



## Explicit Impoliteness: A Corpus-Based Study of the Chinese Formulaic Expression “Jiuzhehai + X”

HONGYANG Li<sup>1</sup>, YI DU<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Research Scholar, School of Foreign Languages, North China Electric Power University, Changping District, Beijing, China.

Email: 17614606530@163.com

<sup>2</sup>Research Supervisor, School of Foreign Languages, North China Electric Power University, Changping District, Beijing, China.

DOI: [10.33329/rjelal.14.2.108](https://doi.org/10.33329/rjelal.14.2.108)



### Article info

Article Received: 19/03/2026  
Article Accepted: 23/04/2026  
Published online: 29/04/2026

### Abstract

This paper investigates the realization and recognition of explicit and implicit impoliteness in interaction through a corpus-based analysis of the formulaic expression “Jiuzhehai+X” which is commonly used for evaluations in Chinese. The results reveal that this formulaic expression can only be used for evaluating explicit and implicit impoliteness. The addressee can recognize the explicit impoliteness based on the literal meaning intended by the speaker. In contrast, implicit impoliteness is recognized based on the implicated meaning intended by the speaker in specific context. In this way, the study confirms that the addressee’s recognition of impoliteness in interpersonal communication is closely related to the speaker’s intention, which may shed new light on studies of politeness in Chinese context.

Keywords: Formulaic expression; Jiuzhehai+X; Explicit impoliteness; Implicit impoliteness.

### 1. Introduction

Increasing use of social media has attracted a large number of interdisciplinary researches in the digital age. In particular, social media as platforms for communication for diverse purposes like self-expression, entertainment, education, business, and politics offer new grounds for age-old questions about politeness. Recently, an expression

“Jiuzhehai+X” (就这还+X) is active on platforms like Sina Weibo, Red Note, etc. It not only appears as a buzzword on the Internet, but also can be found in literary works.

In Mandarin Chinese, the formulaic expression “Jiuzhehai+X” has no equivalent translation in English, but it can be roughly translated as “And you’re the ...?”. According to different Xs, the formulaic expression can be

used to evaluate the identity, quality, ability, etc. claimed by the addressee, or a highly expected standard. For example, in a conference where someone presented as expert answers a question with answer that is far below the expected level of expertise, the audience might respond with “就这还专家?” (And you claim to be an expert?), which intensively deny the person’s identity as expert. This expression displays the audience’s disappointment and contempt towards the expert’s performance. In this sense, the formulaic expression “Jiuzhehai+X” evaluates the mismatch between the behavior and the claimed identity or title of a person in an impolite way. This expression is usually used to explicitly illustrate the acts of evaluation, which resembles “meta-illocutionary expression” (Schneider, 2017). The reason is that it is used by itself to make (im)polite judgments about another person’s behavior. Such formulaic expression is a typical example in the process of understanding the nature of politeness. Politeness evaluates behaviors and linguistic forms (Kádár and Haugh, 2013). therefore, the speaker makes a metapragmatic (im)polite evaluation with this expression in interactions. In this article, we consider “Jiuzhehai+X” to be a metapragmatic evaluative expression, and “Jiuzhehai” as a metapragmatic marker and “X” as an open semantic slot.

## 2. Literature review

Proposed as a complement to the Cooperative Principle (CP), politeness can be defined as any behaviour including verbal behaviour of an interlocutor to maintain his or her face and that of the individuals he or she is interacting with (Huang, 2014). Specifically, politeness is “routinely achieved by means of conventionalised expressions, be they conventionally indirect speech acts or else other types of formulaic expressions” (Terkourafi, 2012: 629). Studies on politeness have experienced a significant shift from the early works such as Brown and Levinson (1987), Lakoff (1973), Leech (1983, 2014), to impoliteness studies such as Culpeper (1996),

