

---

**STRUCTURAL METAPHOR AT THE HEART  
OF UNTRANSLATABILITY IN ANCIENT CHINESE  
AND ANCIENT CHINESE TEXTS: A PRELIMINARY  
STUDY OF THE CASE OF THE LEXICAL FIELD  
OF 'NORM'**

LUKÁŠ ZÁDRAPA

**ABSTRACT**

The article is an initial complex study of the lexical field *NORM* in Ancient Chinese with focus on the classical (Warring States) period. It attempts to bring together as many terms with the meaning 'norm, standard, rule' as possible, classify them according to their origin and conceptual background and describe them from various perspectives, including the etymological and metaphorical one. A brief comparative glimpse on the state of affairs in Ancient Greek and Latin is offered at the end of the text, and further directions of research are suggested.

**Keywords:** Ancient Chinese; lexicology; lexical field; normativity; comparative study

---

**Introduction**

It is not uncommonly asserted that virtually any utterance or expression in one language can be expressed in another language, although it may be at the expense of elegance, brevity, or pregnancy. Although this claim may be true of isolated sentences or utterances of basic everyday communication, when we focus on discourse, the linguistic conceptualization of important social and cultural domains, and the networks of structural relations between lexical units matters become more complicated. When translating an Ancient Chinese text, one can rely on various means to convey its original sense, including, for example, footnotes, yet there is one phenomenon that seems, at least to me, to confound even the best of translators – namely structural, or, more broadly, conceptual metaphors. Succinctly put, the translator is often forced to choose either the literal or the figurative meaning of a given word in an Ancient Chinese text, and the words in the target language employed to render the literal and figurative meanings are often different and unrelated. Thus, the reader of a translation is deprived of knowing that what appear to be completely different words, though with related meanings (this relatedness being usually far from self-evident), are in fact just different meanings or even semantic nuances of one single word in the source language. Although this consequence may seem trivial, it is the main cause of the relative untranslatability of discourses because they are built upon conceptual systems shared by the speakers of a given language.

Although the terms *conceptual metaphor* and *structural metaphor* (actually a type of conceptual metaphor) were introduced by Lakoff and Johnson in their 1980 seminal work and since then elaborated within several strains of cognitive linguistics, the role of figurative extensions (metaphor and metonymy) had been well known long before, both in structuralist lexical semantics and classical philology.<sup>1</sup> This study is not crucially dependent on any particular theoretical model, but it loosely refers to the discourse on conceptual metaphor and metonymy among cognitive linguists, as it provides the most up-to-date, and terminologically convenient account of the conceptual metaphor, and also extends into non-linguistic disciplines. Moreover, this cognitive perspective deservingly emphasizes the cognitive dimension of human language and its use and addresses the issue of conceptualizing reality, which is of primary importance for us who aim to capture the structural asymmetries between Ancient Chinese and European languages.

On the basis of my own experience, both with reading and translating pre-imperial Chinese texts, I have decided to demonstrate the role conceptual metaphor plays in language and culture in general, as well as, quite naturally, in the rendering of some key structural elements of these texts untranslatable into other languages and cultures by examining the vast array of terms subsumed under the lexical field of *NORM*.<sup>2</sup> Indeed, one is astonished how rich the Ancient Chinese lexicon in this domain is, and this extravagant abundance will be exposed below. Of course, modern English and other modern European languages in general, as well as Latin and Ancient Greek, do possess a certain array of norm words, such as *norm, law, standard, rule, pattern, model, order, instructions*, and other terms indicating a norm that must be followed, they cannot be compared to Ancient Chinese, where the domain of general words for a norm or standard based on figurative extensions of the many kinds of measuring devices that exist is much richer.<sup>3</sup> Not only is the terminological richness in this domain impressive, but the very topic of norms was one of the most popular in ancient writing; words relating to it can be found in all types of texts irrespective of the strain of thought they represent, from the earliest times up to the end of the Warring States period.

---

<sup>1</sup> An immense body of literature examining figurative extensions from the perspective of lexicology and theory exists. Modern linguistic descriptions of these phenomena in Ancient Chinese can be found in monographs on lexicology or lexicological semantics in that language, e.g., Zhào Kèqín 1995, Jiǎng Shàoyú 2005, or Zhāng Liánróng 2000. Of course, this topic is quite popular and has also been dealt with in innumerable articles typically focusing on case studies.

<sup>2</sup> Surprisingly, little attention has been given to studying the Ancient Chinese lexicon systematically as a reflexion of the conceptual system of Ancient Chinese. In the West, Christoph Harbsmeier has worked most on this issue; he has been investigating several specific concepts, frequently from a comparative perspective, for years and, with the assistance of many distinguished scholars, has been creating the Thesaurus Linguae Sericae database intended to facilitate precisely this kind of analysis and record its results (cf. Harbsmeier 1999, 2003, 2010, or 2015). A similar approach, but one with more emphasis on etymology and palaeography, can be found in Behr's studies (cf. 2009 or 2015). As far as recent publications are concerned, cf. also, e.g., Schwermann 2011, Goldin 2008, 2011, Ames 2011, von Falkenhausen 1996, or Kern 2001. Earlier papers on selected aspects of ancient Chinese philosophical vocabulary exist, of course; I refer the reader to the extensive literature on the history of Chinese thought for further details. Substantial research on Ancient Chinese normativity has been conducted (cf. Roetz 1994, 2005) and is of relevance for the subject of this article, but cannot be seriously discussed due to limited space.

<sup>3</sup> See also De Reu (2010).

I originally intended this article to be a deep-delving and, ideally, comprehensive study on the issue, with most if not all aspects addressed in considerable detail. Although an extensive body of Western scholarship on normativity exists (little of which, however, focuses on linguistic issues, as far as I know),<sup>4</sup> to my knowledge the present study is the first of its type. My initial idea, however, turned out to be completely unrealistic as it would require writing a full-size book. Such a monograph may materialize in the future, but for the time being I have created an introductory survey in which I have gathered basic material and indicated possibilities for further research. In doing so, I rely on extremely robust textual material: I manually selected and examined all occurrences of every norm word adduced in this paper from the corpus of pre-imperial<sup>5</sup> transmitted texts available in the Academia Sinica Tagged Corpus of Old Chinese combined with the Thesaurus Linguae Sericae database; in addition, in order to learn about the state of affairs in early times and to compare it to the *Book of Documents* and *Book of Songs*, I consulted the convenient anthology of bronze inscriptions *Jinwén jīnyì lèijiǎn* (2003).<sup>6</sup>

### Living and dead metaphors

Metaphor and metonymy are involved at different levels of linguistic semantics. These two phenomena are interrelated and the distinction is typically a matter of degree, but two extreme points should be in principle distinguished: a dead metaphor or metonym, surviving secretly only in the etymology of a given word, and a living, fresh metaphor or metonym, which starts, for example, as a simile. An ample array of intermediate stages exists between these two poles, the conceptual metaphor being one of them. This type of metaphor is obviously based on figurative mapping from one conceptual domain onto another. Its character is still recognizable for the speakers of the language, though frequently only after they pay closer attention to it, but, on the other hand, has long become well entrenched, conventionalized, and thus lexicalized. This fading of the figurative effect is, of course, a gradual process. Living rhetorical and conceptual metaphors and metonyms consist in the projection of the more basic meanings of a word into other spheres. If the figurative nature of a certain meaning becomes practically undetectable by the average speaker, it is accessible only through historical semantics. In this study,

---

<sup>4</sup> The Western literature on normativity is immense (cf. Thomson 2008, Kelsen 1990, Kripke 1982); ideally, it should be taken into account, but once again, this task must be undertaken in future research.

<sup>5</sup> I will not go into the discussion about the authenticity and dating of Ancient Chinese texts. This study is based on an extensive selection of transmitted texts (apart from a few exceptions) that are considered as representative of the preimperial period by relatively conservative scholars (see, e.g., Loewe 1993, Brooks and Brooks 2015, Qū Wǎnlǐ 1964, 1983), with some overlaps with the Early Han period. The list of texts can be found at the beginning of the appendix along with the abbreviations of the titles used in the overview of the distribution of particular words. The details of dating the texts should not hinder the basic objectives of this study, because at this stage of research I have employed a very coarse-grained diachronic stratification (basically preclassical up to Warring States, Warring States, and Han, i.e., very roughly 1000–450–220–100 BC); in fact, the observations made here may, to a large extent, be read without the diachronic perspective, with the focus more on the texts and their groups, their style, and (tentative) affiliation with a certain strain of thought.

<sup>6</sup> I would like to express my gratitude to both anonymous reviewers, who have greatly contributed to the improvement of my article. Of course, all mistakes that might have been left in the text are exclusively mine.

I focus mainly on concept of the half-dead, half-living conceptual metaphor I mention above partly because it is typical of the Ancient Chinese philosophical discourse, in which reviving and updating partially worn-out metaphors and metonyms, as well as constructing new ones, is extremely popular.

The figurative extension hidden in etymology is typically a matter of the relationship of one word to other words, and, most importantly, to the lexical root the word is derived from. It is the ‘literal’ or word-formative meaning of the word we are usually interested in, as well as the family of words based on the same root. It is quite common not to conceive of the relationship between the word-formative and actual lexical meaning of a derived word as a figurative extension. Yet I would still say that the word-formative motivation is a kind of conceptualization of one thing on the background of other things, and in this sense belongs to the domain of research on conceptual metaphor, though as a quite special type. Here, I resort to etymologizing largely when the lexical meaning of a word is not obviously based on a figurative extension; in such cases I attempt to discover such possible motivation with the means of historical semantics and etymology. Being aware of the perils of the *etymological fallacy*, I also embrace the view that one should avoid the *etymological fallacy fallacy*, that is, an approach denying any significance of a word’s etymology for its synchronic semantics and its understanding by the speakers of the language.<sup>7</sup> On the other hand, if the normative meaning clearly displays a figurative relationship to a more literal meaning of the word, I do not explore the word’s etymology, though it naturally does have one (and could be dealt with in a more extensive study).

In any case, the task of ascertaining the etymologies of Ancient Chinese words is seriously hampered by the state of research. In comparison with Indo-European comparative linguistics, Sino-Tibetan comparative linguistics and Chinese etymology are grossly underdeveloped, and, as a consequence, only a minority of Ancient Chinese words has a reliable etymology to date.<sup>8</sup> Only one comprehensive handbook drawing on advanced reconstructions of Old Chinese exists (Schuessler 2007), although the etymologies of many words have been analysed in recent monographs (Sagart 1999, Baxter and Sagart 2014), as well as in quite a few articles by other historical linguists of Chinese. I have chosen to rely on the model of Old Chinese phonology characterized by the six-vowel hypothesis, which has become the standard in the West as represented in Baxter’s works (above all, Baxter 1998), and on the reconstruction of Old Chinese morphology as represented by Western scholars such as Axel Schuessler, Laurent Sagart, William Baxter, Zev Handel, Wolfgang Behr, Guillaume Jacques, and Edwin G. Pulleyblank, as well as by a handful of Chinese scholars working in a similar framework, such as Pān Wùyún or Zhèng-Zhāng Shàngfāng. I do, however, occasionally consult older, more conservative

---

<sup>7</sup> As far as the domain of Ancient Chinese terms is concerned, I refer here specifically to Wolfgang Behr’s balanced attitude exposed in his study on the key concept of *rén* 仁 (2015: 200). Cf. also a shorter article on the same topic and in the same vein by Mei Tsu-lin (1994), speaking very fittingly about “morphology of ideas”.

