Canadian Journal of Linguistics/Revue canadienne de linguistique (2025), **70**, 507–535
doi:10.1017/cnj.2026.10031

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

THEMATIC ARTICLE

No unidirectionality: Textual *yào* in Mandarin as contentful and procedural

Yueh Hsin Kuo

National Chengchi University, Taiwan
Email: ykuo@nccu.edu.tw

(Received 30 November 2023; revised 15 January 2025; accepted 16 January 2025)

Abstract

Yào in Mandarin, typically a modal, has subjunctive-like uses in complement clauses. Such uses are textual in that they signal interclausal modal cohesion between the main verb and the complement clause in a construction known as the *pivotal manipulative construction*. They fall into three types, depending on the relationship between *yào* and the main verb. All three likely originate from complement clauses negated by prohibitives. However, despite a common origin, two of the types are diachronically later and more contentful, rather than procedural. Therefore, it is proposed that the development of uses in complement clauses out of modality proper does not necessarily involve unidirectional increases in procedural meaning, as is often hypothesized.

Keywords: contentful; procedural; subjunctive; textualization; unidirectionality

Résumé

Yào en mandarin, généralement un modal, a des usages similaires au subjonctif dans les clauses complémentaires. Ces usages sont textuels dans la mesure où ils signalent une cohésion modale interclausale entre le verbe principal et la clause complémentaire dans une construction connue sous le nom de *construction manipulatrice pivotante*. Ces constructions se divisent en trois types, selon la relation entre *yào* et le verbe principal. Les trois proviennent probablement de clauses complémentaires niées par les interdictions. Cependant, malgré une origine commune, deux de ces types sont diachroniquement plus récents et plus substentiels, plutôt que procéduraux. Par conséquent, il est proposé que le développement des utilisations dans les clauses complémentaires à partir de la modalité proprement dite n'implique pas nécessairement une augmentation unidirectionnelle de la signification procédurale, comme cela est souvent supposé.

Mots-clés: substantiel; procédural; subjonctif; textualisation; unidirectionnalité

© Canadian Linguistic Association/Association canadienne de linguistique 2026. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution licence (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

https://doi.org/10.1017/cnj.2026.10031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

1. Introduction

要 *yào* in Mandarin has multiple senses. Many reference works list over ten entries (e.g., Lǚ 1980, *Zhóngbiān guóyǔ cídiǎn xiūdìng běn, Zhōnghuá yǔwén dà cídiǎn*).[1] Its lexical origin dates back to Old Chinese and its grammatical uses and developments have received considerable attention in the literature, especially modal(-adjacent) ones (e.g., Lu 1997, Yu 1998, Ma 2002, R. Li 2004, Peyraube and Li 2012, S. Jiang 2013, Hsu et al. 2015, W. Kuo 2015, LaBarge 2016, M. Li 2016). However, despite the wealth of literature on the synchrony and diachrony of *yào*, its uses in certain types of complement clause have not been described or analyzed in detail. Such uses resemble mandative *should* in English: the main verb of the complement clause typically has the kind of semantics that triggers mandative *should* in English, and *yáo* and *should* may be deontic or epistemic modals in main clauses. Verbs that trigger mandative *should* are traditionally called suasive verbs and are functionally deontic (Berg et al. 2020) and directive, similar to the imperative (Hoffman 1997). Example (1a) illustrates mandative *should*, which may alternate with the subjunctive in (1b), the indicative in (1c), or the *to*-infinitive in (1d).

(1) a. The employees demanded that he should resign.

b. The employees demanded that he resign.

c. The employees demanded that he resigns.

d. The employees demanded him to resign.

Based on Greenbaum and Quirk (1990: 44)

Similarly, *yào* in the complement clause in (2), from the Academia Sinica Balanced Corpus of Chinese, may alternate with a zero-marked complement clause and be rendered into mandative *should* or *to*-infinitive in English.

(2) 命令我們要立正站好

mìnglìng	wǒmen	(yào)	lìzhèng	zhàn hǎo
order	we	have.to	stand.at.attention	stand good

(a) '(He) ordered that we (should) stand at attention.'

(b) '(He) ordered us to stand at attention'

Note that the parallel between *yào* and *should* does not extend to mirative *should* (Arigne 2017, Celle 2018). Furthermore, the alternation exemplified above is not unconstrained. For what motivates the alternation involving mandative *should*, see Hoffman (1997), Berg et al. (2020), and references cited therein; for the *yào*-zero alternation, if we draw a parallel with the subjunctive-infinitive alternation, following Givón's observation (1994: 283) that "the infinitive invariably signals stronger

[1]Abbreviations: CCL: Center for Chinese Linguistics; CLF: COMP: Comparative marker; Classifier; PFV: Perfective; POSS: Possessive; PROG: Progressive; VP: Verb phrase.

https://doi.org/10.1017/cnj.2026.10031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

manipulation, and the subjunctive weaker", we may assume that a *yào*-marked complement clause expresses a slightly weaker directive force than a zero-marked one. Despite this contrast, the semantics of *yào* involved in the alternation seems very light. Observing that the variants in (1a–c) are not fully equivalent, Berg et al. (2020: 236) also note that "the meaning differences appear to be rather minor". Omissibility will be used as an intuition-based heuristic diagnosis for weak semantics here (but note that it could be tested and established experimentally in future work): the semantics of *yào* is weak if the overall intended message is not significantly impacted by its omission and if there are instances where a *yào*-marked complement clause and a zero-marked one have the same main verb and express comparable messages.

According to Bybee et al. (1994), mandative *should* likely originates from a harmonious relationship between the deontic (or directive) meaning of the main verb and that of *should* in the complement clause. Related research has also suggested that modals may develop functions specific to subordinate clauses (e.g., Givón 1994; van der Auwera and Plungian 1998; Narrog 2012a, 2012b; Peltola 2021). Such functions may be called subjunctive (as mandative *should* is), but will be henceforth referred to as textual, as neither Mandarin nor its historical varieties likely possess any category that may be clearly designated as the subjunctive. The subjunctive-like *yào* is textual in that, like mandative *should*, it signals a harmonious relationship between the main verb and the complement clause. This relationship may be specifically termed *interclausal modal cohesion*, following Peltola (2021): *yào* marks the deontic modality shared between the main clause and its complement clause. We may hypothesize that textual *yào* has undergone a unidirectional development, as the literature has proposed (e.g., Bybee et al. 1994, Traugott 2002).

Due to the lack of previous research on textual *yào*, this article begins with a corpus-based, descriptive component in order to establish its synchronic and diachronic distribution. Based on the qualitative corpus investigation, it is proposed that synchronically, textual *yào* falls into three types, depending on its relationship with the main verb. Diachronically, it is hypothesized that two of the types share a similar origin in complement clauses negated by prohibitives, while the third one likely has an additional origin in similar modal expressions in complement clauses. On the basis of the synchronic distribution of textual *yào* and its hypothesized diachrony, I propose that there is a contentful-procedural (lexical-grammatical) dimension to textual markers: two types of textual *yào* form multi-word lexical expressions with their main verbs and thus are more contentful (lexical), even though the largest and oldest type, similar to mandative *should*, is more procedural (grammatical). It is therefore not the case, as one would assume on the basis of the literature on textual markers and the subjunctive, that what is originally a main-clause modal unidirectionally becomes more and more procedural as it occurs more frequently in complement clauses. Depending on the relationship with the main verb that the modal enters into, it may also become more contentful, as part of a multi-word expression composed of the main verb and the modal. This observation is in line with a constructional perspective (e.g., Traugott and Trousdale 2013, Trousdale 2014), where change does not necessarily involve unidirectional movement towards the procedural end: "what we observe […] is that the new unit has developed either a procedural function […] or a contentful function […] or a combination of both" (Traugott and Trousdale 2013: 157).

https://doi.org/10.1017/cnj.2026.10031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The article is structured as follows. Section 2 reviews the literature on *yào*; section 3 introduces the type of construction in which textual *yào* occurs; section 4 discusses the corpora and methodology used; section 5 presents the results of the corpus work and categorizes textual *yào* into types in Present-Day Mandarin; section 6 hypothesizes the diachronic origins of textual *yào*; and section 7 discusses the implications of the history of textual *yào*. Section 8 concludes.

2. The literature on *yào*

In the grammaticalization tradition, the focus has been on the origins and developments of the grammatical senses of *yào*, particularly modal(-adjacent) ones, such as volitional 'want', deontic 'have to', epistemic 'will', immediate future 'be about to', and conditional 'if' (Lu 1997, Yu 1998, Ma 2002, R. Li 2004, Peyraube and Li 2012, S. Jiang 2013, Hsu et al. 2015, W. Kuo 2015, LaBarge 2016, M. Li 2016).[2] Examples in (3) illustrate these senses.

(3) a. 他要見你

tā yào jiàn nǐ

he want see you

'He wants to see you.'

b. 學習要誠實

xuéxí yào chéngshí

learn have.to honest

'One has to be honest in learning.'

c. 天要下雨了

tiān yào xiàyǔ le

sky will rain PFV

'It is going to rain.'

d. 我要是你，我現在馬上打包

wǒ yào shì nǐ wǒ xiànzài mǎshàng dǎbāo

I if be you I now immediately pack

'If I were you, I would immediately pack up now.'