Van Olmen et al. (2023). It is widely held that (im)politeness is not inherent in linguistic form or structure but rather a contextual judgment, which is supported by Fraser and Nolan (1981), “no sentence is inherently polite or impolite”. Terkourafi (2003) also pointed that politeness relies on a particularized implicature drawn in a nonce context, that is, communicated politeness, which was generally achieved by relying on the recognition of the speaker’s intention. In contrast to Terkourafi, Haugh (2007) claimed that politeness implicature is an interactional achievement by virtue of the joint, collaborative interaction between speakers and hearers rather than a simple recognition of the speaker’s intentions. Gu Yueguo found out that some of Brown and Levinson’s as well as Leech’s views, in general, were not suitable to account for Chinese data. Therefore, Gu Yueguo formulated the Politeness Principle in his articles “Politeness phenomena in modern Chinese” in *Journal of Pragmatics* (1990), and “Politeness, Pragmatics and Culture” in *Foreign Language Teaching and Research* (1992), which consists of different maxims for explaining politeness phenomena in modern Chinese. Although Gu’s criticism and his formulation shed new light on politeness with Chinese cultural characteristics, Zhou and Zhang (2018) found that some issues need to be seriously addressed in terms of the Politeness Principle and its maxims which he illustrated. Therefore, Zhou and Zhang (2018) reconstructed the Chinese Politeness Principle (CPP) and maxims governing Chinese people’s polite behavior. Furthermore, the contextual application of this metapragmatic expression “Jiuzhehai+X” brings to the fore the elements of politeness in the CPP.

Impoliteness is generally perceived as “behavior that is face-aggravating in a particular context” (Locher and Bousfield, 2008). Such evaluation of impoliteness is not groundless, but “sustained by expectations, desires and/or beliefs about social organization” (Culpeper, 2011: 23). Unlike with politeness, evidence of impoliteness is in the fact that it is typically

challenged by counter impoliteness and that it attracts meta-pragmatic comments (e.g. 'that was so rude') and/or displays of humiliation, hurt, or anger. Generally, formulae can be studied through empirical methods, such as corpus linguistics (Van Olmen et al. 2023). In recent years, corpus-based research in historical pragmatics has increasingly focused on (im)politeness metalanguage (e.g., Gao and Liu, 2023; Jucker, 2020; Jucker et al., 2012; Oliver, 2022, 2025; Wang, 2023). While prior studies have identified (im)politeness metalanguage in corpora, the realizations and different types of (im)politeness through corpus in interpersonal communication have been rarely explored but worth investigating. It is expected that the investigation of (im)politeness in this article can develop people's communicative skills to mitigate or avoid such conflicts in communication and facilitate friendly and effective communication among people.

The current study aims to provide empirical evidence to existing research on (im)politeness by examining the realization and recognition of (im)politeness in the Chinese metapragmatic expression "Jiuzhehai+X" in interactions. There are 2 main research questions:

- (1) How is the metapragmatic expression "Jiuzhehai+X" used to make (im)polite judgments?
- (2) How is such (im)politeness possibly recognized by the addressee in interpersonal communication?

To answer these two research questions, the study will first discuss why the method and data source was selected (section 3). Then in section 4, we will display the results. The results are analyzed in terms of realizations and addressees' recognition of the formulaic expression "Jiuzhehai+X" (section 5) before the study concludes.

### 3. Methodology

#### 3.1 Corpus

This article adopted a corpus-based approach by collecting data from the BLCU Corpus Center (BCC) corpus (<https://bcc.blcu.edu.cn/>) and the Center for Chinese Linguistics Peking University (CCL) corpus ([http://ccl.pku.edu.cn:8080/ccl\\_corpus/index.jsp](http://ccl.pku.edu.cn:8080/ccl_corpus/index.jsp)). Both of them are online corpus. The former is made available by the Corpus Center of Beijing Language and Culture University. BCC is an online large-scale corpus system with approximately 10 billion Chinese characters and covers a wide range of different genres, including newspapers, literature, science and technology articles, and Sina Weibo posts (Xun et al., 2016). The latter is made available by Peking University, which is a corpus system with roughly 80 million Chinese characters, including untagged corpus from Beijing dialects, films, programs, the network, etc (Zhang et al., 2003, 2019). In this study, the corpus data are selected from multi-fields in modern Chinese, which can provide a diverse and ample data for analysis. There are 2 reasons: firstly, the data are authentic and can involve multiple topics and contexts, ensuring the reliability of the data analysis; secondly, the dialogues and contexts help to clarify the relationships and interactions between the speaker and the addressee.