<sup>8</sup> See, e.g., Handel’s summary of the state of the field of Sino-Tibetan comparative linguistics (2008). Modern Chinese etymology is in a sense still in its infancy, though it can draw on a range of valid observations and basic approaches coming from the domain of traditional Chinese philology, especially as represented by the authors of its “golden age” (eighteenth cent.). Although it has been developed somewhat in the twentieth century, it has been partially hindered by the state of reconstruction of Old Chinese pronunciation.

Chinese sources (such as Wáng Lì 1982), including premodern ones, on which modern historical studies Ancient Chinese semantics depend.

### Ancient Chinese words in the lexical field of ‘norm’

We can open our survey into the Ancient Chinese normative lexicon with a quotation from the *Ēryǎ* or *Approaching towards Correctness* (Ch. *Shìgǔ* 釋詁 or *Explaining the Old Words*), which is considered the oldest extant Chinese “dictionary” or “onomasticon,” but is actually a compendium of glosses to the canonical texts, mostly to the *Book of Odes* (possibly third cent. BC or somewhat later<sup>9</sup>):

典、彝、法、則、刑、範、矩、庸、恆、律、夏、職、秩，常也。

*Diǎn, yí, fǎ, zé, xíng, fàn, jǔ, yōng, héng, lǜ, jiá, zhí, zhì*<sup>10</sup> mean ‘constant (standard)’.

柯、憲、刑、範、辟、律、矩、則，法也。

*Kē, xiàn, xíng, fàn, bì, lǜ, jǔ, zé*<sup>11</sup> mean ‘standard’.<sup>12</sup>

Some of these words are only marginally attested with these meanings, such as *kē* 柯 or *zhí* 職. But in general, all of them are interesting for us because they include words with various etymological and figurative backgrounds, which emerge from the analysis of the material explored in this study. Thus, here we can encounter words connected with constancy (*yí* 彝, *yōng* 庸, *héng* 恆, *cháng* 常, very probably also *diǎn* 典), with measurement and measures (*jǔ* 矩, *lǜ* 律), with moulds and models (*xíng* 型,<sup>13</sup> *fàn* 範), or with order (*zhì* 秩). *Fǎ* 法 and *zé* 則 belong to the commonest terms in this domain, but they do not yield to a satisfactory explanation of their origin, and the source of *jiá* 夏 and *bì* 辟 remains unclear as does that of *xiàn* 憲.<sup>14</sup>

The lexical macrofield under investigation constitutes a complexly structured category, with a core and periphery, radial extensions, and overlaps with other categories, precisely as the cognitive theory of categorization would predict (Lakoff 1987, Langacker 1987). Thus, we have prototypical norm words whose semantic content is concentrated on the very notion of normativity and which simply mean ‘norm, rule’, but with certain

<sup>9</sup> For a discussion about the dating see e.g. Coblin 1972 or Carr 1972.

<sup>10</sup> In the reconstructed pronunciation: \*tʰə[r]ʔ, \*[l][ə]j, \*[p.k]ap, \*[ts]ʰək, \*[g]ʰen, \*[b](r)omʔ, \*[k]ʰ(r)aʔ, \*lɔŋ, \*[g]ʰən, \*[r]ut, \*kʰrik, \*tək, \*lik, \*[d]aŋ.

<sup>11</sup> In the reconstructed pronunciation: \*[k]ʰar, \*qʰar-s, \*[g]ʰen, \*[b](r)omʔ, \*[N]-pek, \*[r]ut, \*[k]ʰ(r)aʔ, \*[ts]ʰək.

<sup>12</sup> The word *fǎ* 法 has several meanings, including ‘standard’, ‘model’, and ‘law’, and its semantics has been discussed repeatedly; see Goldin 2011. I chose to employ here the more neutral term *standard*, but different translations are not ruled out either.

<sup>13</sup> For the sake of clarity, I write the word *xíng* ‘mould > model’ with the normalized modern character 型, except for direct quotations, even though it is usually written simply as 刑 even in transmitted texts (bronze inscriptions usually have just the phonophoric 井 – which, by the way, poses an unpleasant problem for Baxter’s reconstruction: 刑 \*[g]ʰen, but 井 \*tsenʔ; Zhèng-Zhāng Shàngfāng’s solutions work better here: \*geen and \*skenʔ). It is quite possible, however, that both words are related.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Schuessler 2007 under the respective entries.

semantic overtones that distinguish these synonyms from each other. Semantic analysis of certain words reveals normativity to be one possible meaning. There are also words in the semantics of which normativity is only one of the components of a varying degree of prominence. It is then not easy to cut off the concepts that already do not belong to our category, but this emerges from the very nature of the category and conceptual categorization in general. There is thus certainly a difference between words like 1. *norm* or *rule*, 2. *pattern (to be followed)*, (*right*) *method (to be employed)*, 3. *decree, order, or instruction*, and so forth. In fact, normativity is systematically implied in Ancient Chinese, for example, in *dào* 道 ‘way, method’ > ‘the right way to be followed’, *xíng* 行 ‘conduct’ > ‘proper conduct’, or *wáng* 王 ‘to become the king’ > ‘to become the true king’; this kind of systematic semantic extension is, after all, a conspicuous feature of the language. When collecting the data for my survey, I tried to capture a broader category of norm words, including words denoting instructions, yet I am aware that determining whether a term implies normativity involves arbitrary decision-making and that, therefore, this category can be defined in many ways.

Quite naturally, words with specific word-formative or figurative backgrounds have different semantic overtones and are woven into different conceptual, discursive, or ideological contexts. It is thus expectable that there may be a correlation between a text or group of texts, or a period of time and the genre favoured for norm words therein. For a better understanding of Ancient Chinese *Begriffsgeschichte*, it would be advisable to trace the diachronic as well as diatextual patterns of distribution of the various types and subtypes of normative terms. Although I roughly outline these patterns in this survey, they deserve much more attention and care than I can afford here, and therefore a more complex statistical analysis and detailed annotation have been left for another occasion.

### A tentative typology of norm words in Ancient Chinese

The typology I present below, which is based on the systematization of the data obtained from the corpus, is only a preliminary scheme open to modifications, corrections, or rearrangements. Be that as it may, the main dividing line runs between measurement-derived words and other words, among which the most prominent group is derived from the model-pattern metaphor, which is in a sense the opposite of the measurement-based metaphor. This crucial opposition, as it emerges from the texts, will be discussed below.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>15</sup> The reconstructions for these words, with the exception of the words reconstructed already above, are as follows: 凡 \**[b]rom*, 式 \**l̥ək*, 率 \**s-rut-s*, 理 \**m(ə).rəʔ*, 文 \**mə[n]*, 章 \**taŋ*, 經 \**k-l̥eŋ*, 緯 \**[g] wəj]-s*, 綱 \**kʰaŋ*, 紀 \**k(r)əʔ*, 維 \**ɣʷij* (? < \**ɣʷuj*), 統 \**tʰuŋ-(s)*, 貫 \**kʰon-s*, 軌 \**kʷruʔ*, 極 \**[g](r) ək*, 序/敍 \**s-m-taʔ*, 數 \**s-roʔ-s*, 倫 \**[r]u[n]*, 類 \**[r]u[t]-s*, 舊 \**N-kʷəʔ-s*, *dào* 道 \**l̥uʔ-s*, 術 \**Cə-lut*, 程 \**l<r>eŋ*, 度 \**[d]ʰak-s*, 揆 \**[g]ʷijʔ*, 權 \**[g]ʷrar*, 衡 \**[g]ʷran*, 稱/秤 \**mə-tʰəŋ-s*, 量 \**[r]aŋ-s*, 概 \**[k]ʰə[t]-s*, 準 \**tʰurʔ*, 規 \**kʷe*, 繩 \**Cə-m.rəŋ*, 墨 \**C.mʰək*, 儀 \**ŋ(r)aj*, 表 \**p(r)awʔ*, 臬 \**ŋʰet*, 正 \**teŋ-s*, 方 \**paŋ*, 義 \**ŋ(r)aj-s*, 節 \**tsʰik*, 檢 \**[k]r[aj]mʔ*, 稽 \**kʰij*, 幅 \**p<r>ək*, 令 \**riŋ-s*, 命 \**m-riŋ-s* (dialect: \**m-r-* > \**mr-*, \*-*iŋ* > \*-*eŋ*), 禁 \**kr[ə]m-s*, 訓 \**l̥u[n]-s* (dialect: \**l̥-* > *x-*), 的 \**[t-l]ʰewk*, 質 \**[t]<r>ip-s*, 禮 \**[r]ʰijʔ*, 體 \**rʰijʔ*.

MODEL, such as *xíng* 型 ‘casting mould > model’, *fàn* 範 ‘bamboo mould > model > rule’,<sup>16</sup> *fǎ* 法 ‘model > law’ (possibly related to *fán* 凡 ‘general pattern’), *shì* 式 ‘form > model’; *yí* 儀 ‘measure’,<sup>17</sup> *zé* 則 ‘model, rule’ (etymology unclear; Duàn Yúcái [1988: 179] suggests that the original meaning was to ‘categorize things’ according to what Xǔ Shèn says<sup>18</sup>); less clear: *shuài* 率

STRUCTURE GENERALLY, *lǐ* 理 ‘structure, order > rule, principle’

SUBTYPES OF STRUCTURE:

PATTERN, such as *wén* 文 ‘(a type of) pattern’<sup>19</sup> and *zhāng* 章 ‘(a type) of pattern’

subtype of patterns: prominent linear objects as guidelines: THREAD AND ROPES, such as *jīng* 經 ‘warp’, *wéi* 緯 ‘weft’, *gāng* 綱 ‘head-rope of fishing net’, *jì* 紀 ‘(main) head of silk thread’,<sup>20</sup> *wéi* 維 ‘rope’, *tǒng* 統 ‘main silk thread’, *guàn* 貫 ‘string’

also: *guī* 軌 ‘tracks’, tentatively *jí* 極 ‘ridgepole’

ORDER, such as *xù* 序/敘 ‘order’, *zhì* 秩 ‘order’

NUMBER, such as *shù* 數 ‘number > method’

CATEGORY, such as in *lún* 倫 ‘category’ and *lèi* 類 ‘category’, both > ‘rules of conduct’

CONSTANCY, or possibly CONSTANT PATTERNS, such as *yí* 彝, *cháng* 常, *héng* 恆, *diǎn* 典, *yōng* 庸, all meaning, apart from other things, ‘constant, usual > constant (pattern > rule)’, *jiù* 舊 ‘old’

WAY, such as *dào* 道 ‘way’, *shù* 術 ‘(a kind of) way’

MEASUREMENT:

*chéng* 程 ‘measure (in general)’, *dù* 度 ‘length measure’, *kuí* 揆 ‘direction measure’, 權 ‘weight’, *héng* 衡 ‘arm of steelyard > balance’, *chèng* 稱/秤 ‘steelyard’, *liàng* 量 ‘volume measure’, *gài* 概 ‘levelling stick’, *zhǔn* 準 ‘level’, *guī* 規 ‘compass’, *jǔ* 矩 ‘carpenter’s square’, *shéng* 繩 ‘carpenter’s rope’, *mò* 墨 ‘ink line (for straight sawing)’, *lǜ* 律 ‘tuning pipe’, *biǎo* 表 ‘marking pillar, gnomon’,<sup>21</sup> perhaps *niè* 臬 in the sense ‘gnomon’

RIGHTNESS, STRAIGHTNESS, such as *zhèng* 正 ‘upright > norm’, perhaps *fāng* 方

PROPRIETY, such as *yì* 義 ‘social or moral appropriateness’

CONTROL, RESTRICTION, such as *zhì* 制 ‘control > regulations, system, regime’, also of the rather moderating type – *jié* 節 ‘bamboo joint > restrain(t); rhythm, standard, rules of conduct, moral integrity’;<sup>22</sup> possibly also *jiǎn* 檢 ‘examine, restrain > laws, statutes’ and *jī* 稽 ‘examine; control’ (both once in a binome), *fú* 幅 ‘cloth width (standard) > standard’

<sup>16</sup> The etymology of *fàn*, written most adequately with the character 範, is far from certain, but it has been traditionally (since the *Shuōwén jiězi*, s. v.) understood to originally mean a bamboo variant of a mould. There is also the word *xíngfàn* 刑范/刑範 ‘mould’ attested in *Xúnzi* 16.1.1.