(Hsu et al. 2015: 56, 66)

[2]The literature does not consistently distinguish between the epistemic and (immediate) future senses. Their (non-)distinction is not relevant here.

https://doi.org/10.1017/cnj.2026.10031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The exact developmental sequence is somewhat controversial. There are multiple accounts of its conditional sense and the related conditional connective *yàoshì* 'if' (< *yào* + *shì* 'be'): the volitional and epistemic senses, and to a lesser extent the deontic one, have all been put forward as the sources of conditional *yào*(*shì*) (Ōta 1958, Yu 1998, Ma 2002, S. Jiang 2013, Hsu et al. 2015), as reviewed in Y. Kuo (2020b). Previous studies also differ as to which of the bewildering range of lexical sources should be regarded as the starting point in the evolution of its more grammatical meanings. For example, Peyraube and Li (2012: 163–164) propose that senses such as 'request', 'invite', and 'ask' give rise to the volitional sense 'want', which then turns into the epistemic sense 'will'. LaBarge (2016: 400–404) presents a more nuanced picture: in addition to 'want', senses such as 'meet', 'force', 'subdue', and 'submit' are involved in the developments of the deontic and epistemic senses. W. Kuo (2015: 11–17) also suggests a multiple-source scenario: the ultimate lexical origin of 'waist' in Old Chinese (Lu 1997) and its derived adjectival sense of 'important' (Ma 2002) and verbal sense of 'summarize' all play a role. Moreover, W. Kuo (2015: 24–30) hypothesizes that *yào* develops its volitional and (immediate) future senses under the analogical influence of *yù* 'want; be about to', which is phonologically and semantically similar to *yào*, and that these two senses of *yào* are thus etymologically unrelated to its other senses. Nevertheless, the overall history is clear and follows general trends in grammaticalization: the more lexical meanings predate and give rise to the more grammatical ones.

The uses of *yào* in complement clauses of certain predicates and their histories are generally overlooked in much of the literature (be it descriptive or theoretical), including by book-length studies (e.g., M. Li 2016, X. Chen 2017). Some exceptions are found in the generative literature, where its occurrence and that of other modals in such clauses have been used in discussions about whether some predicates are non-finite or whether the (non-)finite distinction exists at all in the syntax of (Present-Day) Mandarin (e.g., Xu 1985–1986), as reviewed in Hu et al. (2001). For example, (4) shows that *yào* occurs in complement clauses of what would usually be called control predicates. *Yào* does not contribute much to each sentence, as suggested by the translations.

(4) a. 我勸他要來

wǒ	quàn	tā	(yào)	lái
I	persuade	he	have.to	come

'I persuade him to come.'

b. 他逼我要在兩天之內完成

tā	bī	wǒ	(yào)	zài	liǎng	tiān	zhīnèi	wánchéng
he	force	I	have.to	at	two	day	within	finish

'He forced me to finish it within two days.'

(Based on Hu et al. 2001: 1123; characters and tone marks added)

Such examples are the focus of this article: the aims are to establish the synchronic distribution and properties of *yào* in such clauses and hypothesize its diachronic origins.

https://doi.org/10.1017/cnj.2026.10031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

3. The pivotal construction

The starting point of the investigation is the so-called pivotal construction in Mandarin (Peng 2017) in the framework of Construction Grammar (e.g., Goldberg 1995). Examples in (4) are instances of this construction. There are two main reasons for taking a constructional perspective and using Peng (2017) as a reference point. First, theoretically, this article follows the usage-based tradition in assuming that language is domain-general and that linguistic structure is shaped by usage (e.g., Bybee 2010, Schmid 2020). Referring to *quàn* and *bī* in (4) as control predicates, rather than as parts of the pivotal construction, would imply (though not necessarily entail) a generative perspective where a silent pronoun such as PRO is posited in the complement clause, which is a highly domain-specific analysis that is not compatible with the domain-general view on language in usage-based linguistics. Second, Peng's (2017) diachronic investigation of the pivotal construction contains a presumably representative list of verbs that occur within it, which is useful in establishing the synchronic and diachronic distributions of *yào* in the construction's complement clause.

Peng (2017: 1–2) attributes the origin of the term 'pivotal construction' to Chao (2010) and remarks that the pivotal construction has "two verbs; the object of the first verb is simultaneously the subject of the second verb", which may be represented as (SUBJECT) + (MAIN) VERB + PIVOT NOUN (PHRASE) + VP.[3] There are three subtypes: the manipulative, the cause-complement, and the descriptive, respectively illustrated in (5).

(5) a. 他請你幫忙

tā qǐng nǐ bāngmáng

he ask you help

'He asked you to help him.'

b. 原諒他小

yuánliàng tā xiǎo

forgive him little

'(Someone) forgave him because he was young.'

c. 買了個桌子三條腿

mǎi le gè zhuōzi sān tiáo tuǐ

buy PFV CLF table three CLF leg

'(Someone) bought a table (and the table) has three legs.'

(Based on Peng 2017: 2–4)

[3]Peng (2017: 2) represents part of it as PIVOT NOUN + VERB_2, but PIVOT NOUN can be a phrase and what follows it can be a verb phrase, rather than just a verb.

https://doi.org/10.1017/cnj.2026.10031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 1. Subtypes of representative main verbs in the manipulative pivotal construction

Subtype (n)	Examples
ENFORCE (16)	派 *pài* 'dispatch', 命令 *mìnglìng* 'order', 逼迫 *bīpò* 'force'
ADVISE (20)	警告 *jinggao* 'warn', 勸 *quàn* 'persuade', 鼓勵 *gǔli* 'encourage'
ASSIST (14)	幫助 *bāngzhù* 'help', 協助 *xiézhù* 'assist', 保護 *bǎohù* 'protect'
LEAD (4)	帶 *dài* 'lead', 帶領 *dàilǐng* 'lead', 領導 *lǐngdǎo* 'head'
PERMIT (6)	允許*yǔnx* 'permit', 支持 *zhīchí* 'support', 禁止 *jìnzhǐ* 'forbid'
CAUSE (6)	讓 *ràng* 'let', 使得 *shǐdé* 'cause', 推 *tuī* 'push'
DEMAND (8)	求*qiú* 'beg', 懇請 *kěnqǐng* 'earnestly request', 邀請 *yāoqǐng* 'invite'
FACILITATE (10)	推薦 *tuījiàn* 'recommend', 介紹 *jièshào* 'introduce', 雇 *gù* 'hire'
GUIDE (6)	指導 *zhǐdǎo* 'guide', 教育 *jiàoyù* 'educate', 訓練 *xùnliàn* 'train'
ENTERTAIN (2)	招待 *zhāodài* 'entertain', 宴請 *yànqǐng* 'banquet'

The manipulative pivotal construction is the relevant subtype: it is the context where *yào* occurs as part of the complement clause, but contributes comparatively little to the overall meaning. The semantics of the manipulative pivotal construction is characterized as follows: "the subject of the main verb manipulates (anticipates, facilitates, or blocks) the pivot N's involvement in the action or state denoted by the complement verb" (Peng 2017: 3). The construction may be further categorized into subtypes on the basis of the semantics of the main verb. Peng (2017) proposes ten subtypes, summarized in Table 1, where 'n' indicates the number of representative verbs listed by Peng; see Peng (2017: 72, 82) for a more detailed description.

Finally, the manipulative pivotal construction has a causative semantics, but most of the verbs are not categorized as CAUSE by Peng. For Peng, CAUSE pertains to general causation, typically expressed by *ràng* 'let' and *shǐ* (*dé*) 'cause', and includes verbs whose semantics outside the pivotal construction is also likely causative.

4. Data and methodology

Each of the 92 verbs listed by Peng (2017) as representative main verbs in the manipulative pivotal construction was queried in the Academia Sinica Balanced Corpus of Modern Chinese, which represents the Taiwanese variety of Present-Day Mandarin. Additional queries for words morphologically composed of 求 *qíu* 'beg' were also conducted. Such queries were conducted by using the wildcard function (e.g., *求 and 求*, where the star sign stood for any morpheme, retrieved all words within which 求 preceded or followed a morpheme). Even though words composed of 求 *qíu* are not particularly rare, Peng only lists *qíu*, possibly for reasons of space. Search results were examined if one of the words following the queried verb was *yào*, including instances where it immediately followed modifiers (e.g., *yīdìng* 'absolutely' and *qiānwàn* 'by all means') and negators (e.g., *bù* 'not'). *Bú yào* means 'do not want', if *yào* is a main verb of volition. *Bú yào* may also function as a prohibitive marker, meaning 'do not'. *Bù* undergoes tone sandhi, becoming *bú*, in front of any morpheme carrying the fourth tone, such as *yào*.

No comparable list of verbs exists, as far as I am aware, for Early Mandarin (7th–19th centuries CE). To reconstruct the diachrony of *yào* in the manipulative pivotal construction, main verbs that synchronically may take *yào* as part of the complement clause were used as the basis for the diachronic investigation. Such main verbs, their

https://doi.org/10.1017/cnj.2026.10031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

morphological variants and (near-)synonyms were queried for in the Academia Sinica Corpus of Early Mandarin, again using the wildcard function where relevant.

