edward Finegan. 1999. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow, UK: Pearson.

Blum-Kulka, Shoshana, Juliane House, and Gabriele Kasper. 1989. *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Brown, Penelope, and Stephen C. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511813085

Bybee, Joan L. 1995. An introductory essay. *Modality in Grammar and Discourse*, ed. by Joan L. Bybee and Suzanne Fleischman, 1–14. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.32

Chang, Miao-Hsia. 2015. Two counter-expectation markers in Chinese. *Metaphor and Metonymy across Time and Cultures: Perspectives on the Sociohistorical Linguistics of Figurative Language. Cognitive Linguistics Research Series*, ed. by Javier E. Díaz-Vera, 141–170. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110335453.141

Chang, Miao-Hsia, and Shu-kai Hsieh. 2017. A corpus-based study of the recurrent lexical bundle *ka li kong* 'let (me) tell you' in Taiwanese Southern Min conversations. *Chinese Language and Discourse* 8.2:174–211. https://doi.org/10.1075/cld.17004.cha

Chen, Mei-Ying, and Chia-Ti Tseng. 2015. A comparative study on the request strategies of college students and the semantic formulas of Mandarin textbooks in Taiwan. *Journal of Chinese Language Teaching* 12.3:125–151.

Chen, Xiu (ed.) 1991. *Taiwanhua Dacidian* [*A Dictionary of Taiwanese*]. Taipei: Yuan-Liou Publishing Co., Ltd.

Chen, Yupin. 2010. Mandarin-Speaking Children's Politeness in Requests. Doctoral dissertation, National Chengchi University, Taipei.

Geng, Chunling. 2015. Comparison between Chinese address terms and English address terms. *Higher Education of Social Science* 9.4:1–4.

Gu, Yueguo. 1990. Politeness phenomena in modern Chinese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14.2:237–257. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(90)90082-O

Huang, Han-Chun. 2015. Causative and interpersonal constructions: Manifestations of kang[7] in Modern Taiwanese Southern Min. *Journal of Taiwanese Languages and Literature* 10.2:47–74.

Jang, Hee Jin. 2014. The analysis of Chinese request strategies and pedagogical applications in Chinese TV dramas. MA thesis, National Taiwan Normal University, Taipei.

Kärkkainen, Elise. 2003. *Epistemic Stance in English Conversation: A Description of Its Interactional Functions, with a Focus on I Think*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.115

Kohnen, Thomas. 2008. Tracing directives through text and time: Towards a methodology of a corpus-based diachronic speech-act analysis. *Speech Acts in the History of English*, ed. by Andreas H. Jucker and Irma Taavitsainen, 295–310. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.176.16koh

Lee, Hui-Chi. 2009. *Ka…hoo* constructions in Taiwanese Southern Min. *Taiwan Journal of Linguistics* 7.2:25–47.

Lee, Kai-fat. 1976. Polysyllabicity in the modern Chinese verb: An attempt to quantify a linguistic drift. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 4.1:24–46.

Lee Chen, Lily. 1997. Metaphorical extension: The phenonmenon of *lâi*來/*khì*去 'come/go' in Taiwanese. *Symposium Series of the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica: Chinese Languages and Linguistics, vol. III*, ed. by Feng-fu Tao and H. Samuel Wang, 103–137. Taipei: Academia Sinica.

Lee-Wong, Song Mei. 1994. Imperatives in requests: Direct or impolite–Observations from Chinese. *Pragmatics* 4.4:491–515. https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.4.4.01lee

Levin, Beth. 1993. *English Verb Classes and Alternations: A Preliminary Investigation*. Chicago, IL & London: The University of Chicago Press.

Li, Ing Cherry. 1999. *Utterance-Final Particles in Taiwanese: A Discourse-Pragmatic Analysis*. Taipei: Crane Publishing.

Lin, Yuh-Huey. 2009. Query preparatory modals: Cross-linguistic and cross-situational variations in request modification. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41.8:1636–1656. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2008.12.007

McCarthy, Michael. 1991. *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Ni, D. Fu-yeh. 1996. Discourse functions of Taiwanese adverbs *ma, a*, and *koh*. MA thesis, National Taiwan Normal University, Taipei.