<sup>17</sup> However, one of the many meanings of this word is ‘measure; measuring device’, so there is a connection to another group of words. In any case, these meanings seem to be peripheral and secondary.

<sup>18</sup> Although there exist several hypotheses about it – cf. Boltz 1990 or Takashima 1987.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. von Falkenhausen 1996 or Kern 2001.

<sup>20</sup> The etymology of *jì* is not as straightforward as it might appear; in premodern glosses, it appears as if it originally had a verbal meaning (‘to sort/arrange silk’); see Duàn Yúcái 1988: 645. Unger and Behr have argued that is in fact a \*k- prefixed version of the word *lǐ* 理 in its original meaning ‘to draw boundaries’ (see Behr 2005).

<sup>21</sup> ‘Marking pillar, marking pole’ is a common meaning of the word, ‘gnomon’ is a less frequent specialization of that meaning (cf. e.g. *Guānzǐ* 30.1.4, 35.1.82, *Lǚshì chūnqiū* 2.5.1.1, 15.8.2.1, 25.6.5.1, *Xúnzi* 27.2.1, *Zuǒzhuàn* 7.12.2.67).

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Zhāng Liánróng 2000: 204.

DIRECTION, such as *fāng* 方 ‘direction > method’, or straightness ‘rectangular, straight, upright > (right) method’?

DECREE, such as *xiàn* 憲 ‘decree’, *lìng* 令 ‘order’, *mìng* 命 ‘order’, *jìn* 禁 ‘prohibition’

INSTRUCTION, such as *xùn* 訓 ‘instruct, instruction’

(TARGET, such as *dì* 的 ‘target’, *zhì* 質 ‘target’ [unconventional metaphor])

One could add *lǐ* 禮 (‘rites’) somewhere to this overview; its etymology, however, is unclear.<sup>23</sup> If forced to do so, I would tentatively put it under *propriety*. Generally, I do not aim at delving deeper into prominent philosophical and long-discussed terms such as *dào* 道, *yì* 義, *lǐ* 理, *wén* 文, or *lǐ* 禮 (and some others). They have been dealt with extensively and in high detail in the literature on the history of Chinese thought. This study has a different goal and the larger picture plays the dominant role here, in which these terms are merely single items of the same importance as the others.

### Etymological notes:

Etymologies worthy of our attention can be found for some of the items above. For example, the secondarily normative term *lǐ* 理 ‘structure, order, arrangement’, reconstructed as \*m(ə)-rəʔ by Baxter and Sagart, appears to be related to the verb *chí/zhì* 治 ‘order/rule’ (\*lɿ, lɿ-s), at least according to Sagart 1999 (see also Schuessler 2007 s. v. *zhì* 治), but it is almost surely cognate with the large group of words derived from the root \*rə: cf. *lǐ* 釐 ‘administer/order’ \*rə, *shì* 事 ‘affair/serve’ \*m-s-rə-ʔ-s, or \*s-lɿ-s, *shǐ* 使 ‘deploy/cause’ \*s-rə-ʔ, \*s-rə-s, *lǐ* 吏 ‘executive official’ \*rəʔ-s, *shì* 士 ‘freeman/official’ \*n-s-rə-ʔ, and *shì* 仕 ‘serve in office’ \*m-s-rə-ʔ. The nature of the relationship between \*lɿ and \*rə in the present Baxter-Sagart system remains a moot point.

Further, the word *xùn* 訓 ‘instruct, instructed’, reconstructed as \*ʃun-s, has been long known to belong to the word family including *xún* 循 ‘follow’ Schuessler \*slun, Baxter-Sagart sə-lun (which itself is an important verb in the realm of normativity), 順 *shùn* ‘conform, obey’ \*m-lun-s, Baxter-Sagart Cə-lun-s (again a word endowed with an inherent normative moment), as well as *xùn* 馴 ‘tame’ Baxter-Sagart \*sə-lun (NB instead of Modern pronunciation *xún*; cf. Zhāng Liánróng 2000: 198).

However, the most revealing are the members of the word family derived from the root *yóu* 由 ‘follow’ \*lu, or from different roots very probably somehow (but closely) related to and ultimately cognate with it at least in Proto-Chinese. These expressions constitute an array of salient norm words: *dào* 道 ‘way’ \*Cə-lʰuʔ, *shù* 術 ‘way > method > political technique’, Baxter-Sagart \*Cə-lut, Sagart \*m-lut, *shù* 述 ‘follow’ with the same pronunciation (see Behr 2011: 24–27, who formulated this very promising and actually straightforward etymology; see also Huáng Shùxiān 2009, Wèi Péiquán 2009).<sup>24</sup> Further, there are several words from the \*m-lut group: *shuài* 率 ‘lead’ \*s-rut-s; *lǜ* 律 ‘regulation, norm’ \*rut, Bodman \*lut; and *yù* 聿 ‘follow(ing), then’ Schuessler \*lut, Baxter-Sagart \*m-rut, N-rut. The archaic word *dí* 迪 \*lʰuk ‘follow; road, reason, plan’, characteristic for the *Book of Documents*, might be related as well. Of course, the precise nature of the

<sup>23</sup> It seems, however, to be cognate with *tǐ* 體 ‘structure, body’.

<sup>24</sup> There are many more studies on various aspects of this prominent lexical field, and especially, as one would expect, on the semantic development of *dào* – cf. at least Wú Dān 2013, Liáng Yīqún 2012, Guō Jīngyún 2009, Bào Zhīmíng 2008, Páng Pú 1994, or Sūn Xīguō 1992.

l-/r- distinction must be first determined: different reconstruction systems and their subsequent versions indicate l- and r- almost randomly in some cases (cf. also Schuessler 2015), and thus I can maintain that these words based on \*-rut- and \*-lut- according to the above-mentioned reconstructions pertain to the identical root. The alternation -u(?)/-ut is of a more serious nature. These codas are clearly distinguished in all modern reconstructions of Old Chinese and there is no productive morphological process of t-suffixation posited for the Old Chinese period by Sagart and his followers. However, Schuessler (2007: 70) describes the Proto-Sino-Tibetan to Proto-Chinese suffix \*\* -t, which would be relevant in this case, even though its precise function in \*lut/\*rut, and thus the mutual relationship between \*lu and \*lut/\*rut remains to be seen. The same is true of *dí*; however, even Schuessler lists it under *yóu* (for the pre-Old Chinese suffix \*\* -k, cf. Schuessler 2007: 68).

### A proper abundance: the disyllabic normative lexicon

The monosyllabic words presented above, though already quite an impressive set, constitute only a smaller part of the whole normative lexicon under investigation; in fact, most of them occur more often as the building blocks of disyllabic compounds, the abundance of which is truly amazing. One quick look at the list in the appendix will tell much.

There are two basic types of compounds – coordinate and subordinate (Packard 1998: 12–15, Zádrapa 2017a). They are not, however, of equal value and significance. Coordinate compounds consist of two (exceptionally three) synonyms or words of the same category, the inherent semantic differences between which are neutralized and the meaning of the entire compound becomes generalized.<sup>25</sup> Most, if not all, of these compounds have the basic abstract meaning ‘norms/standards (of all kinds)’, although the meanings of the original components may survive and imbue a specific semantic overtone, as I argue in this paper. Thus, the disyllabic word *yíbiǎo* 儀表, composed of the words ‘model, standard’ and ‘marking pillar, gnomon’, both with a well-established figurative meaning of ‘standard, norm’ when occurring on their own, simply means ‘norms, standards (in general)’. Coordinate compounds are also relatively easily identified as single unitary words, primarily because of their semantics.

Subordinate compounds, on the other hand, tend to retain the meaning of their components and the distinction between them and the usual attributive syntagmas are often elusive. In the expression *xiāndiǎn* 先典, consisting of the adjective ‘former’ and the noun ‘standard’, the modifier *xiān* could be considered a syntactic element (for more information on this type of compound, see Wü Zōngwén 2001: 264–295; for more on the difficulties of identifying compounds, see Wü Zōngwén 2001: 71–147). If the compound has the structure *noun + norm word*, where the first noun is in the genitive case, it is very close to a syntagma; such constructions usually mean something like ‘the standards/rules of/for N’, and one can certainly expand along these lines almost freely. Thus we have *wùlǐ* 物理 ‘rules of (all) phenomena’ < ‘thing’ + ‘structure, pattern’ > order (> principle) > rules’,

<sup>25</sup> There are hundreds of such compounds recorded in the Thesaurus Linguae Sericae database, typically with the gloss ‘N of all kinds’.

but also *shìlǐ* 事理 ‘rules of affairs’ < ‘affair’ + ‘structure, pattern > order (> principle) > rules’, and several others of this type; the possibility of further formations is, in principle, open. As far as adjectival modifiers are concerned, we frequently encounter semantically near-empty words, such as *dà* 大 ‘great’, which just underlines the importance of the norm; we also have such modifiers as *jiù* 舊 ‘old’, *xiān* 先 ‘former’, or *cháng* 常 ‘constant’, which combine easily with the nouns because norms are typically construed as constant and often as inherited from the past, and some of the norm words are directly anchored in the conceptual domain of constancy.<sup>26</sup> Numerals are another popular modifier, either real (though often symbolic) or near-empty, indicating merely plurality or even totality – usually *bǎi* 百 ‘hundred’; while instances of the latter type may be considered compounds, those of the former type may be better seen as syntactic phrases, although they are tagged as words in the Academia Sinica corpus.

Disyllabic compounds are typical of the Warring States texts and their distribution will be discussed below.

### Metaphors kept alive and revived

A considerable amount of passages in Warring States texts reveal, right before our eyes, the metaphorical momentum of norm words, which could have been hidden from us because of the lexicalization and fading out of the original figuration. They are invaluable for re-enacting – in a much neater manner – the original mental process that eventually led to setting up the mapping from one conceptual domain to another. Sometimes a word literally denoting a kind of physical measure is found in a text in a metaphorical context as a simile, but it is not attested elsewhere as a lexicalized metaphor; thus it seems that this particular word did not develop an abstract normative meaning. These cases are interesting instances of a term’s unexploited figurative potential, especially given that these expressions very often co-occur with similar words that actually developed into full-fledged general norm words, which can be observed below (e.g., the merely metaphorical *chídù* 尺度 ‘foot’ + ‘(length) measure’ vs. the fully developed *quánhéng* 權衡 ‘weight’ + ‘(arm of) steelyard’).

Here I would like to quote some of the many metaphorical uses of “measuring words”, although it is not easy to choose the most instructive ones from such an immense selection. I have tried to pick longer passages with concatenations of figurative uses or quasi-definitions. The terms to which I would like to draw the attention of the reader are in bold face. I use available published translations into English, but with the caveat that their precision varies from author to author and from passage to passage. Compare:

世之為治者，多釋法而任私議，此國之所以亂也。先王縣**權衡**，立**尺寸**，而至今**法**之，其分明也。夫釋**權衡**而斷輕重，廢**尺寸**而意長短，雖察，商賈不用，為其不必也。故**法**者，國之**權衡**也，夫倍**法度**而任私議，皆不知類者也。不以**法**論知能賢不肖者，惟堯，而世不盡為堯，是故先王知自議譽私之不可任也，故立**法**明**分**，中**程**者賞之，毀公者誅之。

<sup>26</sup> It may be of interest that, e.g., *jiù*, but largely also *xiān*, combine mostly with the norm words related to the ideas of model, instructions, constancy, etc., but not measurements. This certainly makes sense.