Neither of these two corpora are the largest in size or the most extensive in scope: for comparison, the Balanced Corpus of Modern Chinese includes 17.6 million characters, while the Present-Day Mandarin section of the Center for Chinese Linguistics (CCL) Corpus features 4.7 billion characters and a more comprehensive Pre-Present-Day Mandarin section. However, the two Academia Sinica Corpora were chosen as the main sources of data because they are fully segmented and tagged for parts of speech (unlike the CCL Corpus), which facilitates searching for relevant instances of main verbs that appear in multiple argument structure constructions or have multiple senses. For example, 使 *shǐ* 'make' totals over 5,000 instances in Early Mandarin, and they were retrieved and examined only if they were tagged as 'VL' (for 'causative verb'). Even with this functionality, however, querying for *yào* would not have been practical. Among the various tags available for *yào*, 'VK' (for 'stative verb') in Early Mandarin and 'D' (for 'adverb') in Present-Day Mandarin are closest to what we are examining here, but they nevertheless yield over 15,000 instances in Early Mandarin and over 20,000 in Present-Day Mandarin. While a portion of these could have been sampled, it was more thorough to examine all main verbs rather than simply a sample of *yào*. Additional searches in the Academia Sinica Corpus of Old Chinese and the CCL Corpus were also conducted, but not as systematically, in order to slightly expand the synchronic and diachronic scopes.

Some instances resembled the manipulative pivotal construction only superficially and were therefore excluded from further investigation. For example, (6a) has the pivotal form (SUBJECT) + V + PIVOT NOUN + VP, where *yào* is part of the VP, but not the pivotal meaning. The subject of the second verb *zhòngshì* 'focus' is understood as the same as that of the preceding manipulative verb *yāoqiú* 'demand', whereas in the pivotal construction, the subjects of the V and the VP are distinct, unless in reflexive contexts, as in (6b), where the NOUN is reflexive (i.e., co-referential with both of the subjects of the VP and the V).

(6) a. 企業要求永續經營，一定要重視產品開發

Qǐyè yāoqiú yǒngxù jīngyíng yīdìng yào
firm demand sustainable management absolutely have.to
zhòngshì chǎnpǐn kāifā
focus product development
'(If) a firm is to demand sustainability in its operation, it must focus on product development.'

b. 要求自己，要達到一定的標準

yāoqiú zìjǐ yào dádào yīdìngde biāozhǔn
demand self have.to reach certain standard
'(I) demand of myself that I reach certain standards.'

https://doi.org/10.1017/cnj.2026.10031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

As the focus is on textual *yào* as part of the complement clause, instances where *yào* was used as a lexical verb were also discarded, as in (7). *Yào* in (7a–b) is a main verb meaning 'ask' or 'want'. The first *yào* in (7c) is a volitional verb tinged with conditionality, as it is used in the protasis, and the second is part of the prohibitive *bú yào* 'do not'. Similar to (6a), the subjects of the verb *yào* and the preceding verb are co-referential, but the NOUN is not reflexive in (7a–b).

(7) a. 逼迫他，要他比劍

bīpò tā yào tā bǐ jiàn

force him ask he compete sword

'(He) was forcing him and asking him to have a sword duel.'

b. 召集國中的聰明智士，要他們想辦法拿月亮

zhàojí guó zhōng de cōngmíng zhìshì yào

summon country inside POSS smart wiseman want

tāmen xiǎng bànfǎ ná yuèliàng

they think method take moon

'(He) summoned wise men from within the country, wanting them to come up with ways of taking down the moon.'

c. 告誡他「要在演藝圈成功，最好不要談戀愛。」

gàojiè tā yào zài yǎnyìquān chénggōng zuìhǎo

admonish he want in show.business succeed better

bú yào tánliàn'ài

not have.to be.in.a.relationship

'(Talent managers) warned him that if he wanted to succeed in show business, he had better not be in a relationship.'

5. Synchronic properties and distribution

In what follows, some examples of textual *yào* are presented, and its uses and distribution are examined. Table 2 lists the 22 manipulative verbs that may take *yào* in the complement clause in Present-Day Mandarin and their subtype according to Peng's (2017) classification.

The main verbs in Table 2 may be grouped into three types, according to the relationship between *yào* and the main verb: GUIDE, CAUSE, and the largest, DEFAULT, which comprises all verbs that are neither a GUIDE verb nor a CAUSE verb. In all three types, as with all manipulative verbs in general, the complement clause may be marked by no modal. The three types thus have a contrast between zero-marked and *yào*-marked complement clauses.

https://doi.org/10.1017/cnj.2026.10031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 2. Main verbs with *yào* in the complement clause in Present-Day Mandarin

SUBTYPE	Instances
ENFORCE	命令 *mìnglìng* 'order'
ADVISE	警告 *jǐnggào* 'warn', 告誡 *gàojiè* 'admonish', 勸 *quàn* 'advise, persuade', 說服 *shuōfú* 'convince', 騙 *piàn* 'deceive', 鼓勵 *glì* 'encourage', 叮囑 *dīngzh* 'exhort', 敦促 *dūncù* 'urge', 提醒 *tíxǐng* 'remind; warn'
CAUSE	讓 *ràng* 'let', 使得 *shǐdé* 'cause'
DEMAND	求*qiú* 'ask, beg', 力求 *lìqiú* 'strongly ask, strive', 央求 *yāngqiú* 'earnestly ask, beg', 懇求 *kěnqiú* 'sincerely ask, beg', 苛求 *kēqiú* 'harshly ask', 要求 *yāoqiú* 'ask, demand', 請求 *qǐngqiú* 'politely ask, beg'
GUIDE	教 *jiāo* 'teach', 教育 *jiàoyù* 'educate', 訓練 *xùnliàn* 'train'

In the DEFAULT type, *yào* is typically harmonious with the directivity and deonticity of the main verb – as expected if we assume the parallel between *yào* and mandative *should* – and as such, *yào* is semantically light. What little it does express is expressed by the main verb as well. Directivity, as intended here, refers to the function of directive speech acts (Searle 1979), which is to get the referent of the NOUN to do what the complement clause describes. Deonticity is defined generally here; it may pertain to the permission or obligation placed by the SUBJECT on the NOUN or the moral urgency, responsibility, or even just social appropriateness of the action (or state) described by the main verb as well as the complement clause.[4] For example, the sentences in (8) are deontic.

(8) a. 提醒她要小心

tíxǐng tā yào xiǎoxīn

warn she have.to careful

'(They) warn her to be careful.'

b. 勸他要努力

quàn tā yào nǔlì

advise he have.to work.hard

'(She) advised him to work hard.'

c. 鼓勵他要好好鍛鍊身體

gǔlì tā yào hǎohǎo duànliàn shēntǐ

encourage he have.to well train body

'(She) encouraged him to train his body well.'

A variant on this characterization is *piàn* 'deceive', as it cannot be said to be socially appropriate. Example (9) is the only instance where the main verb of *yào* is *piàn*. Nevertheless, directivity and deonticity in terms of obligation are still present.

[4] A strict division between directivity and deonticity is not assumed here, contra Nuyts et al. (2010), who maintain that notions of permission and obligation are directive and notions of moral acceptability and necessity are deontic.

https://doi.org/10.1017/cnj.2026.10031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(9) 以前老師大人騙你要虛心受教...

yǐqián	lǎoshī	dàrén	piàn	nǐ	yào	xūxīn
before	teacher	adult	deceive	you	have.to	humbly
shòujiào						
learn						

'Before, teachers and adults deceived you into humbly learning (from them)…'

The GUIDE type is much smaller, comprised of only *jiāo* 'teach', *jiàoyù* 'educate', and *xùnliàn* 'train'. In this type, *yào* is also harmonious with the main verb, but it is not semantically as light as it is in the non-GUIDE type. This is because *yào* actually specifies the deonticity of the main verb, which, unlike main verbs in the DEFAULT type, is not always deontic. For example, (10) shows that *jiāo* 'teach' and *jiàoyù* 'educate' are deontic: what is taught is morally good and socially acceptable. In this kind of deontic context, *yào* may occur.

(10) a. 教青少年朋友要愛惜生命

jiāo	qīngshàonián	péngyǒu	yào	àixī	shēngmìng
teach	teenage	friend	have.to	cherish	life

'(She) taught teenagers to cherish life.'

b. 她教他要和善、仁慈

tā	jiāo	tā	yào	héshàn	réncí
she	teach	he	have.to	gentle	kind

'(She) taught him to be gentle and kind.'

c. 教育男性要懂得尊重女性

jiàoyù	nánxìng	yào	dǒngdé	zūnzhòng	nǚxìng
educate	man	have.to	know	respect	woman

'(They) educate men to respect women.'

By contrast, (11) shows that *jiāo* 'teach' may be non-deontic: what is taught is simply skills and *yào* does not occur in this kind of non-deontic context.[5]

(11) a. 姊姊教我騎車

jiějie	jiāo	wǒ	qí	chē
older.sister	teach	I	ride	bike

'My older sister taught me (how) to ride a bike.'

[5]The character representing 教 has two possible pronunciations: *jiāo* and *jiào. Jiāo* may be deontic, as in (10a–b), or non-deontic, as in (11). *Jiào* has a stronger deontic sense 'teach; instruct; reprimand' than *jiāo* and may be a causative verb 'make; let' without any connotation of 'teach'. 教 in (10a–b) is read as *jiāo*, at least in Taiwanese Mandarin, but could perhaps be read as *jiào* in other varieties.

https://doi.org/10.1017/cnj.2026.10031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

b. 爸爸教我們游泳
bàba jiāo wǒmen yóuyǒng
father teach us swim
'Father taught us (how) to swim.'

c. 教她使用臺幣
jiāo tā shǐyòng tái bì
teach she use Taiwan dollar
'(Someone to) teach her (how) to use Taiwan dollars.'