#### 3.2 Data collection

The data collection procedure is as follows. Firstly, we retrieved data through inputting "就这还 n" (Jiuzhehai n), "就这还 a" (Jiuzhehai a), "就这还 v" (Jiuzhehai v), and filtered to exclude "就这还[n a v]" (Jiuzhehai [n a v]) from "就这还" (Jiuzhehai) respectively in the BCC. Limited to the search engine of CCL, we can only selected the data manually and with the help of generative AI by inputting "就这还" (Jiuzhehai). Next, we examined the data by considering conditions: firstly, in terms of "就这还+v" (Jiuzhehai v), the expression "就这还叫" (Jiuzhehai jiao) or "就这还能" (Jiuzhehai neng)

are nearly the same as “就这还” (Jiuzhehai) semantically. Thus we needed further filter the data. Additionally, some expressions that are used mainly to describe some truth about the state of affairs were excluded because these have nothing to do with politeness and we intend to study dialogues in interactions. Besides, some data without sufficient contextual information were removed because they cannot be employed to evaluate (im)politeness judgments. There are 235 examples in total, 126 examples from BCC and 109 examples from CCL. Among them, 7 examples are repetitive or invalid, such as “就这还不一要要的电信服务不错” (This is necessarily a telecommunications service not good) (illogical). Therefore, we have obtained 228 valid examples. Then we categorized the items into either the literal or the implicated meaning, politeness and impoliteness judgments, and explicit or implicit category.

#### 4. Results

The formulaic expression “Jiuzhehai+X” consists of two parts: a fixed part “Jiuzhehai”, and an open slot “X”. “Jiuzhe” means “only this...” or “nothing more than this...”, expressing strong contempt, disdain, or disappointment. “Hai”, an adverb, indicates a transition or something unexpected, which conveys a huge gap between the reality and the claimed “X”. “X”, a variable, usually a noun, a verb, an adjective, or a clause, presents context-specific speech acts. Irony or negation are achieved by contrasting actual inferiority or mediocrity (Jiuzhehai) with claimed or expected high standards (X). It is counter-expected expression in nature. That is, the actual situation is far away from the speaker’s expectation or the addressee’s claim. Evaluations are reflections of what we think and feel about people and our relationships with others, and they influence what we do and, in particular, what we say

(Kádár and Haugh, 2013). This metapragmatic expression is usually employed to evaluate one’s behavior or speech. “X” part is analyzed as a whole to discuss (im)politeness evaluations from the perspective of literal meaning and implicated meaning. Therefore, we do not discuss the impacts of an adverb attached to this formula on a noun, a verb, an adjective, or a clause of “X” part. In this article, classification is based on parts of speech of “X”, which can be a noun or noun phrase, an adjective, a verb or verb phrase, or a clause as shown in Table 1.

Overall, total instances amount to 228, covering all four variants. “Jiuzhehai+V/VP” is the dominant pattern in the formulaic expression according to the existing 2 corpora, while “Jiuzhehai+adjective” is the least common. Significant disparities exist in the frequency of usage among the variants. The most frequently used form, “Jiuzhehai+V/VP”, accounts for over half of all instances (53.07%), like “就这还学习呢?” (Is this still considered studying?), followed by “Jiuzhehai+clause”, which represents approximately a quarter of the total examples (25.88%), such as “就这还不知道这节课她上心没有!” (This lesson - and who even knows if she cares!) The third most frequently used variant is “Jiuzhehai+N/NP” which represents approximately a quarter of the total examples (16.67%), such as “就这还警官证呢?” (Is this still considered a police ID card?). The least frequently used pattern “Jiuzhehai + adjective” makes up only 4.38% of the examples, like “就这还不够?” (Is this still not enough?).