Nuyts, Jan, Pieter Byloo, and Janneke Diepeveen. 2010. On deontic modality, directivity, and mood: The case of Dutch *mogen* and *moeten*. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42.1:16–34. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2009.05.012

Panther, Klaus-Uwe, and Linda L. Thornburg. 1998. A cognitive approach to inferencing in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 30.6:755–769. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(98)00028-9

Panther, Klaus-Uwe, and Linda L. Thornburg. 1999. The potentiality for actuality metonymy in English and Hungarian. *Metonymy in Language and Thought*, ed. by Klaus-Uwe Panther and Günter Radden, 333–357. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/hcp.4.19pan

Panther, Klaus-Uwe, and Linda L. Thornburg (ed.) 2003. Introduction: On the nature of conceptual metonymy. *Metonymy and Pragmatic Inferencing*, 1–20. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Jonh Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.113.03pan

Pérez Hernández, Lorena, and Francisco José Ruiz de Mendoza. 2002. Grounding, semantic motivation, and conceptual interaction in indirect directive speech acts. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34.3:259–284. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(02)80002-9

Rue, Yong-Ju, and Grace Qiao Zhang. 2008. *Request Strategies: A Comparative Study in Mandarin Chinese and Korean*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.177

Schourup, Lawrence. 2011. The discourse marker *now*: A relevance-theoretic approach. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43.8:2110–2129. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.01.005

Searle, John R. 1969. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139173438

Searle, John R. 1979. *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511609213

Shei, Chris. 2014. *Understanding the Chinese Language: A Comprehensive Linguistic Introduction*. London & New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315767222

Stefanowitsch, Anatol, and Stefan Th. Gries. 2003. Collostructions: Investigating the interaction of words and constructions. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 8.2:209–243. https://doi.org/10.1075/ijcl.8.2.03ste

Su, Xiu-mei. 1988. The Acquisition of Directives in Pre-School Children in Pragmatic and Syntactic Perspectives. MA thesis, Fu Jen Catholic University, Taipei.

Takahashi, Hidemitsu. 2012. *A Cognitive Linguistic Analysis of the English Imperative: With Special Reference to Japanese Imperatives*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/hcp.35

Taylor, John R. 1989. *Linguistic Categorization: Prototypes in Linguistic Theory*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Teng, Kuan-ming. 2017. On Negative Imperatives in Taiwanese Southern Min. Doctoral dissertation, National Tsinghua University, Hsinchu.

Teng, Shou-hsin. 1982. Disposal structures in Amoy. *Bulletin of the Institute of the History and Philology, Academia Sinica* 53.2:331–352.

Thornburg, Linda L., and Klaus Panther. 1997. Speech act metonymies. *Discourse and Perspective in Cognitive Linguistics*, ed. by Wolf-Andreas Liebert, Gisela Redeker and Linda Waugh, 205–222. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.151.14tho

Toolan, Michael J. 1994. Narrative: Linguistic and structural theories. *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics, vol. 5*, ed. by R. E. Asher and J. M. Y. Simpson, 2679–2696. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1991. English speech act verbs: A historical perspective. *New Vistas in Grammar: Invariance and Variation*, ed. by Linda R. Waugh and Stephen Rudy, 387–406. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.49.24clo

Tsao, Feng-fu. 1987. A topic-comment approach to the *ba* construction. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 54.1:1–54.

Tsao, Feng-fu. 1988. The function of Mandarin *gei* and Taiwanese *hou* in the double object and the passive constructions. *The Structure of Taiwanese: A Modern Synthesis*, ed. by Robert Liang-wei Cheng and Shuanfan Huang, 165–208. Taipei: Crane Publishing.

Wardhaugh, Ronald. 2006. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* (5th edition). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Wierzbicka, Anna. 1987. *English Speech Act Verbs: A Semantic Dictionary*. Marrickville, Australia: Academic Press.

Wierzbicka, Anna. 1991. *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: The Semantics of Human Interaction*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783112329764

Yu, Ming-chung. 1999. Universalistic and culture-specific perspectives on variation in the acquisition of pragmatic competence in a second language. *Pragmatics* 9.2:281–312. https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.9.2.04yu

Zhang, Yanyin. 1995. Strategies in Chinese requesting. *Pragmatics of Chinese as Native and Target Language*, ed. by Gabriele Kasper, 23–68. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.

Online appendix

Online appendix is available at: https://doi.org/10.1075/consl.00030.cha.additional.

Address for correspondence

Miao-Hsia Chang
Department of English
National Taiwan Normal University
Taipei, TAIWAN

mhchang@ntnu.edu.tw

Co-author information

Ún-giân Iûnn
Department of Taiwanese Languages and Literature
National Taichung University of Education
Taichung, TAIWAN

ungian@ntcu.edu.tw

Publication history