One could add *yào* to the complement clauses in (11), but the interpretation would then be that there is some obligation, urgency, or moral imperative associated with 'ride a bike', 'swim', and 'use Taiwan dollars'. For example, any of the examples in (11) could use *yào* in a context where the action is vital for one's survival or health.

Similar to *jiāo, xùnliàn* 'train' is not inherently deontic, and *yào* occurs in contexts where *xùnliàn* is deontic, as in (12a), but not in contexts where it is non-deontic and has only the skill-imparting sense, as in (12b–c), which are unlikely to be associated with any obligation or moral imperative. One might perceive a hint of one of these in 'train them to play football', but it is doubtful anyone would find them in 'train dolphins to perform'.

(12) a. 訓練小孩子要獨立自主
xùnliàn xiǎoháizi yào dúlìzìzhǔ
train children have.to independent
'(They) train children to be independent.'

b. 訓練他們踢足球
xùnliàn tāmen tī zúqiú
train they kick football
'(They) train them to play football.'

c. 訓練牠們表演空中翻滾…
xùnliàn tāmen biǎoyǎn kōngzhōng fāngǔn
train they perform midair somersault
'(They) train them (dolphins) to perform somersaults in midair.'

Note that the GUIDE type does not require the presence of *yào* to express deonticity. As seen in (13), it may be deontic without *yào*, but adding *yào* to these examples would not be inappropriate.

https://doi.org/10.1017/cnj.2026.10031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(13) a. 教人向善

jiāo rén xiàngshàn

teach people do.good

'(It is to) teach people to do good.'

b. 教他尊重生命

jiāo tā zūnchóng shēngmìng

teach he respect life

'(They rarely) teach him to respect life.'

c. 教育病人養成良好的衛生習慣

jiàoyù bìngrén yǎngchéng liánghǎode wèishēng xíguàn

educate patient cultivate good hygiene habit

'(They) educate patients to have good hygiene practices.'

Even before examining any data, the CAUSE type perhaps stands out immediately: *ràng* 'let' and *shǐdé* 'cause', being general causative verbs, are semantically more schematic than the other main verbs. In the corpus, all instances of *yào* with *ràng* and some with *shǐdé* as the main verb co-occur with other markers, particularly quantifiers, such as 所有 *suǒyǒu* 'every; all', 每 *měi* 'each', 都 *dōu* 'all', 就 *jiù* 'then, as soon as', and 還 *hái* 'still'. This suggests a different function of *yào*, which will not be examined in more detail.[6] What is more similar to the kind of textual *yào* found in the other two types includes examples in (14), where *shǐdé* leaves the type of causation unspecified; it is *yào* that specifies it. *Shǐdé*… *yào* essentially means 'require' or even 'force', with the exact deontic force dependent on the context. Compare (15), where *shǐdé* also lets the following modal *néng*(*gòu*) 'can, be able to' specify the type of causation; *shǐdé*… *néng*(*gòu*) means 'enable'.

(14) a. 更使得南方國家的農民要向北方國種苗公司付出權利金

gēng shǐdé nánfāng guójiā de nóngmín yào

furthermore make southern country POSS farmer have.to

xiàng běifāng guó zhǒngmiáo gōngsī fùchū

toward northern country seedling company pay

quánlì jīn

rights money

'(Plant breeders' rights), furthermore, require farmers in the Global South to pay licence fees to seed suppliers in the Global North.'

[6]Such uses are infrequent, as modals rarely occur in the complement clauses of causative verbs such as *ràng* and *shǐ*(*dé*), according to Q. Chen's (2020) and Tian et al.'s (2022) data.

https://doi.org/10.1017/cnj.2026.10031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

b. 使得媒體必須要查證
shǐdé méitǐ bìxū yào cházhèng
make media must have.to verify
'(The burden of proof) forces the media to verify (their sources).'

(15) a. 使得這些家庭能夠過下去
shǐdé zhèxiē jiātíng nénggòu guòxiàqù
make these family able survive
'(You could) enable these families to survive.'

b. 使得用戶能容易學習
shǐdé yònghù néng róngyì xuéxí
make users able easy learn
'(It) enables users to learn easily.'

The contrast between (14) and (15) shows that the modal following *shǐdé* specifies the type of causation. In force dynamic terms (Talmy 1988), *shǐdé… yào* signals positive compulsion and *shǐdé… néng*(*gòu*), positive enablement (Sweetser 1990).

In sum, the main verbs with which textual *yào* co-occurs may be divided into three types, depending on the relationship between the main verb and textual *yào*. In all three types, *yào* and the main verb are harmonious in terms of directivity and deonticity, but in the GUIDE type, *yào* additionally specifies the deonticity of the main verb, which is not necessarily inherently deontic. In the CAUSE type, *yào* specifies the exact type of causation signalled by the construction.

6. Diachronic origins

Projecting from the synchronic distribution (see Table 2) back into Early Mandarin yielded the results summarized in Table 3.

Of the three types DEFAULT, GUIDE, and CAUSE, only CAUSE is absent in Early Mandarin. The other two types also occur considerably less often in Early Mandarin than Present-Day Mandarin. This is in line with the overall expansion of the pivotal construction, which has included more verb types over time (Peng 2017). In what follows, section 6.1 hypothesizes the origin of the DEFAULT and GUIDE types of textual *yào* (i.e., textual *yào* whose main verb belongs to the DEFAULT or the GUIDE type). Section 6.2 derives a synchronic implicational hierarchy from the diachronic hypothesis. Section 6.3 hypothesizes the origin of the CAUSE type of *yào*.

Table 3. Main verbs with *yào* in the complement clause in Early Mandarin

DEFAULT	ENFORCE	令 *lìng* 'order'
	ADVISE	戒 (orthographic variant of 誡) *jiè* 'admonish; forbid', 勸 *quàn* 'advise, persuade', 囑 *zh* 'exhort'
GUIDE		教 *jiāo* 'teach'

https://doi.org/10.1017/cnj.2026.10031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

6.1 Origin of the DEFAULT *and* GUIDE *types*

Sentences in (16) illustrate ADVISE, ENFORCE (both of which are the DEFAULT type) and GUIDE.

(16) a. 勸人天切要修

quàn	réntiān	qiè	yào	xiū
advise	everyone	absolutely	have.to	practise

'(It) advises everyone to practise (Buddhism).'

敦煌變文集 *Dūnhuáng biànwénjí* (7th–10th centuries)

b. 令小弟要拜識哥哥

lìng	xiǎodì	yào	bàishí	gēgē
order	I	have.to	respectfully.meet	older.brother

'(He) ordered me to meet you.'

水滸傳 *Shuǐhǔzhuàn* (14th century)

c. 聖人教人要博學

shèngrén	jiào	rén	yào	bóxué
sage	teach	people	have.to	knowledgeable

'Sages teach people (how) to be knowledgeable.'

朱子語類 *Zhūzǐ Yǔlèi* (1270)

The earliest attested main verb taking textual *yào* in its complement clause, *quàn*, of the ADVISE type, as in (16a), is particularly noteworthy for the diversity of prohibitive markers attested in its complement clause: 莫 *mò*, 勿 *wù*, 休 *xiū*, 不要 *bú yào*, 休要 *xiū yào*, and 別 *bié*, illustrated in (17).

(17) a. 勸君莫向他鄉住

quàn	jūn	mò	xiàng	tāxiāng	zhù
advise	you	not	towards	foreign.land	live

'(I'd) advise you not to live in a foreign land.'

敦煌變文集 *Dūnhuáng Biànwénjí* (7th–10th centuries)

b. 勸他勿迫切

quàn	tā	wù	pòqiè
advise	he	not	hurry

'(He) advises him not to hurry.'

朱子語類 *Zhūzǐ Yǔlèi* (1270)

https://doi.org/10.1017/cnj.2026.10031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

c. 勸你休窖約

quàn nǐ xiū xūnyuē

advise you not ponder

‘(I) advise you not to ponder.’

張協狀元 *Zhāng Xié Zhuàngyuán* (12th–13th centuries)

d. 我勸他不要遞呈

wǒ quàn tā bú yào dì chéng

I advise he not have.to deliver official.document

‘I advised him not to file an official complaint.’

醒世姻緣 *Xǐngshì Yīnyuán* (16th century)

e. 勸他休要哭

quàn tā xiū yào kū

advise he not have.to cry

‘(He) advised him not to cry.’

金瓶梅 *Jīnpíngméi* (1610)

f. 我勸你，別為我們得罪人

wǒ quàn nǐ bié wèi wǒmen dézuì rén

I advise you not for we offend people

‘I am advising you not to offend anyone on our behalf.’

紅樓夢 *Hónglóumèng* (1791)

The other verbs in the DEFAULT and GUIDE types also take complement clauses negated by prohibitives, but none has the same range of prohibitives.[7]

(18) a. 戒其子勿用浮屠

jiè qí zǐ wù yòng fútú

forbid his son not use Buddhism

‘(He) forbade his son from planning Buddhist (funeral rites).’

[7]教 in (18b) could be read as *jiāo* or *jiào*; see footnote 5. The preceding context tilts the reading toward *jiāo*, as it discusses something related to learning.

https://doi.org/10.1017/cnj.2026.10031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

b. 教人不要去求

jiāo	rén	bú	yào	qù	qiú
teach	people	not	have.to	go	seek

'(It is to) teach people not to seek (a political career).'