The two corpora also demonstrate that the formulaic expression is generally used to evaluate the addressee at both the individual level (physical features, personality, and capabilities) and the sociocultural level (honor, morality, and favor) as demonstrated in Table 2. The criteria for categorization is based on and adapted from Wang et al. (2023).

Table 1: Variants of "Jiuzhehai+X"

Patterns	Examples	Frequency	Percent
Jiuzhehai + Adjective	就这还不够? ("Is this still not enough?")	10	4.38%
Jiuzhehai + V/VP	就这还学习呢? ("Is this still considered studying?")	121	53.07%
Jiuzhehai + N/NP	就这还警官证呢? ("Is this still considered a police ID card?")	38	16.67%
Jiuzhehai + Clause	就这还不知道这课她上心没有! ("This lesson – and who even knows if she cares!")	59	25.88%
Total		228	100%

Table 2 categorizes the evaluative functions of the formulaic expression "Jiuzhehai+X". Most of them actually cannot be classified into any category (36.40%). Besides, evaluations about capabilities (15.35%) at the individual level constitutes the most frequent feature, such as questioning one's competence "就这还招架不住?" (You still cannot deal with this?), followed by honor (14.04%) like "就这还警官呢?" (And this is called a police officer?) and morality (14.04%) like "就这还假公济私?"

(You still engage in jobbery?) at the sociocultural level. Next two features are favor (7.46%) such as "就这还邻居帮他们做的。" (And this was done with the neighbors' help!) and personality (6.58%) like "就这还男人呐!" (And this is called a man!). The least frequent occurrence of feature is physical features (6.14%) exemplified by "就这还自拍?" (Looking like this, you still took selfies?). These personal and social features are value well recognized in Chinese culture.

Table 2: Values of the Evaluative Formulaic Expression "Jiuzhehai + X"

Category	Features	Examples	Frequency	Percent
Individual Level	Physical Features	就这还自拍..... ("Looking like this, you still took selfies?")	14	6.14%
	Personality	就这还男人呐! ("And this is called a man!")	15	6.58%
	Capabilities	就这还招架不住。 ("You still cannot deal with this?")	35	15.35%
Sociocultural Level	Honor	就这还警官呢? ("And this is called a police officer?")	32	14.04%
	Morality	就这还假公济私。 ("You still engage in jobbery?")	32	14.04%
	Favor	就这还邻居帮他们做的。 ("And this was done with the neighbors' help!")	17	7.46%
Unclassifiable	—	—	83	36.40%
Total			228	100%

Generally, positive evaluations denote acknowledgement and agreement and thus are closely related to politeness. In contrast, negative evaluations denote disagreement and thus are associated with impoliteness (Wang et al., 2023). As illustrated above, the metapragmatic expression “Jiuzhehai+X” is generally explicitly employed to make only

negative evaluations of the addressee’s behavior in Chinese communication with explicit and implicit emotions. To be more specific, the formulaic expression can be employed by the speaker to demonstrate a negative evaluation with both explicit and implicit impoliteness, as displayed in Table 3 in Section 5.

**Table 3:** Contextual Features of Explicit and Implicit Impoliteness

Types	Speaker’s Intention	Typical Situations	Frequency	Percent
Explicit Impoliteness	Criticizing improper behavior	Deceive/exploit; fail to do one’s duty; false promotions; breach a contract; be opinionated; damage the speaker’s interests	120	52.63%
	Making complaints	Resource shortages; forced to take actions; excessive demands; causing trouble	49	21.49%
	Insulting	Incompetence; demoralization	20	8.77%
Implicit Impoliteness	Relieving negative emotions	Forced to be grateful; accepting something reluctantly	5	2.19%
	Satirizing offensively	Capabilities; conflicts; values; identity	34	14.91%
Total			228	100%