賞誅之法，不失其義，故民不爭。授官予爵，不以其勞，則忠臣不進。行賞賦祿，不稱其功，則戰士不用。(Shāngjūnshū, Xiūquán, 14.5)

Those who are engaged in governing, in the world, chiefly dismiss the **law** and place reliance on private appraisal, and this is what brings disorder in a state. The early kings hung up **scales with standard weights**, and fixed the **length of feet and inches**, and to the present day these are **followed as models** because their divisions were clear. Now dismissing **standard scales** and yet deciding weight, or abolishing **feet and inches** and yet forming an opinion about length – even an intelligent merchant would not apply this system, because it would lack definiteness. Therefore, laws are the **standard scales** of a state. Now, if the back is turned on **models and measures**, and reliance is placed on private appraisal, in all those cases there would be a lack of definiteness. Only a Yao would be able to judge knowledge and ability, worth or unworth without a **model**. But the world does not consist exclusively of Yaos! Therefore, the ancient kings understood that no reliance should be placed on individual opinions or biased approval, so they set up **models** and made the distinctions clear. Those who fulfilled the **standard** were rewarded, those who harmed the public interest were punished. The **standards** for rewards and punishments **were not wrong**, and therefore people did not dispute them. But if the bestowal of office and the granting of rank are not carried out according to the labour borne, then loyal ministers have no advancement; and if in awarding rewards and giving emoluments the respective merits are not weighed, then fighting soldiers will not enter his service.<sup>27</sup>

故明主使其群臣不遊意於法之外，不為惠於法之內，動無非法。法所以凌過遊外私也，嚴刑所以遂令懲下也。威不貸錯，制不共門。威制共則眾邪彰矣，法不信則君行危矣，刑不斷則邪不勝矣。故曰：巧匠目意中繩，然必先以規矩為度；上智捷舉中事，必以先王之法為比。故繩直而枉木斲，準夷而高科削，權衡縣而重益輕，斗石設而多益少。故以法治國，舉措而已矣。法不阿貴，繩不撓曲。法之所加，智者弗能辭，勇者弗敢爭。刑過不避大臣，賞善不遺匹夫。故矯上之失，詰下之邪，治亂決繆，絀羨齊非，一民之軌，莫如法。(Hánfēizi, Yóudu, 6.5)

And similarly the enlightened ruler sees to it that the ministers do not stray beyond the law, and that they do not show generosity [even] within the law, that in everything they do they follow the law. Through formidable laws one prevents transgressions and keeps egotism away; through strict punishments, one has orders carried through and inferiors chastised. Authority must not be imposed from two sources, and control must not go through a common gate. When authority and control are shared in common, then all the kinds of wickedness will show themselves; when the law is not reliable, then the ruler's actions are precarious; when corporal punishments are not decisive, then wickedness will not be overcome. Therefore it is said: The skilful carpenter will hit the **ink-line** by visual intuition, and yet he certainly first takes **the circle and the square** as his **standard**; the superbly competent man will act gingerly and get everything right, and yet he certainly takes the **laws** of the former kings for comparison. Thus as long as the **ink-line** is straight then warped wood will end up straight; as long as the **water balance** is even, great unevennesses will be levelled off; as long as the **scales** are evenly hung then weights will be levelled out; as long as bushels and stones are standardised, quantities will be levelled out. Thus ruling a state by use of the **law** is simply a matter of carrying out standard measures. The **law** does not pander to the noble, the **ink-line** does not get all bent according to what is crooked. Where the **law** applies, the

<sup>27</sup> Tr. J. J. Duyvendak 1928.

crafty cannot make their excuses and the courageous will not dare to fight against it. The physical punishing of transgressions should not spare great ministers; the rewarding of the good should not bypass the ordinary person. As for correcting the ruler's oversights, as for pursuing subordinates' wickedness, as for sorting out insubordinacy and unravelling mistakes, as for removing the superfluous and evening out the incorrect, as for uniting the **tracks** for the people to follow, nothing is as good as the **law**.<sup>28</sup>

禮之於正國家也，如權衡之於輕重也，如繩墨之於曲直也。(Xúnzǐ, Dàliùè, 27.41.1, parallel with *Liji*, Jīngjiě, 26.1.12)

The relationship of **ritual principles** to the **correct governance** of the nation is like that of the suspended **balance and steelyard** to the determination of weight or that of the **darkened marking line** to straightness.<sup>29</sup>

國無禮則不正。禮之所以正國也，譬之猶衡之於輕重也，猶繩墨之於曲直也，猶規矩之於方圓也，既錯之而人莫之能誣也。(Xúnzǐ, Wángbà, 11.3.1)

If a state lacks **ritual principles**, then it will not be rectified, for **ritual principles** are the means whereby to **rectify** the state. This is analogous to the **steelyard** for the measurement of weight, the **blackened marking-line** for determining crookedness or straightness, or the **compass and square** for testing squareness and roundness. When they are set up as standards, then no one can deceive him.

是故子墨子言曰：「古者聖王為五刑，請以治其民。譬若絲縷之有紀，罔罟之有綱，所連收天下之百姓不尚同其上者也。」(Mòzǐ, Shàngtóng shàng, 11.4.1)

Therefore, Mozi said: The sage-kings of old devised the five punishments to rule the people in order to be able to lay hands on those who did not identify themselves with their superiors – a device of the same nature as **threads** are tied into skeins and a net is controlled by a **main rope**.<sup>30</sup>

用民有紀有綱，壹引其紀，萬目皆起，壹引其綱，萬目皆張。為民紀綱者何也？欲也惡也。(Lǚshì chūnqiū, Yòngmín, 19.4.4.2)

In employing the people, there are **small lines** and a **main cord** just like those found in a net. With a single tug of the **small lines**, the net is lifted; with a single pull of the **main rope**, the net is made taut. What are the **small lines and main rope** in handling the people? They are desires and aversions.<sup>31</sup>

子墨子言曰：「我有天志，譬若輪人之有規，匠人之有矩，輪匠執其規矩，以度天下之方圓，曰：『中者是也，不中者非也。』今天下之士君子之書，不可勝載，言語不可盡計，上說諸侯，下說列士，其於仁義則大相遠也。何以知之？曰我得天下之明法以度之。」(Mòzǐ, Tiānzhi shàng, 26.8.1)

<sup>28</sup> All translations from the *Hánfēizǐ* by C. Harbsmeier (n. d.), Thesaurus Linguae Sericae.

<sup>29</sup> All translations of the *Xúnzǐ* by John Knoblock (1988–90).

<sup>30</sup> Tr. W. P. Mei 1929.

<sup>31</sup> This whole passage is actually rhymed: \*-ang in *gāng* 綱 and *zhāng* 張 and \*-ə? in *jì* 紀 (NB the modern pronunciation does not conform to the Middle Chinese one with regard to the tone) and *qǐ* 起.

Mozi said: The will of Heaven to me is like the **compasses** to the wheelwright and the **square** to the carpenter. The wheelwright and the carpenter measure all the square and circular objects with their **square and compasses** and accept those that fit as correct and reject those that do not fit as incorrect. The writings of the gentlemen of the world of the present day cannot be all loaded (in a cart), and their doctrines cannot be exhaustively enumerated. They endeavour to convince the feudal lords on the one hand and the scholars on the other. But from magnanimity and righteousness they are far off. How do we know? Because I have the most competent **standard** in the world to **measure** them with.<sup>32</sup>

Equally worthy of attention are passages in which the meaning of the word is stretched between the literal and figurative poles: the word is basically employed in the literal sense, but in a normative context which adds clear metaphorical overtones to it, breaking thus ground for a gradual abstraction of the term. These instances represent a bridge to the fully figurative meaning (but sometimes are just a re-evocation of the original literal meaning).<sup>33</sup> These instances are not easily identifiable, as one is never sure to what extent the word is meant metaphorically. They represent a large portion of all occurrences of norm-related words in the corpus and should be carefully studied in their own right. Compare:

「故曰，徒善不足以為政，徒法不能以自行。《詩》云：『不愆不忘，率由舊章。』遵先王之法而過者，未之有也。聖人既竭目力焉，繼之以規矩準繩，以為方員平直，不可勝用也；既竭耳力焉，繼之以六律，正五音，不可勝用也；既竭心思焉，繼之以不忍人之政，而仁覆天下矣。(Mèngzǐ, Lǐlǒu shàng, 4A.1.2)

Hence we have the saying: 'Virtue alone is not sufficient for the exercise of government; **laws** alone cannot carry themselves into practice.' It is said in the Book of Poetry, 'Without transgression, without forgetfulness, following the **ancient statutes**.' Never has any one fallen into error, who **followed** the **laws** of the ancient kings. When the sages had used the vigour of their eyes, they called in to their aid the **compass, the square, the level, and the line**, to make things square, round, level, and straight: the use of the instruments is inexhaustible. When they had used their power of hearing to the utmost, they called in the **pitch-tubes** to their aid to **determine** the five notes – the use of those tubes is inexhaustible. When they had exerted to the utmost the thoughts of their hearts, they called in to their aid a government that could not endure to witness the sufferings of men – and their benevolence overspread the kingdom.<sup>34</sup>

Finally, it is of eminent importance for the study of this lexical field to analyse concatenations and the parallelism of norm words used with a fully abstract meaning, as well as, of course, the definitions and quasi-definitions of these terms, which is a popular strategy of argumentation in Ancient Chinese texts in general. Again, such passages are truly abundant and prove once more the key position of the entire conceptual and lexical field under investigation. Compare:

古之王者，知命之不長，是以並建聖哲，樹之風聲，分之采物，著之語言，為之律度，陳之藝極，引之表儀，予之法制，告之訓典，教之防利，委之常秩，道之以禮，則使毋失其

<sup>32</sup> Tr. W. P. Mei 1929.

<sup>33</sup> See Harbsmeier (2015: 527) on the inseparability of literal from figurative meanings.

<sup>34</sup> Tr. James Legge 1872.

士宜，眾隸賴之，而後即命，聖王同之，今縱無法以遺後嗣，而又收其良以死，難以在上矣 (Zuǒzhuàn, Wéngōng, 6.3.4)

The ancient kings, knowing that their life would not be long, largely established the sagely and wise (as princes and officers); planted their instructions in the soil of the manners (of the people); instituted the several modes of distinguishing rank and character; published excellent lessons; made the **standard tubes and measures**; showed (the people) the **exact amount of their contributions**; led them on by the **rules of department**; gave them the **rules of their own example**; declared to them the **instructions and statutes** (of their predecessors); taught them to guard (against what was evil) and obtain what was advantageous; employed for them the **regular duties** (of the several officers); and led them on by the **rules of propriety**; thus securing that the earth should yield its proper increase, and that all below them might sufficiently depend on them. It is after they had done all this that those ancient kings went to their end. Succeeding sage kings have acted in the same way. But now, granting that duke Muh had no such **example** to leave to his posteriority, yet when he proceeded to take away the good with him in his death, it would have been hard for him to be in the highest place.<sup>35</sup>

使天下皆極智能於儀表，盡力於權衡，以動則勝，以靜則安。(Hánfēizǐ, Ānwēi, 25.2.1)

If one makes the whole world exert all their competence on the ‘**standard**’, if they put in all their effort into the ‘**objective weighing**’, if then they take action they will succeed, and if they stay inactive they will be at peace.