朱子語類 *Zhūzǐ Yǔlèi* (1270)

The diversity of prohibitives associated with *quàn* is especially pronounced when compared to the DEMAND verb *qiú* 'ask, beg', which only takes prohibitive *bú yào* and its morphological fusion *bié* 'do not' (L. Jiang 1991, Feng and Wang 2006), as in (19), but not textual *yào* in its complement clause.

(19) a. 求那問官不要多入贓

qiú	nà	wènguān	bú	yào	duō	rùzāng
ask	that	judge	not	have.to	more	take.bribe

'(We) ask that judge not to take more bribes.'

b. 求他別拆鞦韆

qiú	tā	bié	chāi	qiūqiān
ask	she	not	dismantle	swing

'(He) asked her not to take down the swing.'

醒世姻緣 *Xǐngshì Yīnyuán* (16th century)

Interestingly, if textual *yào* is attested in the complement clause of a main verb, a prohibitive is also attested in the clause, but not vice versa. That is, the occurrence of textual *yào* implicates that of a prohibitive. It is thus hypothesized that the DEFAULT and GUIDE types of textual *yào* (i.e., *yào* whose main verb is a non-CAUSE verb) originate from complement clauses that are negated by prohibitives. The development of textual *yào* is thus likely a case of analogical extension. While the majority of manipulative verbs, both synchronically and diachronically, leave the non-negated complement clause unmarked, some allow it to be marked by *yào*, by analogy with the fact that the negated complement clause is marked by a prohibitive. Initially the analogical relation likely holds only between *yào* and *mò* in the complement clause of *quàn*, as in (16a) and (17a), since the other cases of textual *yào* are not attested until later.[8] However, thanks to the rise of prohibitives that are morphologically similar to *yào*, such as *bú yào* and *bié*, the analogy becomes more transparent, which likely facilitates the spread of textual *yào* to more verbs, such as *qiú* 'ask, beg', which evolves from taking *bú yào* and *bié* but not textual *yào* in Early Mandarin, to doing so in Present-Day Mandarin.

[8]To expand the diachronic coverage, the 唐 *Táng* Dynasty section of the CCL Corpus was queried, as it immediately predates the section where *Dūnhuáng Biànwénjí* is placed in the corpus. Only one instance of textual *yào* was found in the complement clause of *quàn*, but it was from a misplaced Present-Day Mandarin passage. There were multiple genuine instances where *quàn* had a prohibitive-negated complement clause.

https://doi.org/10.1017/cnj.2026.10031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

If this hypothetical scenario is true, it is perhaps not accidental that diachronically, the complement clause of *quàn* is where we find more types of prohibitives than elsewhere and where textual *yào* first occurs. We would expect that the analogy between textual *yào* and the prohibitive is most likely to occur in a context where the prohibitive is particularly frequent, as is suggested by the diachronic high-type frequency of the prohibitive associated with *quàn*. Furthermore, the prohibitive is very often face-threatening. Therefore, new strategies may frequently emerge to express the prohibitive because they come across as less face-threatening than old strategies (Van Olmen 2010, Devos and Van Olmen 2013). The diachronic high type frequency of the prohibitive in the complement clause of *quàn* also suggests that it is a context where face work is at play. A new marker like textual *yào* is thus more likely to emerge to introduce more functional contrast (namely different degrees of directive force, cf. Givón's 1994 subjunctive-infinitive contrast) in this context than elsewhere.

This hypothesis accounts for the directivity and deonticity associated with textual *yào*: prohibitives are also associated with such functions by default, as their intended purposes are to direct the PIVOTAL NOUN away from the action or state referred to by the complement clause and place varying degrees of restriction on it. The functional similarity between textual, subjunctive-like *yào* and the prohibitive also has crosslinguistic (near-)parallels, which further strengthens the hypothesis. The subjunctive and the prohibitive are functionally similar and compatible, in that the negative version of the former may express the latter and the former may be required in the context of the latter (Aikhenvald 2010, Devos and Van Olmen 2013). The fact that *qiú* in Early Mandarin takes only prohibitives in its complement clause, but not textual *yào*, is not evidence against this hypothesis. It is simply that users have not generalized the use of textual *yào* to include the complement clause of *qiú*, which is not surprising, as generalizations are often verb-based (Croft 2003, Iwata 2008, Boas 2010).

6.2 A synchronic implicational hierarchy

The hypothesis would suggest that, if synchrony reflects diachrony, a main verb able to take textual *yào* in its complement clause in Present-Day Mandarin should also be able to take a prohibitive, as the former originates from the latter, but that a main verb able to take a prohibitive would not necessarily allow textual *yào* in its complement clause. That is, the historical development of textual *yào* may have resulted in a synchronic implicational hierarchy, whereby the occurrence of textual *yào* implies that of a prohibitive, but not vice versa. In other words, textual *yào* is more 'marked' than a prohibitive. A strong version of the synchronic implicational hierarchy would state more specifically that the occurrence of textual *yào* implicates that of prohibitive *bú yào* (as they are morphologically similar), but not vice versa. This might seem to contradict the typological generalization holding that a negative clause is more marked than an affirmative one, but it does not in fact do so. Within the manipulative pivotal construction, the default, unmarked strategy is zero-marking.

Even the strong version of the implicational hierarchy seems largely correct, as most of the main verbs (17 out of 22) in Present-Day Mandarin take textual *yào* and

https://doi.org/10.1017/cnj.2026.10031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

prohibitive *bú yào* in complement clauses. Sentences in (20) illustrate prohibitive *bú yào* in complement clauses whose main verbs are the GUIDE type.

(20) a. 教子女避孕比教她不要有性行為更重要

Jiāo zǐnǚ bìyùn bǐ jiāo tā bú yào
teach offspring contraception COMP teach her not have.to
yǒu xìngxíngwéi gèng zhòngyào
have sexual.intercourse even important
'It is more important to teach your children about contraception than to teach them not to have sexual intercourse.'

b. 教育這家伐木公司不要「砍盡殺絕」

jiàoyù zhè jiā fámù gōngsī bú yào kǎn
educate this CLF logging company not have.to cut.down
jìn shājué
completely exterminate
'(They) taught this logging company not to cut everything down.'

The five exceptions that allow for textual *yào* but not prohibitive *bú yào* are: *mìnglìng* 'order', *kēqiú* 'harshly ask', *yāngqiú* 'earnestly ask', *piàn* 'deceive', and *xùnliàn* 'train'. However, upon closer inspection, the non-occurrences of *bú yào* in the complement clauses of most of these verbs may not be genuine exceptions.

The complement clause of *mìnglìng* 'order' is negated by *bù néng* 'cannot', as in (21). *Bù néng* 'cannot' is also a prohibitive, and thus (21) is an exception only to the strong version of the hierarchy. The hypothesis, which gives rise to the hierarchy in its weak version, postulates a diachronic connection between textual *yào* and a prohibitive, which may or may not be *bú yào*.

(21) 我命令自己不能掉下眼淚

wǒ mìnglìng zìjǐ bùnéng diào xià yǎnlèi
I order self not can fall tear
'I ordered myself not to cry.'

The complement clauses of *kēqiú* 'harshly ask' and *yāngqiú* 'earnestly ask' do not take any prohibitive, which may be attributed to the size of the corpus, where *kēqiú* and *yāngqiú* in general are infrequent. Occurring respectively only 21 and 27 times, *kēqiú* and *yāngqiú* are less frequent than the other DEMAND verbs: *kěnqiú* 'sincerely ask' (38 times), *lìqiú* 'strongly ask' (40), *qiú* 'ask' (111), *qǐngqiú* 'politely ask' (268), and *yāoqiú* 'ask, demand' (3,035).[9] *Kēqiú* in the manipulative pivotal construction is especially infrequent, occurring only three times, while *yāngqiú* occurs 21 times. Semantically,

[9]Instances with non-verbal tags were excluded from the frequency counts.

https://doi.org/10.1017/cnj.2026.10031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

there does not seem to be any reason why *yāngqiú* could not replace *kěnqiú* 'sincerely ask' in (22), as they are largely synonymous.

(22) 他們都在懇求她不要這樣做

tāmen	dōu	zài	kěnqiú	tā	bú	yào	zhèyàng	zuò
they	all	PROG	sincerely.ask	she	not	have.to	this	do

'They were asking her not to do this.'

The cases of *kēqiú* 'harshly ask' and *yāngqiú* 'earnestly ask' could perhaps be explained by a semantic constraint: as the semantics of these main verbs is strong, it is not possible for their complement clauses to be negated. But semantically similar verbs, as in (22), suggest that this proposal ought to be interpreted more stochastically: the stronger the semantics of the main verb, the less likely the complement clause is to be negated. As attractive as the proposal is, it is beyond the scope of this article.

The final exceptions are *piàn* 'deceive' and *xùnliàn* 'train'. As a verb, *piàn* occurs 239 times and *xùnliàn* 336 times, neither of which is particularly infrequent. Note that *xùnliàn* in the skill-imparting sense, which does not take textual *yào* in the first place, as in (12b–c), may have its complement clause negated by *bù* 'not', as in (23).

(23) 訓練勞工不被新科技、新工具淘汰

xùnliàn	láogōng	bù	bèi	xīn	kējì	xīn	gōngjù	táotài
train	employee	not	pass	new	technology	new	tool	discard

'(They) train employees (how) not to be phased out by new technologies and tools.'