## 5. Discussion

### 5.1 Analysis of the formulaic expression “Jiuzhehai+X” in terms of explicit impoliteness

Table 3 categorizes explicit and implicit impoliteness based on contextual features. Overall, explicit impoliteness is significantly more common than implicit in these two corpora. Criticizing improper behaviour represents the most frequent acts of impoliteness. In terms of explicit impoliteness, it constitutes the majority of cases (82.89%) with 3 sub-types (criticizing improper behavior, making complaints, and insulting). Criticizing improper behavior (52.63%) makes up the

largest share of the speaker’s intention when he or she uses the formulaic expression “Jiuzhehai+X”. This occurs when the speaker encounters deception, lack of sense of responsibility, false promotions, breaches of contract, persistence in opinion, or damage to the speaker’s interests of the addressee. Making complaints is the second most common type (21.49%) in the explicit impoliteness, arising from resource shortages, being forced to take actions, excessive demands, or trouble-making. Insulting is the least frequent sub-type of explicit impoliteness (8.77%), associated with criticisms about the addressee’s incompetence or demoralization.

Regarding implicit impoliteness, which is less common overall (17.1%), two sub-types are presented. Satirizing offensively is the dominant implicit form (14.91%), targeting addressee's capabilities, conflicts with the speaker, values, or identity. Relieving negative emotions (e.g., Example 1: Context: A cannot defend himself about his incompetence in mathematics. B, an expert, is mocking A and weakens A's enthusiasm.

forced to express gratitude or reluctant acceptance) is the least frequent type across the entire table (2.19%). Now, let us clarify the explicit and implicit impoliteness with 2 examples.

Original text	English translation
A: 我参加的是非专业组，像您这样的专业组冠军当然不会注意到我。	A: I was in the non-professional group. A champion like you from the professional group naturally wouldn't have noticed me.
B: 你真该上数学系。	B: You really should have studied in the math department.
A: 其实我小时候也挺喜欢数学的，要不是后来成绩掉下来差点也报了数学系。	A: Actually, I was quite fond of math when I was young. If my grades hadn't dropped, I would have applied to the math department.
B: 从什么时候开始往下掉的？	B: When did they start dropping?
A: 初中吧。小学我的数学成绩一直名列前茅，一到初中就跟不上趟了。	A: Junior high school. My math grades in elementary school have always been at the top, and I couldn't keep up with them when I got to junior high school.
B: 就这还称喜欢数学呢！	B: And you say you like math like this!
A: 过了好久我才明白，闹了半天我喜欢的不是数学，我喜欢的那叫算术！[我注意到导线在上下震颤，给人的感觉好像是对方在那边笑得前仰后合。]	A: It took me a long time to realize that what I liked wasn't math, but arithmetic! [I noticed the wire vibrating up and down, as if the other person was laughing over there.]
B: 谦虚了。	B: Too modest.
A: 哪里哪里，和您相比显然还差那么一小截儿。	A: Not at all. I'm still not quite up to your level.

This conversation occurs between two anonymous online interlocutors: Speaker A who identifies himself as a "non-professional math enthusiast", and Speaker B, who conceals his identity as a "professional championship winner". While A shares his experience that his math grades have declined since middle school—a strategic attempt to guide B to reveal his identity. However, B abruptly shifts from the current conversation to another topic, says, “就这还称喜欢数学呢！” (And you say you like

math like this!) This intervention demonstrates that B recognizes the discrepancy between A's claimed identity and ability. From B's point of view, there is a correlation between one's interest and his or her competence on that aspect. B takes the utterance “小学我的数学成绩一直名列前茅，一到初中就跟不上趟了。” (My math grades in elementary school have always been at the top, and I couldn't keep up with them when I got to junior high school.) as evidence and thus questions that A's interest in