程者、物之準也，禮者、節之準也；程以立數，禮以定倫；德以敘位，能以授官。凡節奏欲陵，而生民欲寬；節奏陵而文，生民寬而安；上文下安，功名之極也，不可以加矣。(Xúnzǐ, Zhìshì, 14.6)

**Measures** are the **standards** of things. **Ritual principles** are the **standards for obligations**. **Measures** are used to establish **modes of calculation**, **ritual principles** to determine the **constant relationships**, inner power to **assign each his proper place**, and ability to assign official positions. It is a general principle that in handling the **obligations of one’s office and in making reports** strictness is desirable, and in providing a living for the people generosity is to be desired. **When official obligations and reports** are strictly maintained, the result is good form. When the people are provided a generous living, the result is security. When the upper classes have good form and the lower classes security, this is the acme of accomplishment and fame, for it is impossible to add anything to it.

儀者，萬物之程式也。法度者，萬民之儀表也。禮義者，尊卑之儀表也。故動有儀則令行，無儀則令不行；(Guǎnzǐ, Xíngshìjiě, 21.1.118)

**Good form** sets the **pattern of conduct** for all things. **Laws and procedures** set the **standards of good form** for people as a whole. **Rules for propriety and righteous conduct** set the **standards of good form** between the honored and lowly. Therefore, if [the ruler’s] movements adhere to **good form**, his orders will be carried out. Otherwise they will not.<sup>36</sup>

<sup>35</sup> All translations from the *Zuǒzhuàn* by James Legge 1872.

<sup>36</sup> All translations from the *Guǎnzǐ* by A. Rickett (1985).

法律政令者，吏民規矩繩墨也。夫矩不正，不可以求方。繩不信，不可以求直。(Guānzǐ, Qíchén qizhū, 52.1.31)

Laws, administrative statutes, and official orders, are the **compass, square, and marking line** of government functionaries and the people. If the **square** is not true, one cannot expect it to produce squareness. If the **marking line** is not stretched tight, one cannot expect it to produce **straightness**.

明主者，一度量，立表儀，而堅守之，故令下而民從。法者，天下之程式也，萬事之儀表也。吏者，民之所懸命也；故明主之治也，當於法者賞之，違於法者誅之，故以法誅罪，則民就死而不怨。以法量功，則民受賞而無德也，此以法舉錯之功也。(Guānzǐ, Míng-fǎjiě, 46.1.56)

The enlightened ruler unifies his **procedures and measurements**, establishes his **standards**, and steadfastly observes them. Therefore, when **orders** are handed down, the people **follow** them. **Law** sets the **pattern** for the empire and the **standards** for all undertakings. Civil functionaries become the ones who post his commands. Now, the enlightened ruler, in maintaining good order, rewards what accords with the **law** and punishes what violates it. Hence when he uses the law to punish the guilty and people are killed, there is no resentment; when he uses the **law** to **measure** merit and people are rewarded, there is no sense of gratitude. This is what is accomplished by putting the **law** in place.

A structural metaphor could or even should be reflected in the collocability of the terms with verbs, for example. Nevertheless, very little is to be gained from Ancient Chinese: norm words tend to co-occur with general verbs that do not depend on the original literal semantics or etymology of the respective norm words. Certainly, one can encounter an array of verbs with the basic meaning of ‘follow’, for example, *yóu* 由, *zūn* 遵, *xún* 循, *cóng* 從, *shù* 述, *zǔshù* 祖述, *yuán* 緣, *shuài* 率, and also *dí* 迪, some of which are etymologically cognate with certain norm words (see above, the roots \*lu, \*lut/\*rut, \*luk, and \*lun), but apart from them, the choice of verbal predicate is relatively free.<sup>37</sup>

## Diachronic and diatextual distribution

As already mentioned above, the inquiry into the distribution of particular norm words as well as of their types and subtypes across the texts can reveal diachronic transformations and synchronic differences in the conceptualization of norms and the whole normative discourse. Given the large numbers of the norm words I register, and, above all, given the number of their occurrences in the corpus, I attempt only to present an

<sup>37</sup> Except for ‘follow’ verbs and many other verbs, the subsequent verbs typically occur in the predicate: *yǒu* 有 ‘have’, *wú* 無 ‘have not’, *shǒu* 守 ‘observe’, *shòu* 受 ‘accept’, *yòng* 用 ‘employ’, *zhī* 知 ‘understand’, *xíng* 行 ‘carry out’, *shèn* 慎 ‘pay careful attention’, *shèn* 審 ‘examine’, *shùn* 順 ‘conform to’, *yīn* 因 ‘rely on’, *cāo* 操 ‘take in hand, operate’, *lì* 立 ‘establish’, *shè* 設 ‘set up’, *zhì* 制 ‘make’, *zhì* 置 ‘set up’, *bù* 布 ‘announce’, *dé* 得 ‘succeed’, *shī* 失 ‘fail’, *fǎn* 反 ‘go against’, *wéi* 違 ‘go against’, *bèi* 背 ‘turn one’s back on’, *guò* 過 ‘surpass’, *shì* 恃 ‘rely on’, *zhí* 執 ‘hold’, *wò* 握 ‘grasp, hold’, *zhǎng* 掌 ‘hold’, *jìn* 盡 ‘exhaust’, *lóng* 隆 ‘deeply respect’, *xí* 習 ‘practice’, *xiū* 修 ‘cultivate’, *shì* 釋 ‘put aside’, *shě* 捨 ‘put aside’, *qì* 棄 ‘abandon’, *fèi* 廢 ‘abandon’, *huī* 毀 ‘destroy’, *míng* 明 ‘clearly understand/propagate’, *zhèng* 正 ‘make correct’, *píng* 平 ‘make level/just’, *yī* 一 ‘unite’, *tóng* 同 ‘unite’, *biàn* 變 ‘change’, *yì* 易 ‘change’, and *gé* 革 ‘change’.

overall overview of the basic trends and patterns of distribution that emerge from this material. In fact, many passages deserve closer attention and commentary, and perhaps even a small case study. Moreover, one must realize, among other things, that the occurrences of these words may represent instances of their various semantic uses – literal, figurative, freshly metaphoric (in a simile, for example), or symbolic – and, what is worse, they sometimes blend into each other or effect distinct semantic overtones (this phenomenon can also be observed in the examples quoted in previous section). A detailed, comprehensive display of the data and their analysis is beyond the scope of the present study, as is the fine-grained statistics necessary for such analysis. Therefore, I will limit myself to an overview capturing the most important trends.

Let us first look at the inventory of norm words attested in the earliest texts from my sample, which I deliberately chose in order to have a diachronic counterpart to the Warring States material:

Bronze inscriptions (BI): *shuài* 帥/率,<sup>38</sup> *shuàixíng* 帥型, *shuàiyòng* 帥用, *xíng* 井=型, *jīng* 罍=經, *bì* 辟, *jí* 亟=*jí* 極, *zeshàng* 劓 (=則)尚, *lǐ* 禮, *xiàn* 憲

*The Book of Documents:*

Earliest chapters: *fǎ* 法, *niè* 臬, *lún* 倫, *jiá* 戛, *xíng* 型, *diǎn* 典, *yì* 義, *shuài* 率, *bì* 辟, *dù* 度, *jí* 極, *jì* 紀, *yìxùn* 彝訓, *fēiyí* 非彝, *shì* 式, *xùn* 訓, and perhaps *zhǔnrén* 準人 ‘officers of law’

Intermediate chapters: *xíng* 型, *yì* 義, *niè* 臬, *diǎn* 典, *lún* 倫, *fǎ* 法, *cháng* 常, *yí* 彝, *dù* 度, *biàn* 卞, *xùn* 訓

Late chapters: *xíng* 型, *diǎn* 典, *lún* 倫, *yì* 義, *cháng* 常, *xù* 紘, *zhì* 秩, *lǐ* 禮, *xiàn* 憲, *shuài* 率, *zé* 則, *jí* 極, *yí* 彝, *jiùfú* 舊服, *shuàidiǎn* 率典, *yílún* 彝倫, *bǎikuí* 百揆, *lǜ* 律, *dù* 度, *liàng* 量, *héng* 衡, *fàn* 範, *fǎdù* 法度, *diǎnxíng* 典型, *jìgāng* 紀綱

*The Book of Songs:*

According to sections:

Guófēng: *dù* 度, *cháng* 常 (tentatively)

Yǎ: *jiù* 舊, *zhāng* 章, *jiùzhāng* 舊章, *diǎnxíng* 典型, *zé* 則, *jīng* 經 (v), *gāng* 綱, *jì* 紀, *gāngjì* 綱紀 (v), *wéi* 維 (v), *yíxíng* 儀型, *dù* 度, *chéng* 程, *cháng* 常, *lún* 倫, *xiàn* 憲, *xùn* 訓 (v), *lǐyí* 禮儀, *shì* 式, *xíng* 型

Sòng: *yíshíxíng* 儀式型, *zé* 則, *diǎn* 典, *cháng* 常, *xùn* 訓 (v), *lǚ* 履 = *lǐ* 禮, *xíng* 型

According to metaphorical background:

model-structure-pattern: *shì* 式, *jiù* 舊, *zhāng* 章, *jiùzhāng* 舊章, *xíng* 型, *diǎnxíng* 典型, *yíshíxíng* 儀式型, *zé* 則, *jīng* 經 (v), *gāng* 綱, *jì* 紀, *gāngjì* 綱紀 (v), *wéi* 維 (v), *yíxíng* 儀型

<sup>38</sup> There is a problem with the reading of the word written as 率; modern dictionaries usually indicate the reading *lǜ* for the meaning of ‘standard’ or something similar, and sometimes even identify the character as a variant for *lǜ* 律. But given the fact that the word is obviously sometimes written as 帥 in bronze inscriptions, the character standardly having only the pronunciation *shuài*, I prefer to render it as *shuài*. Moreover, both the reading *lǜ* and *shuài* are based on the root \*-rut-/lut-, with *shuài* being distinguished from the former only by the prefix \*s- and the suffix \*-s.

constancy: *diǎn* 典, *cháng* 常

category: *lún* 倫

instruction: *xiàn* 憲, *xùn* 訓 (v)

measurement: *dù* 度, *chéng* 程

other: *lǐyí* 禮儀, *lǐ*<sup>39</sup> 履 = *lǐ* 禮

Overlap of BI and the earliest parts of the *Documents*: *shuài* 帥/率, *bì* 辟, *xíng* 型, *jí* 極

Overlap of BI and the *Odes*: *dù* 度, *xíng* 型, *diǎn* 典

Overlap of all three early sources: *xíng* 型

One can easily notice that in all these corpora, measure-related norm words are rather scarce, although not absent altogether. The prevailing metaphoric backgrounds include the MODEL-STRUCTURE-PATTERN subgroup in first place, followed by CONSTANCY and INSTRUCTION, and some miscellaneous others. This observation is basically true of the late chapters of the *Documents*, where, however, several measure-related terms appear, such as *lǜ* 律, *liàng* 量, *héng* 衡, and *fǎdù* 法度, making these sections intuitively reminiscent of Warring States texts. *Dù* 度 seems to be a very basic general norm word across all texts encountered from the very beginning, as do some other ubiquitous terms with different backgrounds (*fǎ* 法, *cháng* 常, etc.), but it is not dominant in this discourse. In my opinion, this pattern of distribution is its characteristic feature and can be explained with reference to by and large purely historical social-cultural developments. If we look at all the data presented in the appendix, we can observe that the same metaphors were the principal normative metaphors of the Zhōu aristocratic culture and of its ‘Confucian’ appropriation, embodied in such texts as the *Lúnyǔ*, the *Mèngzǐ*, or the *Zuǒzhuàn* and *Guóyǔ*. Although the overall picture of distribution is extremely complex, MEASUREMENT stands out as the opposite pole, representing the principal metaphor of the newly (early to mid-Warring States) emerging ideologies of state administration (referred to as the “pragmatic” or “legalist” strains of thought), represented by such texts as the *Shāngjūnshū*, the *Hánfēizǐ*, and also, in a different manner and only to a certain extent, the *Xúnzǐ*, as well as the all-embracing *Guānzǐ*. Naturally, it is also simply the language of a new urban society born from the far-reaching reforms and transformations of the Warring States period, of cities inhabited by craftsmen, merchants, and many other specialists possessing command of various techniques.<sup>40</sup>

At this stage of research, several general observations have emerged from the chaos of the available data. As a matter of course, some lexical units have a specific distribution that reveals their connection with a certain type of discourse; some terms may be limited merely to one single text, being fully or nearly a *hapax legomenon*. In contrast, some particular texts may be quite specific with regard to the occurrence of norm words, but not all in the same way: it is expectable that texts representing different strains of thought display a preference for partially different normative figurations. The *Xúnzǐ* is highly

<sup>39</sup> The pronunciation *lǐ* does not conform to the Middle Chinese pronunciation of the word, which should give modern *lǐ*; *lǐ* is reconstructed as \*rǐj-ʔ, *lǐ* as \*r'ǐj-ʔ, and thus, they are supposed to have been homophonous except for the syllable type A/B distinction.