The fact that *piàn* 'deceive' and *xùnliàn* in its deontic sense both take textual *yào*, as in (9) and (12a), but no prohibitive, may suggest a further generalization of textual *yào*: it is no longer constrained by its diachronic source in negated complement clauses, at least for some speakers, and therefore it may occur in complement clauses of main verbs that do not typically take negated complement clauses.

Finally, an investigation into the CCL Corpus uncovered that *kēqiú, yāngqiú, piàn*, and *xùnliàn* may take complement clauses negated by prohibitives, as in (24). Therefore, the absence of such data in the Balanced Corpus may indeed be attributed to the size of the corpus, amongst other potential reasons.

(24) a. 苛求观众们不要…离场

kēqiú	guānzhòngmen	bù	yào	lí	chǎng
harshly.ask	audiences	not	have.to	leave	venue

'(Don't) ask the audience not to leave the venue.'

https://doi.org/10.1017/cnj.2026.10031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

b. 央求她不要离开

yāngqiú tā bù yào líkāi

earnestly.ask her not have.to leave

'(She) begged her not to leave.'

c. 骗人不要这样想

piàn rén bù yào zhèyàng xiǎng

deceive people not have.to this think

'(They) deceived people into not thinking this way.'

d. 你需要训练你自己不要过多地关心钱

nǐ xūyào xùnliàn nǐ zìjǐ bù yào guòduōde

you need train you self not have.to excessively

guānxīn qián

care money

'You need to train yourself not to care too much about money.'

6.3 Origin of the CAUSE *type*

As no verb of the CAUSE type takes *yào* in its complement clause in Early Mandarin, any hypothesis regarding the origin of this type of *yào* is inevitably more speculative than data-based hypotheses, but there are three plausible ones. The first is the same hypothesis as proposed in section 6.1, originating from complement clauses negated by prohibitives. The non-attestation of *yào* in the CAUSE type may be an artefact of the size of the corpus. Second, *yào* associated with the CAUSE type is related to other modals that occur in complement clauses of CAUSE verbs, in light of some additional data from the Academia Sinica Corpus of Old Chinese (8th–1st centuries BCE). Third, the first and second hypotheses both play a role.

The following data suggest that the second hypothesis is plausible. In Early Mandarin, *shǐ* 'make' may take modals such as *néng* 'can; be able to' in its complement clause, whether non-negated or negated, as in (25).

(25) a. 使壙僅能容槨

shǐ kuàng jǐn néng róng guǒ

make tomb just able contain coffin

'(You should) make the tomb just about contain the coffin.'

朱子語類 *Zhūzǐ Yǔlèi* (1270)

https://doi.org/10.1017/cnj.2026.10031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

b. 使吾軍不能進
shǐ wú jūn bù néng jìn
make our troop not able advance
'(He) made our troop unable to advance.'
全相平話五種 *Quánxiàng pínghuà wǔzhǒng* (14th century)

Shǐ… néng 'make… able' and *shǐ… yào* 'make… have to' are structural parallels: both *néng* and *yào* are modals. It is thus possible that the former is one of the diachronic sources of the latter. We can also compare their Present-Day parallels, *shǐdé… yào* and *shǐdé… néng*(*gòu*) in (14)–(15).

Interestingly, while *shǐ* does not seem to take any deontic modal in its complement clause in Early Mandarin, it does in Old Chinese, as in (26).

(26) a. 使人臣必有言之責
shǐ rénchén bì yǒu yán zhī zé
make courtier must have speech POSS responsibility
'(One should) hold one's courtiers absolutely accountable for their words.'
韓非子 *Hánfēizǐ* (3rd century BCE)

b. 使人必貴己
shǐ rén bì guì jǐ
make people must value self
'(One cannot) force others to value oneself.'
荀子 *Xúnzǐ* (3rd century BCE)

Such Old Chinese examples suggest that modals in complement clauses of general causative verbs may have a long history, but as this article focuses on the history of *yào*, a more thorough investigation lies outside its scope.

7. Discussion

Section 7.1 situates the history of textual *yào* in the literature on textualization, unidirectionality, and the contentful-procedural continuum in order to draw a parallel between textual *yào* and the subjunctive in section 7.2, which, however, argues that its history cannot be conceptualized as unidirectional, despite the many similarities to the subjunctive, whose development has been claimed to be unidirectional. Section 7.3 connects the analysis to recent trends in Diachronic Construction Grammar.

7.1 Textualization, unidirectionality, and the contentful-procedural continuum

Textual markers signal relationships between units of text or discourse. Their development is referred to as 'textualization' (Traugott 2022) or '(increased) text/discourse-orientation' (Narrog 2012a, 2012b), which has been hypothesized as 'late-stage' in that

https://doi.org/10.1017/cnj.2026.10031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

it typically happens to markers that have already undergone certain changes, such as subjectification and intersubjectification. The process is also closely associated with grammaticalization and unidirectionality; see Traugott (2002), Narrog (2012a, 2012b), Y. Kuo (2020a), and Traugott (2022) for reviews. That is, textualization, like grammaticalization, is hypothetically unidirectional: a textual marker may become more grammatical, but does not become less so.

Being textual markers, subjunctive markers, alternatively referred to as markers of 'subordinating' or 'subordinate' mood, are also said to be results of unidirectional, late-stage processes. For example, Bybee et al. (1994: 213) remark: "the subordinating uses show up very late on the grammaticization paths […] the only further development for such grams is their gradual loss from the language". (See also Narrog 2012b: 179–183). As this quote implies, the subjunctive can be referred to as grammatical in addition to being characterized as textual. More recently, the lexical-grammatical continuum has been conceptualized by Traugott and Trousdale (2013) as the *contentful-procedural continuum*, which will be adopted here. Procedural meaning signals linguistic relations (including, but not limited to, textual relations), while contentful meaning is referential. Subjunctive markers are procedural.

On the basis of the literature, one could hypothesize that textual *yào*'s resemblance to a subjunctive marker means that it is also procedural and that its history is also unidirectional: it becomes more procedural as it occurs in more complement clauses. However, section 7.2 argues that while this is indeed the case for one type of textual *yào*, the other two types, though both textual and procedural, are more contentful, and that the history of textual *yào* as a whole thus also involves increases in contentful meaning. That is, while markers may be textual, some may be more contentful (or procedural), and diachronically textualization may be positioned on the contentful-procedural continuum, without necessarily being unidirectionally procedural.

7.2 *Textual* yào *as procedural and contentful*

The DEFAULT type of textual *yào* resembles mandative *should*: both are abstract and harmonious with the main verb and they are to a certain extent omissible. Other modals in complement clauses have also been noted for their relative omissibility, such as *pouvoir* 'can' in French and *pitää* 'should' in Finnish (Peltola 2021: 150). Like mandative *should*, this type of *yào* occurs in complement clauses that pertain to unrealized events and whose main verbs are directive and deontic. The parallel between *yào* and the subjunctive goes even further. Crosslinguistically, Givón (1994) has hypothesized that subjunctive markers originate from the epistemic context of low certainty and/or the deontic context of weak manipulation, these being contexts where epistemic modality, deontic modality, and subjunctivity, all shades of irrealis, resemble each other. Textual *yào* resembles the subjunctive through its similar origin: it is first attested in the complement clause of *quàn*, of the DEFAULT type, whose deontic semantics is relatively weak, varying between 'advise' and 'persuade'. (For how the speech act of 'advise' is weakly deontic, see Searle 1969 and Y. Kuo 2022a.)

Given the many similarities between the DEFAULT type of *yào* and subjunctive markers, one may regard its function as procedural: it marks the relational notion of clause type, namely the complement clause of a number of manipulative verbs where it occurs.

https://doi.org/10.1017/cnj.2026.10031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The function of these verbs may also be conceptualized more specifically as interclausal (modal) cohesion, as used by Peltola (2021) to refer to the function of *pouvoir* 'can' and *pitää* 'should': they signal the modal identity (specifically, deonticity) shared between the main clause and its complement clause.

However, even though the DEFAULT type of textual *yào* is the first attested type and thus presumably the first developed one, the other two types (GUIDE and CAUSE) of textual *yào* cannot be simply described as only procedural or more procedural than the DEFAULT type. The other two types of *yào* specify the semantics of the main verb to the extent that it plays a role in determining the semantics of the whole construction and consequently has a stronger semantics and a lower degree of omissibility. That is, given a GUIDE or CAUSE verb in the manipulative pivotal construction and *yào* in the complement clause, the main verb and *yào* form a multi-word lexical expression.

In the case of a GUIDE verb, 'GUIDE… *yào*', as in (10), is distinct from its counterpart (i.e., the skill-imparting sense of GUIDE), which neither occurs with *yào* nor encodes deonticity, as in (11): deonticity is specified (not merely highlighted) as part of the expression, but the counterpart has no such specification. There is thus a contrast between the deontic 'GUIDE… *yào*' and the non-deontic, merely skill-imparting aspect of a GUIDE verb. Another way of framing the contrast is that *yào* brings out the distinction between the deontic and non-deontic senses of GUIDE verbs.

In the case of a CAUSE verb, 'CAUSE… *yào*', as in (14), specifies the type of causation that the construction conveys. The relative significance of *yào* in this expression is especially obvious when a similar multi-word expression such as 'CAUSE… *néng*(*gòu*)' is considered, as in (15). The modal in the complement clause plays a decisive role in signalling the exact type of causation: positive compulsion (a kind of deonticity) in the case of *yào* and positive enablement in the case of *néng*(*gòu*).