maths as performative rather than authentic. For B, genuine interest is consistent with competence. That is, incompetence proves inadequate passion. Therefore, B does not believe that A is genuinely interested in maths. In this conversation, the formulaic expression is an explicit impoliteness in Chinese culture, used to criticize improper behavior. Here, B emphasizes the performance the A's statement through the word "挺喜欢" (be quite fond of), but "喜欢数学" (be fond of math) as an identity symbol in a field cannot be considered only as an interest. It symbolizes one's competence in the meantime. So B does not approve of A's behavior. Additionally, "我注意到导线在上下震颤, 给人的感觉好像是对方在那边笑得前仰后合。" (I noticed the wire vibrating up and down, as if the other person was laughing over there.) makes A suffer the humiliation from B who belittle A's cognitive level "我喜欢的不是数学只是算数" (what I liked wasn't math, but arithmetic) and maintains his power with "谦虚了。" (too modest) as irony. In this circumstance, A has to submit to B's authority and says, "哪里哪里, 和您相比显然还差那么一小截儿。" (Not at all. I'm still not quite up to your level.). What's more, such behavior is closely related to "dispraising", an impoliteness strategy proposed by Bousfield (2008). Therefore, the formulaic expression is very impolite in an explicit way.

It is believed that the addressee can recognize the speaker's intention and way of representing this intention during an interaction. Therefore, if an utterance is polite, the interlocutor must abide by a set of social norms, such as the CPP, which is composed of

the four maxims of politeness: modesty, respectfulness, friendliness, and refinement (Zhou and Zhang, 2018). From the addressee's perspective, the speaker's intention should be appropriately expressed in line with at least one of these four elements (Wang et al., 2023). In example 1, A recognizes that B is expressing his criticism by using the formulaic expression "就这还称喜欢数学呢。" (And you say you like math like this!) to invalidate A's interest in maths. A's recognition of B's impoliteness involves the following procedure. First, B takes A's utterance "小学我的数学成绩一直名列前茅, 一到初中就跟不上趟了。" (My math grades in elementary school have always been at the top, and I couldn't keep up with them when I got to junior high school.) as a weapon to attack A. Second, B conveys his disagreement and mockery evidenced by the vibrating wire implying laughter. Third, and most significantly, A decodes B's utterance meaning through the verb "称" (claim) which deliberately constructs his interest as ostensible. In this way, A immediately recognizes that B's comments demonstrate explicit impoliteness through its coherence.

## 5.2 Analysis of the formulaic expression "Jiuzhehai+X" in terms of implicit impoliteness

For implicit impoliteness, let's analyze Example 2.

Context: C narrates his problem when getting along with his girlfriend and seeks help on the Internet to solve it. D, an enthusiastic netizen, provides suggestions with C.

Original text

English translation

C: 她的脾气说变就变一句话不合她的意她就会翻脸或者她不好就对你爱理不理。过几天好像一切都没发生过一样, 她又对你关怀倍至一天到晚陪着你,错了从来不道歉; 她错了我为哄她都是先给她说对不起, 就这还得几天不理我。对这样的人大家有没有好的方法对待,我希望能陪她走完一

Her temper is utterly unpredictable. If a single word is after her fancy, she either turns hostile or doesn't take a lot of notice of me. A few days later, it's as if nothing ever happened – she shows the utmost solicitude, staying by your side all day. Yet she never apologizes when she's wrong; instead, I'm the one saying sorry just to calm her

生请朋友们支点高招(心灵倍受伤害再没招我就崩溃了只有去死了)。

D: 你是不是男人? 没有男人气, 这样下去即使她嫁给你, 你会幸福? 无理取闹必须知道这是错误的, 你不会轻易原谅她, 不改不行, 看来你是个无能懦弱的人, 拿出点男人气, 如果她真的爱你, 就不会无理取闹。

down, and even then she ignores me for days. Does anyone have good ways to deal with someone like this? I truly hope to spend the rest of our lives together, so I'd accept any advice. (My heart is deeply wounded, and if nothing works, I'm afraid I'll break down completely—I can't go on like this.)

D: Are you a man? There is no manliness, even if she marries you, will you be happy? You must know that this is wrong. You will not forgive her easily if she can't make a change. It seems that you are incompetent and cowardly. Show a little manhood and if she really loves you, she will not be unreasonable.