<sup>40</sup> See Yú 2003 or Lewis 1999.

remarkable though in its own right for containing an unparalleled range of normative terms. At first sight the *Guānzǐ* appears to be similar in this respect, but in fact, the frequent presence of the title in the lists of the texts a given term occurs in is most probably caused by its composite, syncretic nature (and, of course, its length), which is not quite the case of the *Xúnzǐ*, though both books are of relatively late origin (late Warring States). Thus, the texts tell us much about the terms, and vice versa the terms inform us about the character of the texts.

Distributional analysis is naturally and necessarily only relative. But even terms that clearly prefer a certain type of discourse usually occur in admixtures of different textual and intellectual traditions. Again, this is to be expected, as only special technical terms are strictly limited to particular texts or environments. The Ancient Chinese texts I have examined largely contain non-specific language and do not indicate a particularly high degree of technical specialization. As a consequence, analysis, especially preliminary analysis, reveals rather general trends and tendencies, or possible semantic overtones; moreover, the results may be distorted by various random factors related to the character of our corpus. A deeper analysis is far beyond the scope of this article: one would have to study the combinatorics of constituents of disyllabic words in the light of their diachronic and diatextual distribution, both from formal and semantic perspectives (I touch upon this issue above when introducing the basic types of compounds). A very wide array of semantic issues remains to be formulated and addressed, including the level of abstraction in relation to the relative semantic distance and compatibility of the constituents. When one look on the data in the appendix, it would seem promising to start with apparently (and, of course, to a large extent subjectively) unusual compounds, such as *yífǎ* 儀法, because the distance is greatest in their case, but eventually a full-fledged theoretical framework would need to be developed and comprehensively applied on the data. This task would have to involve a better, more detailed description of the conceptual category of NORM that covers its inner structure, carefully distinguishes core norm words from mixed and peripheral domains (INSTRUCTION, etc.), and maps their mutual relationships and overlaps with other conceptual fields.

It is interesting to note that some norm words are attested exclusively, or nearly so, in explicitly metaphorical contexts. They can appear repeatedly in one text or in several texts (as can be seen from the list in the appendix, this kind of behaviour is mostly true of monosyllabic terms<sup>41</sup>). Such words should be in principle distinguished from the other types of terms that feature at least somewhere as more or less abstract words: their figurative meaning is already conventionalized and lexicalized. This, however, does not mean that both these types of figuration cannot pertain to the same environment and have the same metaphorical background. For example, the normative figurative meaning of some measurement-based words is well entrenched to the point that the original metaphor may already be unrecognizable to the average speaker, whereas similar words from the same group are found with a normative sense only temporarily in a simile or similar

---

<sup>41</sup> It is obvious from the data that the rapidly growing disyllabic vocabulary based on measurement words often covers more abstract meanings, whereas older monosyllabic words tend to retain their literal meaning, though sometimes side by side with a figurative meaning and metaphorically exploited.

environment without traces of lexicalization. Finally, other words from the same group may never appear in an abstract normative context, always denoting actual measurement tools – *sua fata habent verba*.

Some norm words are, on the other hand, used only or predominantly verbally: although in this study I focus on nominal expressions, that is, designations for various types of normative concepts, I sometimes register verbally used lexemes as well, primarily when there seems to be an extremely close relationship between them and clearly nominal lexemes. Such connections typically arise when the expression in question is the verbal use of a word that occurs elsewhere as a noun (for word-class flexibility in Ancient Chinese, see Zádrapa 2011 or 2017b), or when a word itself does not occur as a noun but its constituent parts or closest synonyms do. Their inclusion can be then considered informative; in any case, the situation would require greater elaboration.

To start off with an example, I tried to figure out which norm-denoting words occur predominantly in the texts of the *rú* 儒, or “ritualist” or “Confucian”, discourse, and which are typical of “legalist” discourse.<sup>42</sup> Although this perspective seems to involve extreme simplification, I believe that such an initial step may demonstrate the applicability of the method and its potential merits (and naturally also point out any complications and limitations); the systematic fine-grained analysis of the collected material is a matter of future research.

When looking at monosyllabic words either as independent words or compound constituents, we discover, besides ubiquitous general terms, a group of words or word constituents occurring only, or primarily, in the “ritualist” or “traditionalist” discourse. The *Xúnzǐ* belongs to this strain of thought, but is peculiar in including, or perhaps even introducing, many other expressions not found elsewhere. It is significant, though not unexpected, that they largely belong to non-measurement, non-technicist backgrounds typical for soft-power approaches to ruling society, including instruction (only weakly represented in the other set). I register the following units:

MODEL: *xíng* 型 ‘casting mould > model’, *fàn* 範 ‘bamboo mould > model > rule’, *shì* 式 ‘form > model’, *zé* 則 ‘model, rule’

PATTERN: *wén* 文 ‘(a type of) pattern’, *zhāng* 章 ‘(a type) of pattern’

PROMINENT LINEAR OBJECTS as guidelines: *jīng* 經 ‘warp’, *gāng* 綱 ‘head-rope of fishing net’, *jì* 紀 ‘(main) head of silk thread’, *tǒng* 統 ‘main silk thread’, *guàn* 貫 ‘string; jí 極 ‘ridgepole’

CATEGORY: *lún* 倫 ‘category’, *lèi* 類 ‘category’, both > ‘rules of conduct’

CONSTANCY: *yí* 彝 ‘constant’, *diǎn* 典 ‘constant’, *jiù* 舊 ‘old’

<sup>42</sup> I am aware of the controversy surrounding this distinction, but this matter cannot be entirely avoided. I do not intend to deal here with the heavily disputed issues of different strains of thought and traditions in ancient China, and arguments about the correct terminology and the proliferation of new, supposedly much more suitable and much less misleading terms. For my present purposes, I take the “ritualist” tradition to be represented by the ancient canonical books, ritualist works (the various “Rites”), the historiographic works of the *Zuǒzhuàn* and *Guóyǔ*, the works traditionally connected with great “Confucian” thinkers (the *Lúnyǔ*, the *Mèngzǐ*, and with certain reservations, the *Xúnzǐ*), and writings traditionally understood as supporting to some extent “Confucian values”, such as the *Yǎnzǐ chūnqiū* or, in part, the *Lǚshì chūnqiū*. In contrast, the legalist discourse is primarily represented by the *Shāngjūnshū* and *Hánfēizǐ*, but it is largely typical of the *Guǎnzǐ* as well and overlaps with other non-ritualist traditions.

PROPRIETY: *yì* 義 ‘social or moral appropriateness’

CONTROL, RESTRICTION: *jié* 節 ‘bamboo joint > restrain(t); rhythm, standard, rules of conduct, moral integrity’ *fú* 幅 ‘cloth width (standard) > standard’

INSTRUCTION, such as *xùn* 訓 ‘instruct, instruction’

MEASUREMENT: *kuí* 揆 ‘direction measure’, (*zhún* 準 ‘level’)<sup>43</sup>

I find this overall and relatively rough scheme telling; it demonstrates the promise of studying the peculiarities of normative discourse in other groupings of texts using the same method, though ideally in a much more sophisticated manner.

### A comparative glimpse

Although a comparative study of the analogies and asymmetries between Ancient Chinese on one hand and Ancient Greek and Latin on the other would be very useful, such an inquiry is far beyond the scope of this paper, although the issue should be carefully addressed in the future. However, I would like to suggest some comparisons that might indicate further research directions and draw attention to its potential merits. Let us consider the following facts:<sup>44</sup>

The Chinese *jǔ* 矩 is the literal equivalent of the Latin *norma* ‘square; norm’; it is highly remarkable that the root of this word (*\*ǵneh<sub>3</sub>* ‘to know’) is the same as in the Greek *gnōmōn* ‘pointer, gnomon’ (Beekes 2010: 273 s. v. *gignōskō*), which has a Chinese parallel, namely, *biǎo* 表, an important norm word.

The closest word to the Ancient Chinese *fǎ* 法 ‘law, model’ in Greek is possibly *nomos* ‘law’ (Beekes 2010: 1006 s. v. *nemō*), which is based on the root *\*nem* ‘to take’ (Gr. *nemō* ‘to distribute’); the Latin word *numerus* ‘number; rhythm; rank; class, category; order, duty etc.’, with overlaps to other Chinese normative terms, is its cognate (de Vaan 2008: 419), and, at the same time, its meaning can be directly rendered by the Ancient Chinese *shù* 數 ‘number > method’. The Latin counterpart is *lēx* ‘law’, based on the root *\*leg* ‘to gather, collect’ (de Vaan 2008: 337), which is also found in the preeminent Greek key term *logos* ‘word, speech, thought, reason, proposition, principle’ (Beekes 2010: 841 s. v. *legō*); *logos*, in turn, appears to be close in meaning to such ancient Chinese words as *dào* 道 ‘the right way, method’<sup>45</sup> or *lǐ* 理 ‘structure, order’. None of the Ancient Chinese norm words are, as far as I know, derived from a root with this meaning.<sup>46</sup> Thus, we do encounter some interesting connections, but they are highly asymmetrical.

<sup>43</sup> This type of measurement device is untypical, being an indicator rather than measuring devices in the narrow sense.

<sup>44</sup> For the meanings of the Latin and Ancient Greek words, I rely on the entries from dictionaries digitalized as part of the Perseus Project (Lewis and Short 1879, Lewis 1890, Liddell and Scott 1940, Liddell and Scott 1889).

<sup>45</sup> For a comparative study on *dào* and *logos* see Yáo Xiǎopíng 1992.

<sup>46</sup> But one could think of a connection between Ancient Chinese *lún* 倫 ‘category’ and the relatively rare word *lún* 揀 ‘to choose’.