Note that both types of *yào* nevertheless signal interclausal modal cohesion, just like the DEFAULT type, and as such all three are textual and procedural. It is not the case that the GUIDE or CAUSE type of *yào* is disharmonious with the main verb; they are harmonious with the specific, deontic aspect of the main verb that is otherwise not specified. (See (13), where a GUIDE verb expresses deonticity without the specification of *yào*.) What brings about the difference between the types is how *yào* interacts with the main verb. The DEFAULT type of *yào* is not contentful, because it contributes little lexical content to DEFAULT verbs, which are inherently deontic. The other two types are more contentful because they contribute to deontic aspects of GUIDE and CAUSE verbs that are otherwise unspecified. That the GUIDE and CAUSE types of *yào* have both procedural and contentful meanings is in line with Traugott and Trousdale's (2013) observation that such meanings may co-exist from a constructional perspective.

In short, all three types of *yào* are textual, by virtue of occurring in complement clauses, where they signal interclausal modal cohesion; as such, they are procedural. Given that textual and subjunctive markers are claimed to result from unidirectional development, one would expect the history of textual *yào* to be unidirectional and thus involve increases only in procedural meaning and not in contentful meaning. However, the GUIDE and CAUSE types of *yào*, though diachronically later and by hypothesis more procedural, are actually more contentful than the DEFAULT type.

https://doi.org/10.1017/cnj.2026.10031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

7.3 Towards a non-linear view

The analysis presented here suggests that textual or discourse-oriented (post-)modality may be procedural or contentful, depending on the type of relationship that a modal expression enters into with the main verb in the construction. This suggestion ultimately points to a non-unidirectional, or at least non-linear perspective on change, if we generalize over the history of *yào*: a grammatical item like a modal is not on a unidirectional trajectory towards more procedural meaning; rather, the direction depends on the specific contextual interaction the item is involved in. This perspective is compatible with studies in Diachronic Construction Grammar, which have shifted the focus away from conceptualizing change linearly (Trousdale 2014, Torrent 2015, Fischer 2018, Y. Kuo 2020b). Such studies emphasize the multidimensional nature of language, showing that change may be implicated at various levels and therefore is not easily reducible to a cline-like representation, as such a representation may obscure formal and functional details and correspondences (e.g., Hilpert 2008, Trousdale 2014, Traugott 2015, Y. Kuo 2020a).

For example, Traugott (2002: 27) identifies contracted auxiliaries in English as results of late-stage processes, which may be represented as clines (e.g., *will* > *'ll* and *would* > *'d*). While these clines are not inaccurate at some level of generalization (e.g., frequent items undergo reduction; Bybee 2010), they gloss over many details. In fact, the contracted forms have formal and functional properties that cannot be derived from their full forms; therefore, they constitute parts of constructions that are distinct from constructions in which their full forms occur (Daugs 2021). For example, the enclitic *'d* cannot be used emphatically and, compared to *would*, "exhibits a relative preference for mental/emotive verbs (e.g. *know, love*)" (Daugs 2021: 34), amongst other distinctive preferences. Examining future constructions with the same lexical sources, whose developments thus have been subsumed under the same clines, Hilpert (2008) also shows that their usage patterns are too diverse to be captured fully by clines.

Similarly, the analysis of *yào* presented here highlights the importance of construction-specificity: a fuller understanding of *yào* can only be achieved if we examine in detail its interactions with specific construction types, which correspond to types of the main verb (DEFAULT, GUIDE, and CAUSE). While such interactions might to a certain extent be reduced to a unidirectional or linear account in other cases (e.g., *would* > *'d*), they cannot be in the case of *yào*: it does not become more and more procedural as it occurs in more types of complement clause. It follows that postmodal development – whereby a modal develops a function, such as interclausal modal cohesion, beyond modality proper – may not be equated to increases in procedural meaning exclusively.

In challenging the unidirectionality hypothesis from a constructional perspective, this study is part of a recent trend identified by Hilpert et al. (2021: 3): "[…] constructional research is eager to take up and test hypotheses from grammaticalization theory. At the same time, a recurring result seems to be that proposed generalizations need to be reconsidered in the light of cases that do not follow the general trend." See also Y. Kuo (2024) for how regularity in grammatical change may be non-unidirectional from a constructional perspective.

A defender of unidirectionality would perhaps argue that the GUIDE and CAUSE types of *yào* may have a history independent of the DEFAULT type, as has been

https://doi.org/10.1017/cnj.2026.10031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

hypothesized for the CAUSE type in section 6, and that the existence of the GUIDE and CAUSE types does not therefore deny the unidirectionality of the DEFAULT type. Indeed, one could also hypothesize that the GUIDE type of *yào* is not related to the DEFAULT type. Even though both have their origins in negated complement clauses, the actual processes may be independent. Furthermore, for the history of textual *yào* to be a strong case against unidirectionality, it would perhaps require evidence that the DEFAULT type has become contentful. Nevertheless, there is no denying that, first, all three types of textual *yào* have their ultimate origins in main clauses; second, at least the DEFAULT and GUIDE types of *yào*, and potentially the CAUSE type as well, have their immediate origins in negated complement clauses; and third, the CAUSE type of *yào* may have an additional immediate origin in similar modals in complement clauses. This means that, regardless of how each type is (un)related, they ultimately develop their textual uses from main clause uses and more immediately from complement clause uses, which, since the GUIDE and CAUSE types are contentful, challenges a strong version of unidirectionality whereby the development of textual meaning is unidirectionally procedural. Therefore, a finer distinction should be made with respect to postmodal textualization or discourse orientation: what is originally a main-clause modal may become textual and, at the same time, more contentful and/or procedural. Again, this distinction would be difficult to make on a strictly unidirectional view, but it is much more compatible with a multidimensional view. See also Traugott (2022: 4) for how textual, non-subjunctive markers may be contentful or procedural.

8. Conclusions

This article has proposed that textual *yào* originates from complement clauses negated by prohibitives. Depending on its relationship with the main verb of the complement clause, textual *yào* may be categorized into three types. While the largest type is fairly procedural, bearing similarities to subjunctive markers such as mandative *should*, the other two types are more contentful in that they form multi-word lexical expressions with the main verbs. On the basis of these types of textual *yào*, it is proposed that a modal may become textual and at the same time procedural or contentful. That is, textualization or increased discourse orientation may involve increases in both contentful and procedural meanings.

For future research, since the synchronic and diachronic distributions of textual *yào* are likely much wider than presented in this article, additional insights might be achieved through the use of a more comprehensive list of verbs or a larger corpus. Furthermore, it was briefly noted that textual *yào* whose main verb is *ràng* 'let' co-occurs with quantifiers. Modals are quantifiers in many approaches, and therefore the interaction between *yào* and quantifiers is not entirely unexpected. Indeed, quantifier(-related) uses of *yào*, especially comparative ones, have not gone unnoticed in functional and formal approaches (e.g., Yu 1998, Xie 2022). But their diachrony and properties in complement clauses remain to be investigated in more detail. Any analysis of such quantifier(-related) uses may fall outside modality proper; as such, this would be an especially interesting topic to explore with respect to postmodal development.

Acknowledgements. I would like to thank the editors and reviewers for their insightful comments. All remaining errors are my own.

https://doi.org/10.1017/cnj.2026.10031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2010. *Imperatives and commands*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Arigne, Viviane. 2017. From mirativity to argumentation: A case of discursive mirativity. *Review of Cognitive Linguistics* **15**(2): 438–459.

van der Auwera, Johan, and Vladimir A. Plungian. 1998. Modality's semantic map. *Linguistic Typology* **2**(1): 79–124.

Berg, Thomas, Tim Zingler, and Arne Lohmann. 2020. The range of linguistic units: Distance effects in English Mandative Subjunctive Constructions. *Journal of Linguistics* **56**(2): 231–268.

Boas, Hans C. 2010. Verb meanings at the crossroads between higher-level and lower-level constructions. *Lingua* **120**: 22–34.

Bybee, Joan. 2010. *Language, usage and cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bybee, Joan, Revere Perkins, and William Pagliuca. 1994. *The evolution of grammar: Tense, aspect and modality in the languages of the world*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Celle, Agnès. 2018. Epistemic evaluation in factual contexts in English. In *Epistemic modality and evidentiality in a cross-linguistic perspective*, ed. Zlatka Guentchéva, 22–51. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Chao, Yuen-ren. 2010. 漢語口語語法 [*Hanyu kouyu yufa* (A grammar of spoken Chinese)]. Beijing: Commercial Press. [1980].

Chen, Qiaoyun. 2020. Creating a 3D semantic profile of causative *shi* and *rang*: A constructional approach. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* **40**(4): 405–427.

Chen, Xianqing. 2017. 漢語助動詞'要'及其相關問題研究 [*Hanyu zhudongci 'yao' ji qi xiangguan wenti yanjiu* (A study of the Chinese auxiliary verb *yào* and related issues)]. Beijing: China Social Sciences Press.