This conversation occurs between an individual (C) describing a terrible relationship and an interlocutor (D) offering advice. C initiates the conversation by narrating his girlfriend emotional abuse about him, such as “翻脸” (turn hostile), “爱理不理” (do not take a lot of notice of me), “错了从来不道歉” (she never apologizes), which leads to C's cumulative desperation. When complaining about his girlfriend's behavior, C uses “就这还得几天不理我” (even then she ignores me for days) to express helplessness and relieve his negative emotions. D directly criticizes C, saying that he incompetent. Besides, D advises C to make every effort to improve himself, which demonstrates that D understands that C's complaint is due to negative emotions. However, instead of sympathy, D blames C. D's response focuses on C's behavior rather than his girlfriend's behavior. It implies that D considers C's acts as his own weakness, and thus recognizes that C uses “就这还得几天不理我。” (even then she ignores me for days) to alleviate his negative emotions, but D thinks C should change himself. The formulaic expression here is an implicit impoliteness through which C conveys his dissatisfaction because it is not a direct attack to his girlfriend, but an expression of his inner thoughts through this formulaic expression. This creates a superficially polite

appeal for advice, but it carries an underlying impolite implicature, because it subtly blames his girlfriend while portraying himself as a victim. Thereby C undermines his girlfriend's face without overt confrontation. In this case, an impolite implicated meaning arises from this utterance, based on sarcasm as an impoliteness strategy associated with an unfriendly demeanor, whereby C intends to impolitely communicate to D that his politeness and sincerity are only superficial (Culpeper, 1996; Leech, 2014). D's recognition of C's impoliteness involves the following procedure. Firstly, D recognizes that C's expression “就这还得几天不理我” (even then she ignores me for days) is not a true call for help but an implicit impoliteness to make complaints about his girlfriend. Secondly, D does not engage with the superficial plea for help or validate C's identity as victim. Instead, D directly criticizes C, labeling him as “incompetent” and “cowardly”. By accusing C of lacking “manliness”, D discovers the implicit impoliteness in C's utterance and interprets it as an emotional release. Thirdly, D provides some advice for C because D are also aware that C would like to be in a good relation with his girlfriend.

The above discussion suggests that politeness is a matter of recognizing the speaker's intention from the addressee's

perspective, or rather the speaker's intention is crucial to the recognition and understanding of (im)politeness (Culpeper, 2005; Bousfield, 2008). Therefore, recognition of speaker's intention in interaction is necessary for people to communicate effectively.

## 5. Conclusion

Politeness plays a significant role in interaction among people to express their emotions and attitudes. The formulaic expression "Jiuzheshai+X" (就这还+X) reflects both explicit and implicit impoliteness to criticize improper behavior, make complaints, insult, relieve negative emotions, and satirize offensively. In communication, recognition of speaker's intention is vital for the addressee to respond to the hearer. The present study also demonstrates that the formulaic expression "Jiuzheshai+X" is an expression with a high frequency of use in daily communication and provides metapragmatic resources for the evaluation of impoliteness. This article has significant implications in studies, especially those with focus on the study of Chinese. However, there are limitations in this article. Firstly, the formulaic expression "Jiuzheshai+X" is only an example of Chinese language. Secondly, the sample size is relatively small. Future research should be conducted on more data from more diverse forms of Chinese interpersonal communication.