The family of Greek words based on the root *\*deik* ‘to point out’, Ancient Greek *deiknūmi* ‘to show’, such as *dikē* ‘justice’, *dikaioi* ‘just’, *dikaiosynē* ‘justice’, *paradeigma* ‘pattern, example’ (Beekes 2010: 309 s. v. *deiknūmi*), and their cognates, such as the English *token*, has no simple parallels in Ancient Chinese, which has many different words for paradigm, or pattern or model (*paradeigma*). None of these terms seem to be based on such a root, though the etymologies of many Ancient Chinese expressions are uncertain. Nonetheless, the Greek etymological connection between justice and a model might be quite interestingly mirrored in the Chinese pair *yí* 儀 *\*ŋ(r)aj* ‘standard, model’ and *yì* 義 *\*ŋ(r)aj-s* ‘social propriety, righteousness’, itself perhaps derived from *yí* 宜 *\*ŋ(r)aj* ‘appropriate, deserved’, that is, if the words are related.<sup>47</sup>

The ancient Chinese terms *dào* 道 ‘way > right way, right methods’ and *shù* 術 ‘way > method, technique’, both metaphorical extensions of ‘way’, perhaps based on the root *\*lu* (*yóu* 由), have their less prominent counterpart in the Greek *methodos* ‘method, system’ with a similar range of meanings, which stems from *meta* ‘along’+ *hodos* ‘way’ (the root *\*sod* ‘to walk, go’, Beekes 2010: 1046 s. v. *hodos*), and the even less important Latin *iter* or *via*, both ‘way’, with the same semantic extension as the English *way*.

In Ancient Greek and Latin, and also in other Indo-European languages, there is a large and conceptually exceedingly important word family ultimately derived from the root *\*h<sub>2</sub>er* ‘to fit, fix, put together’;<sup>48</sup> many of these terms have good translations into Ancient Chinese (sometimes multiple ones due to polysemy), in which they represent noteworthy norm words. The etymologies of these words, however, differ, and they do not constitute an interrelated network. Compare the Ancient Greek *arithmos* ‘number’ (*shù* 數); *aretē* ‘virtue’ (*dé* 德); *harmonia* ‘harmony’ (*hé* 和) (see Beekes 2010: 123 s. v. *arariskō*, 128 s. v. *areskō* and *aretē*, 131 s. v. *arithmos*, 135 s. v. *harmonia*); *ratio* ‘(among many others:) fashion, method; reason, propriety, law, rule, order’ (several Ancient Chinese synonyms), and Latin *rītus* ‘rite, manner, mode, way’ (de Vaan 2008: 524) (e.g., *lǐ* 禮); *ordō* ‘order, right order’ (de Vaan 2008: 434) (e.g., *xù* 序/紱); and *ars* ‘art, skill, conduct, science’ (de Vaan 2008: 55) (e.g., *shù* 數 or *shù* 術, or *jì* 技 – all with the meaning ‘art, technique’).<sup>49</sup>

A similar group of normative terms is ultimately based on the root *\*h<sub>3</sub>reg* ‘straighten, right, just’, possibly via the extension ‘to stretch out an arm’ > ‘to show’ > ‘to lead, to give orders’, again with asymmetrical parallels in Ancient Chinese – compare the Latin *rēctus* ‘right’ (*zhèng* 正 ‘right, correct > norm’), *rēgula* ‘ruler; rule’ (*shéng* 繩 ‘carpenter’s rope’ can be considered a somewhat more distant analogue), and also *rēx* ‘king’ (for all see de Vaan 2008: 517 s. v. *regō*) and its derivatives and cognates in some other Indo-European languages, such as the English *right* and the German *Recht* (‘right, law’) and all their abundant derivatives related to law, as well as the German *rechnen* (‘to count’), the translation of which into Ancient Chinese is *shù* 數.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. Zádrapa 2014, or Jia and Kwok 2007.

<sup>48</sup> The closest parallel may be *yí* 儀 and *yì* 義, both derived from *yí* 宜 ‘appropriate, fitting’.

<sup>49</sup> I suggest these equivalences on the basis of an approximate synonymy between the words.

Further, the Latin norm word *modus* ‘measure, method, way’ has a perfect counterpart in the Ancient Chinese *dù* 度, as it is based on the root *\*med* ‘to measure’ (de Vaan 2008: 384), and many less perfect but still very good counterparts in the multitude of Ancient Chinese words for various kinds of measuring devices. The Latin terms *iūs* ‘right, justice, duty’ and *iustus* ‘right, just’ have a good counterpart in the Ancient Chinese *yì* 義, but the etymological connections do not offer any revealing parallel, as the Latin words are ultimately based on the root *\*h<sub>2</sub>ey* ‘vital force, life’ (de Vaan 2008: 316), or more precisely on its derivative *h<sub>2</sub>óyu*. The Latin *formula* ‘small pattern, mould > rule, method’ is analogous to *xíng* 型 and the rare *fàn* 範, but, of course and expectedly, with a somewhat different figurative radiation of the central meaning. Other Latin words for a rule, *praescriptum* and *praescriptiō* ‘precept, order, rule’, stem from *prae* + *scribere* ‘to write’, and, as far as I know, have no parallels in Ancient Chinese.

The following Latin and Greek words can be found among the correlates of Ancient Chinese *xùn* 訓 ‘instructions’, and perhaps *xiàn* 憲 ‘statutes’, although they do not seem to indicate the same word-formative motivation:

All meaning, among other things, ‘instruction’:  
*disciplīna* < *discipulus* ‘disciple’ < *dis* + *cap-ulus* (*\*keh<sub>2</sub>p* ‘to seize, grab’) (de Vaan 2008: 172 s. v. *discipulus*, 89 s. v. *capīō*)  
*īnstructiō* < *īnstruere* ‘to set in order, to instruct’ < *stru* (*\*strew* ‘to spread’) (de Vaan 2008: 592 s. v. *struō*); *īnstrūmentum* ‘device’ is based on the same root (*ibid.*)

All meaning, among other things, ‘decree’, all transparent deverbative formations:  
*īnstitūtum* < *īnstituere* ‘to institute, to regulate’ < ultimately *stā* (*\*steh<sub>2</sub>* ‘to stand’) (de Vaan 2008: 589 s. v. *stāre*)  
*statūtum* < *statuere* ‘to impose a condition or law upon one, decree, order’, based ultimately on *stā* as well  
*dēcrētum* < *dēcernere* ‘to decide, decree’ < *dē* + *cern*, *\*krei* ‘to separate, discern’ (Latin *crīmen* ‘verdict, crime’, *certus* ‘determined, certain’; Greek *krīnō* ‘to separate, distinguish, decide’, *krīsis* ‘decision, judgement’) (de Vaan 2008: 110)  
*dogma* < *dokeō*, *\*dek* ‘to take, perceive’ (Latin *docere* ‘teach’, *dignus* ‘worthy’, *deceat* ‘it is suitable’, *decor* ‘what is seemly, grace, ornament’, *discere* ‘to learn’; Greek *doxa* ‘notion, opinion’) (Beekes 2010: 320 s. v. *dekhomai* and 344 s. v. *dokeō*, de Vaan 2008: 176)  
*axiōma* < *axiō* ‘to deem worthy’ < *axios* ‘worthy’ < *agō*, *\*h<sub>2</sub>eg* ‘to drive’ (Beekes 2010: 111 s. v. *axios*)  
*praecēptum* < *praecipere* < *prae* + *cap-* *\*keh<sub>2</sub>p* ‘to seize, grab’, meaning also ‘maxim, rule, order’ (de Vaan 2008: 89 s. v. *capīō*)

## Conclusions

It should be clear after this exposition that translations of Ancient Chinese texts into modern European languages cannot but fail to render the conceptual metaphors crucial for the normative discourse. When one translates various Ancient Chinese words into

English as “norm”, “rule”, and so forth, there is a painful awareness that these “norms” may be quite different norms, for example, in the *Shūjīng* on one hand and the *Guānzǐ* on the other. However, this problem is not only associated with translating particular passages – translators necessarily fail to convey systematic relationships, the whole complex network with its own structure and own rules that cannot be reasonably rendered in a relatively distant language.

This article is a preliminary study of the conceptual and lexical field of *NORM*. Much work remains to be done to investigate it in closer detail and in all its complexity, not to mention to make a well-founded comparison with the state of affairs in ancient and modern Europe. The material is extraordinarily extensive, as demonstrated by the overview in the appendix, and the only way to thoroughly exploit it is to use the old, lengthy “manual” method of closely reading each occurrence of a norm word in its broader context and evaluating it from the different perspectives outlined in this article. Passages in which symbolic, metaphoric, and half-concrete/half-abstract meanings come into play are especially elusive but crucial; they should be analysed extensively and in high detail, as they open the way to the very core mechanism of figurative derivation in this domain and to the conceptual foundations of the whole lexical and conceptual field, which in turn shape the given discourses. I am not aware of any study of this kind on any lexical field in Ancient Chinese. This lack of literature might be an excuse for the fact that this paper is certainly sketchy in many places and, on the whole, draws the reader’s attention to hopefully interesting data and possible methods of interpretation rather than presents neatly sorted results and extensive conclusions, for which a monograph would be a better format.

---

## REFERENCES

### Primary sources

- Academia Sinica Tagged Corpus of Old Chinese* [online]. Accessible at [http://old\\_chinese.ling.sinica.edu.tw](http://old_chinese.ling.sinica.edu.tw) (accessed 05-03-2017).
- Harbsmeier, Christoph (ed.). *Thesaurus Linguae Sericae: An Historical Encyclopaedia of Chinese Conceptual Schemes* [online]. Accessible at <http://tls.uni-hd.de> (accessed 05-03-2017).
- Sturgeon, David (ed.). *Chinese Text Project* [online]. Accessible at <http://ctext.org> (accessed 05-03-2017).

### Literature and secondary sources

- Ames, Roger T. (2011). *Confucian Role Ethics: A Vocabulary*. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press.
- Bāo Zhì míng 包智明 (2008). “Shuō dào 说《道》” [Explanation of *dào*]. *Yǔyán kēxué* 32, 26–38.
- Baxter, William (1992). *A Handbook of Old Chinese Phonology*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Baxter, William and Sagart, Laurent (2014). *Old Chinese. A New Reconstruction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Beekes, Robert S. P. (2010). *Etymological dictionary of Greek*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill.
- Behr, Wolfgang (2005). “Language Change in Premodern China: Notes on Its Perception and Impact on the Idea of a ‘Constant Way.’” In: Helwig Schmidt-Glinzer, Achim Mittag and Jörn Rüsen (edd.), *Historical Truth, Historical Criticism, and Ideology: Chinese Historiography and Historical Culture From a New Comparative Perspective*, Leiden: Brill, 13–51.
- Behr, Wolfgang (2009). “Etymologische Notizen zum Wortfeld “lachen” und “weinen” im Altchinesischen.” In: A. Nitschke et al. (edd.), *Überraschendes Lachen, gefordertes Weinen: Gefühle und Prozesse, Kulturen und Epochen im Vergleich*. Wien: Böhlau, 401–446.