Croft, William. 2003. Lexical rules versus constructions: A false dichotomy. In *Motivation in language*, eds. Hubert Cuyckens, Thomas Berg, René Dirven, and Klaus-Uwe Panthe, 49–68. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Daugs, Robert. 2021. Contractions, constructions and constructional change: Investigating the constructionhood of English modal contractions from a diachronic perspective. In *Modality and Diachronic Construction Grammar*, eds. Martin Hilpert, Bert Cappelle, and Ilse Depraetere, 13–52. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Devos, Maud, and Daniël Van Olmen. 2013. Describing and explaining the variation of Bantu imperatives and prohibitives. *Studies in Language* **37**(1): 1–57.

Feng, Chuntian and Wang Qun. 2006. 副詞"別"形成問題補議 [Fuci bie xingcheng wenti buyi (On the problems of the formation of the adverb *bié*)]. *Hanyu Xuebao* **13**(1): 35–38.

Fischer, Olga. 2018. Analogy: Its role in language learning, categorization, and in models of language change such as grammaticalisation and constructionalisation. In *New trends in grammaticalisation and language change*, eds. Sylvie Hancil, Tine Breban, and José Vicente Lozano, 75–104. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Givón, T. 1994. Irrealis and the subjunctive. *Studies in Language* **18**(2): 265–337.

Goldberg, Adele E. 1995. *Constructions: A Construction Grammar approach to argument structure*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Greenbaum, Sidney, and Randolph Quirk. 1990. *A student's grammar of the English language*. Harlow: Longman.

Hilpert, Martin. 2008. *Germanic future constructions: A usage-based approach to language change*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Hilpert, Martin, Bert Cappelle, and Ilse Depraetere. 2021. Modality in Diachronic Construction Grammar: Long-standing questions, new perspectives. In *Modality and Diachronic Construction Grammar*, eds. Martin Hilpert, Bert Cappelle, and Ilse Depraetere, 1–11. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Hoffmann, Andreas Sebastian. 1997. Mandative sentences: A study of variation on the basis of the British National Corpus. Master's thesis, University of Zurich.

Hsu, Hsun-Ming, Yu-Fang Wang, and Kai-Ming Hu. 2015. Direct and indirect conditionals: A corpus-based study of Chinese *yaoshi* and *yaobushi* in spoken and written discourse. *Taiwan Journal of Linguistics* **13**(2): 31–77.

Hu, Jianhua, Haihua Pan, and Liejiong Xu. 2001. Is there a finite vs. nonfinite distinction in Chinese? *Linguistics* **39**(6): 1117–1148.

Iwata, Seizi. 2008. *Locative alternation: A lexical-constructional approach*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

https://doi.org/10.1017/cnj.2026.10031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Jiang, Lansheng. 1991. 禁止詞"别"考源 [Jinzhici bie kaoyuan (On the etymology of the prohibitive *bie*)]. *Yuwen Yanjiu* **38**: 42–47.

Jiang, Shaoyu. 2013. 詞義演變三例 [Cíyì yǎnbiàn sān lì (The semantic evolution of *kuài/màn, niàn*, and *yào*)]. In *Breaking down the barriers: Interdisciplinary studies in Chinese Linguistics and beyond*, eds. Guangshun Cao, Hilary Chappell, Redouane Djamouri, and Thekla Wiebusch, vol. 1: 321–344. Taipei: Academia Sinica.

Kuo, Wei-ju. 2015. 多義情態詞"要"來源試探 [Duoyi qingtaici 'yao' laiyuan shitan (The history of the modal *yào*)]. *Chinese Studies* **33**(3): 1–34.

Kuo, Yueh Hsin. 2020a. Late-stage grammatical change in Chinese: A constructional account. Doctoral dissertation, University of Edinburgh.

Kuo, Yueh Hsin. 2020b. Reinforcement by realignment in diachronic construction grammar: The case of classifier *xiē* in Mandarin Chinese. *Constructions and Frames* **12**(2): 206–238.

Kuo, Yueh Hsin. 2022a. From deontic modality to conditionality: A diachronic investigation into *bì* in Classical Chinese. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* **23**(1): 84–110.

Kuo, Yueh Hsin. 2024. Bidirectional grammaticalization: Chinese modal and conditional. *Journal of Linguistics* **60**(2): 363–398.

LaBarge, Robert Santana. 2016. The grammaticalization of 要 Yao and the future cycle from Archaic Chinese to Modern Mandarin. In *Cyclical change continued*, ed. Elly van Gelderen, 395–418. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Li, Ming. 2016. 漢語助動詞的歷史演變研究 [*Hanyu zhudongci de lishi yanbian yanjiu* (A study of the historical development of Chinese auxiliary verbs)]. Beijing: Commercial Press.

Li, Renzhi. 2004. Modality in English and Chinese: A typological perspective. Doctoral dissertation, University of Antwerp.

Lu, Zhuoqun. 1997. 助动词"要"汉代起源说 [Zhudongci 'yao' handai qiyuan shuo (The Han Dynasty origin of the auxiliary verb *yào*)]. *Research in Ancient Chinese Language* **3**: 45–48.

Lǚ, Shūxiāng. 1980. 現代漢語八百詞 [*Xiandai hanyu babai ci* (Eight hundred words in Modern Chinese)]. Beijing: Commercial Press.

Ma, Beijia. 2002. '要'的語法化 ['Yao' de yufahua (The grammaticalization of *yào*)]. *Linguistics Study* **4**: 81–87.

Narrog, Heiko. 2012a. Beyond intersubjectification: Textual uses of modality and mood in subordinate clauses as part of speaker-orientation. *English Text Linguistics* **5**(1): 29–52.

Narrog, Heiko. 2012b. *Modality, subjectivity, and semantic change: A cross-linguistic perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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.

Van Olmen, Daniël. 2010. Typology meets usage: The case of the prohibitive infinitive in Dutch. *Folia Linguistica* **44**(2): 471–507.

Ōta, Tatsuo. 1958. *Chugokugo Rekishi Bunpō* [A historical grammar of modern Chinese]. Tokyo: Kōnan Shoin.

Peltola, Rea. 2021. Unfolding constructions: Postmodal auxiliaries in mirative complement patterns. In *Modality and Diachronic Construction Grammar*, eds. Martin Hilpert, Bert Cappelle, and Ilse Depraetere, 149–184. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Peng, Rui. 2017. *Pivotal constructions in Chinese: Diachronic, synchronic, and constructional perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Peyraube, Alain, and Li Ming. 2012. The semantic historical development of modal verbs of volition in Chinese. In *Newest trends in the study of grammaticalization and lexicalization in Chinese*, ed. Janet Zhiqun Xing, 149–167. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Schmid, Hans-Jörg. 2020. *The dynamics of the linguistic system: Usage, conventionalization, and entrenchment*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Searle, John R. 1969. *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, John R. 1979. *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech act*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sweetser, Eve. 1990. *From etymology to pragmatics: Metaphorical and cultural aspects of semantic structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

https://doi.org/10.1017/cnj.2026.10031 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Talmy, Leonard. 1988. Force dynamics in language and cognition. *Cognitive Sciences* **12**(1): 49–100.

Tian, Xiaoyu, Weiwei Zhang, and Dirk Speelman. 2022. Lectal variation in Chinese analytic causative constructions: What trees can and cannot tell us. In *Data analytics in Cognitive Linguistics: Methods and insights*, eds. Dennis Tay and Molly Xie Pan, 137–168. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Torrent, Tiago Timponi. 2015. On the relation between inheritance and change: The constructional convergence and the construction network reconfiguration hypotheses. In *Diachronic Construction Grammar*, eds. Jóhanna Barðdal, Elena Smirnova, Lotte Sommerer, and Spike Gildea, 173–211. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Traugott, Elizabeth C. 2002. From etymology to historical pragmatics. In *Studying the history of the English language: Millennial perspectives*, eds. Donka Minkova and Robert P. Stockwell, 19–49. Berlin: Mouton.

Traugott, Elizabeth C. 2015. Toward a coherent account of grammatical constructionalization. In *Diachronic Construction Grammar*, eds. Jóhanna Barðdal, Elena Smirnova, Lotte Sommerer, and Spike Gildea, 51–80. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Traugott, Elizabeth C. 2022. *Discourse structuring markers in English: A historical constructionalist perspective on pragmatics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Traugott, Elizabeth C., and Graeme Trousdale. 2013. *Constructionalization and constructional changes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Trousdale, Graeme. 2014. On the relationship between grammaticalization and constructionalization. *Folia Linguistica* **48**(2): 557–577.

Xie, Zhiguo. 2022. Epistemic modality and comparison in Mandarin Chinese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* **31**: 99–137.

Xu, Liejiong (1985–1986). Towards a lexical-thematic theory of control. *The Linguistic Review* **5**: 345–376.

Yu, Hsueh-ying. 1998. Some speculations on the semantic change of Chinese modal verb '*Yao*'. *Wenshan Review* **1**(2): 161–175.

Zhongbian guoyu cidian xiuding ben [The Ministry of Education Revised Mandarin Chinese Dictionary]. Taiwan Ministry of Education. Taiwan: Taipei. https://dict.revised.moe.edu.tw

Zhonghua yuwen da cidian [Chinese Linguipedia]. The General Assembly of Chinese Culture. Taiwan: Taipei. https://www.chinese-linguipedia.org/search.html

Cite this article: Kuo, Yueh Hsin. 2025. No unidirectionality: Textual *yào* in Mandarin as contentful and procedural. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics/Revue canadienne de linguistique*. 70(3). 507–535. https://doi.org/10.1017/cnj.2026.10031

https://doi.org/10.1017/cnj.2026.10031 Published online by Cambridge University Press