## References

- Bousfield, D. (2008). *Impoliteness in interaction*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.
- Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 25(3), 349-367. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(95\)00014-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(95)00014-3)
- Culpeper, J. (2005). Impoliteness and entertainment in the television quiz show: *The Weakest Link*. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 1(1), 35-72. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jplr.2005.1.1.35>
- Culpeper, J. (2011). *Impoliteness: Using language to cause offence*. Cambridge University Press.
- Fraser, B., & Nolen, W. (1981). The association of deference with linguistic form. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 1981(27), 93-109. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.1981.27.93>
- Gao, X., & Liu, Q. (2023). Dynamics and evaluations of impoliteness: Evidence from short videos of passenger disputes and public comments. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 203, 32-45. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2022.1.012>
- Gu, Y. (1990). Politeness phenomena in modern Chinese. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14(2), 237-257.
- Gu, Y. (1992). 礼貌、语用与文化 [Politeness, pragmatics and culture]. *Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, 4, 10-17.
- Haugh, M. (2007). The co-constitution of politeness implicature in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39(1), 84-110. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2006.07.004>
- Huang, Y. (2014). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.
- Jucker, A. H. (2020). *Politeness in the history of English: From the Middle Ages to the present day*. Cambridge University Press.
- Jucker, A. H., Taavitsainen, I., & Schneider, G. (2012). Semantic corpus trawling: Expressions of "courtesy" and "politeness" in the Helsinki Corpus. In C. Suhr & I. Taavitsainen (Eds.), *Developing corpus methodology for historical pragmatics*. VARIENG. [http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/series/volumes/11/jucker\\_taavitsainen\\_schneider/](http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/series/volumes/11/jucker_taavitsainen_schneider/)

- Kádár, D. Z., & Haugh, M. (2013). *Understanding politeness*. Cambridge University Press. eBooks (pp. 617–637). <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9781139022453.034>
- Lakoff, R. (1973). The logic of politeness: Or, minding your p's and q's. In C. Corum, T. C. Smith-Stark, & A. Weiser (Eds.), *Papers from the 9th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* (pp. 292–305). Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Leech, G. N. (2014). *The pragmatics of politeness*. Oxford University Press.
- Locher, M., & Bousfield, D. (2008). Introduction: Impoliteness and power in language. In D. Bousfield & M. Locher (Eds.), *Impoliteness in language: Studies on its interplay with power in theory and practice* (pp. 1–16). De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110208344.01>
- Oliver, S. J. (2022). A corpus-based approach to (im)politeness metalanguage: A case study on Shakespeare's plays. *Arbeiten Aus Anglistik Und Amerikanistik*, 42(2). <https://periodicals.narr.de/index.php/aa/article/view/3491>
- Oliver, S. J. (2025). A corpus-based analysis of (im)politeness metalanguage and speech acts: The case of insults in Shakespeare's plays. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 235, 132–144. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2024.11.011>
- Schneider, K. P. (2017). Is that a threat? Forms and functions of metapragmatic terms in English discourse. *Arbeiten Aus Anglistik Und Amerikanistik*, 42(2). <https://periodicals.narr.de/index.php/aa/article/view/3491>
- Terkourafi, M. (2003). Generalised and particularised implicatures of linguistic politeness. In *Pragmatics & Beyond New Series* (pp. 149–164). <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.114.09ter>
- Terkourafi, M. (2012). Politeness and pragmatics. In *Cambridge University Press*
- Van Olmen, D., Andersson, M., & Culpeper, J. (2023). Inherent linguistic impoliteness: The case of insulting you+np in Dutch, English and Polish. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 215, 22–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2023.06.013>
- Wang, K., Zhou, L., & Zhang, S. (2023). Explicit and implicit (im)politeness: A corpus-based study of the Chinese formulaic expression "Nikezhen + X." *Lingua*, 291, Article 103560. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2023.103560>
- Xun, E. D., Rao, G. Q., Xiao, X. Y., & Zang, J. J. (2016). The construction of the BCC corpus in the age of big data. *Corpus Linguistics*, 3(1), 93–109.
- Zhan, W., Guo, R., & Chen, Y. (2003). *The CCL corpus of Chinese texts*. Center for Chinese Linguistics, Peking University. [http://ccl.pku.edu.cn:8080/ccl\\_corpus](http://ccl.pku.edu.cn:8080/ccl_corpus)
- Zhan, W., Guo, R., Chang, B., Chen, Y., & Chen, L. (2019). The building of the CCL corpus: Its design and implementation. *Corpus Linguistics*, 6(1), 71–86.