- Behr, Wolfgang (2011). "Zhuangzis ‚Weg‘: eine Abschweifung" In: *Begleitbuch zum Hörbuch von H. Keller, Das Kamel und Nadelohr: Eine Begegnung zwischen Zhuangzi und Meister Eckhart*. Zürich: Universität Zürich MELS, 41–59 and 174–175.
- Behr, Wolfgang (2015). "Der gegenwärtige Forschungsstand zur Etymologie von rén 仁 im Überblick" *Bochumer Jahrbuch zur Ostasienforschung* 38, 199–224.
- Boltz, William (1990). "Three Footnotes on the Ting 鼎 'Tripod'." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 110.1, 1–8.
- Brooks, E. Bruce and Brooks, A. Taeko (1998). *The Original Analects*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Carr, Michael E. (1972). "A Linguistic Study of the Flora and Fauna Sections of the Erh-ya." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Arizona.
- Charlton, T. Lewis and Short, Charles (1879). *A Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Coblin, Weldon South (1972). "An Introductory Study of Textual and Linguistic Problems in Erh-ya." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Washington.
- Crane, Gregory R. (ed.). *Perseus Digital Library Project* [online]. Accessible at: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/> (accessed 05-02-2017).
- De Reu, Wim (2010). "How to Throw a Pot: The Centrality of the Potter's Wheel in the Zhuangzi." *Asian Philosophy: An International Journal of the Philosophical Traditions of the East* 20.1, 43–66.
- Duàn Yùcái 段玉裁 (1988). *Shuōwén jiězì zhù 說文解字注* [Shuōwén jiězì with Commentary]. Shànghǎi: Shànghǎi gǔjī chūbǎnshè.
- Duyvendak, J. J. (tr.) (1928). *The Book of Lord Shang*. London: Arthur Probsthain.
- Falkenhausen, Lothar von (1996). "The Concept of wen in the Ancient Chinese Ancestral Cult." *Chinese Literature: Essays, Articles, and Reviews* 18, 1–22.
- Goldin, Paul R. (2008). "When Zhong 忠 Does Not Mean 'Loyalty'." *Dao* 7.2, 165–174.
- Goldin, Paul R. (2011). "Persistent Misconceptions about Chinese 'Legalism'" *Journal of Chinese Philosophy* 38.1, 88–104.
- Guó Jìngyún 郭靜云 [= Olga Gorodeckaja] (2009). "Yóu Shāng-Zhōu wéndào lùn dào de běnyì 由商周文字論〈道〉的本義" [The Original Meaning of dào in Light of Shāng and Zhōu Dynasty Writing]. In: Sòng Zhènáo 宋鎮豪 (ed.), *Jiǎgǔwén yǔ Yīn-Shāngshǐ new series* 1. Běijīng: Xiànzhuāng shūjú, 203–226.
- Handel, Zev (2008). "What is Sino-Tibetan? Snapshot of a Field and a Language Family in Flux." *Language and Linguistics Compass* 2.3, 422–441.
- Hàndiǎn* 漢典 [online]. Accessible at <http://zdic.net> (accessed 05-03-2017).
- Harbsmeier, Christoph (ed.). *Thesaurus Linguae Sericae: An Historical Encyclopaedia of Chinese Conceptual Schemes* [online]. Accessible at <http://tls.uni-hd.de> (accessed 05-02-2017).
- Harbsmeier, Christoph (1999). "Weeping and Wailing in Ancient China." In: H. Eifring (ed.), *Minds and Mentalities in Traditional Chinese Literature*. Běijīng: Culture and Art Publishing House, 317–422.
- Harbsmeier, Christoph (2003). "The semantics of qíng." In: H. Eifring (ed.), *Emotions in Chinese Culture*. Leiden: Brill, 32–108.
- Harbsmeier, Christoph (2010). "Towards a Conceptual History of Some Concepts of Nature in Classical Chinese." In: Hans Ulrich Vogel et al. (edd.), *Understanding Nature in China Europe until the Eighteenth Century – A Cross-Cultural Project*. Leiden: Brill, 231–269.
- Harbsmeier, Christoph (2015). "On the Nature of Early Confucian Classical Chinese Discourse on Ethical Norms." *Journal of Value Enquiry* 49.4, 517–541.
- Huáng Shùxiān 黃樹先 (2009). "Shuō jīng 說《經》" [Explanation of jīng]. *Hànzǔ xuéào* 28, 2–15.
- Jia Jinhua and Kwok Pang-fei (2007). "From Clan Manners to Ethical Obligation and Righteousness: A New Interpretation of the Term Yi." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 117.1, 33–42.
- Jiǎng Shàoyù 蔣紹愚 (2005). *Gǔ Hànyǔ cíhuì gāngyào* 古汉语词汇纲要 [Ancient Chinese Lexicon]. Běijīng: Shāngwù yīnshūguǎn.
- Jīnwén jīnyì lèijiǎn* 金文今译类检 (2003). *Yīn-Shāng-Xīzhōu juàn*. Nánjīng: Guǎngxī jiàoyù chūbǎnshè.
- Kelsen, Hans (1990). *General Theory of Norms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kern, Martin (2001). "Ritual, Text, and the Formation of the Canon: Historical Transitions of Wen in Early China." *T'oung Pao* 87.1–3: 43–91.

- Knoblock, John (tr.). (1988–1990). *Xunzi: A Translation and Study of the Complete Works*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Kripke, Saul A. (1982). *Wittgenstein on Rules and Private Language*. Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press.
- Langacker, Ronald W. (1987). *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar I. Theoretical Prerequisites*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Legge, James (tr.) (1872). *Ch'un T'sew with the Tso Chuen*. London: Trübner.
- Lewis, Charlton T. (1890). *An Elementary Latin Dictionary*. New York, Cincinnati, and Chicago: American Book Company.
- Lewis, Mark (1999). "Warring States Political History." In: Michael Loewe and Edward G. Shaughnessy (edd.), *Cambridge History of Ancient China. From the Origins of Civilization to 221 BC*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 587–650.
- Liáng Yìqún 梁一群 (2012). "Qián-zhūzǐ shíqī de dào 前诸子时期的〈道〉" [Word dào before the Era of Philosophers]. *Zhōnggòng Níngbō shìwěi dǎngxiào xuébào* 2012.4 (= 188), 96–105.
- Liddell, Henry George and Scott, Robert (1889). *An Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Liddell, Henry George and Scott, Robert (1940). *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Loewe, Michael (ed.) (1993). *Early Chinese Texts: A Bibliographical Guide*. Berkeley: Society for the Study of Early China, Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California Berkeley.
- Mei, W. P. (tr.) (1929). *The Ethical and Political Works of Motse*. London: Probsthain.
- Packard, Jerome L. (1999). "Introduction." In: Jerome L. Packard (ed.), *New Approaches to Chinese Word Formation: Morphology, Phonology, and the Lexicon in Modern and Ancient Chinese*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1–34.
- Páng Pú 庞朴 (1994). "Yuán dào 原道" [To the Origins of dào]. *Chuántǒng wénhuà yǔ xiàndàihuà* 1994.5, 24–37.
- Pokorny, Julius (1949–1965). *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 2 vols. Bern and München: Francke.
- Qū Wǎnlǐ 屈万里 (1964). *Gǔjī dǎodú 古籍導讀 [A Guide to Ancient Books]*. Táiběi: Kāimíng shūdiàn.
- Qū Wǎnlǐ 屈万里 (1983). *Xiān-Qín wénshǐ zīliào kǎobiàn 先秦文史資料考辨 [Critique of Pre-Qin Literary and Historical Material]*. Táiběi: Liánjīng.
- Rickett, Allyn W. (tr.) (1985). *Guanzi: Political, Economic, and Philosophical Essays from Early China*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Roetz, Heiner (1994). *Confucian Ethics of the Axial Age*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Roetz, Heiner (2005). "Normativity and History in Warring States Thought. The Shift towards the Anthropological Paradigm." In: Helwig Schmidt-Glintzer, Achim Mittag und Jörn Rüsen (edd.), *Historical Truth, Historical Criticism, and Ideology Chinese Historiography and Historical Culture from a New Comparative Perspective*. Leiden: Brill, 79–92.
- Schuessler, Axel (2007). *Etymological Dictionary of Old Chinese*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Schwermann, Christian (2011). "Dummheit" in *altchinesischen Texten: Eine Begriffsgeschichte*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Sūn Xīguó 孙希国 (1992). "Dào de zhéxué chōuxiàng lìchéng 《道》的哲学抽象历程" [Process of Philosophical Abstraction of the Word dào]. *Wén-shǐ-zhé* 1992.6, 68–74.
- Takashima, Ken-ichi (1987). "Settling the Cauldron in the Right Place." In: Ma Meng (ed.), *Papers Presented to Wang Li on His Eightieth Birthday*. Hong Kong: Joint Publishing Co., 405–421.
- Thomson, Judith Jarvis (2008). *Normativity*. Chicago: Open Court.
- Vaan, Michiel Arnoud Cor de (2008). *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the Other Italic Languages*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Wáng Lǐ 王力 (1982). *Tóngyuán zìdiǎn 同源字典 [Etymological Dictionary]*. Běijīng: Shāngwù yìnyuán.
- Wèi Péiquán 魏培泉 (2009). "Cóng dàolù míngcí kàn xiān-Qín de dào 從道路名詞看先秦的〈道〉" [A View on dào from the Perspective of Way-Denoting Nouns]. In: Zhèng Jíxióng 鄭吉雄 (ed.), *Guānniànzì jiědù yǔ sīxiǎngshǐ tàn suǒ 觀念字解讀與思想史探索*. Táiběi: Táiwan xuéshēng shūjú, 1–51.

- Wú Dān 吴丹 (2013). “Shàngǔ Hànyǔ ‘dàolù’ lèi cíyǔ yánjiū 上古汉语〈道路〉类词语研究” [Study of Lexical Field ‘Way’ in Ancient Chinese]. M. A. thesis, Guǎngzhōu dàxué.
- Wú Zōngwén 伍宗文 (2001). *Xiān-Qín Hànyǔ fùyīncí yánjiū* 先秦漢語複音詞研究 [Survey of Polysyllabic Words in Pre-Imperial Chinese]. Chéngdū: Bā-Shù shūshè.
- Yáo Xiǎoping 姚小平 (1992). “Logos yǔ dào 与〈道〉” [Logos and dào]. *Wàiyǔ jiàoxué yǔ yánjiū* 1992.1, 33–44.
- Yú Yīngshí 余英时 (2013). *Shì yǔ Zhōngguó wénhuà* 士与中国文化 [Public Intellectuals and Chinese Culture]. Shànghǎi: Shànghǎi rénmin chūbǎnshè.
- Yùndiǎn* 韻典 [online]. Accessible at <http://ytenx.org> (accessed 05-03-2017).
- Zádrapa, Lukáš (2011). *Word-class Flexibility in Classical Chinese*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Zádrapa, Lukáš (2014). “Čínský pojem yì 義 a jeho český překlad” [The Chinese Term yì 義 and its Czech Translation]. *Nový Orient* 69.3, 48–55.
- Zádrapa, Lukáš (2017a). “Word, Wordhood, Pre-Modern.” In: R.P.E. Sybesma, W. Behr, Gu Yueguo, Z. J. Handel, C. T. J. Huang, James Myers (edd.), *Encyclopedia of Chinese Language and Linguistics*, vol. 4. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 549–554.
- Zádrapa, Lukáš (2017b). “Word Classes, Pre-Modern.” In: R.P.E. Sybesma, W. Behr, Gu Yueguo, Z. J. Handel, C. T. J. Huang, James Myers (edd.), *Encyclopedia of Chinese Language and Linguistics*, vol. 4. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 566–576.
- Zhāng Liánróng 张联荣 (2000). *Gǔ Hànyǔ cíyìlùn* 古汉语词义论 [Lexical Semantics of Ancient Chinese]. Běijīng: Běijīng dàxué chūbǎnshè.
- Zhào Kèqín 赵克勤 (1995). *Gǔdài Hànyǔ cíhuìxué* 古代汉语词汇学 [Lexicology of Ancient Chinese]. Běijīng: Shāngwú yīnshūguǎn.

---

#### APPENDIX

- ± = not especially typical example  
 d = definition  
 a = abstract  
 m = metaphoric  
 c = concrete  
 s = symbolic  
 v = (only) verbally  
 adj = adjectively  
 ? = dubious case  
 ! = well attested, good examples

*Shū* = *Shūjīng*, *Shī* = *Shījīng*, ZY = *Zhōuyì*, ZL = *Zhōulǐ*, YL = *Yǐlǐ*, LJ = *Lǐjì*, ZZ = *Zuǒzhuàn*, GY = *Guóyù*, LY = *Lúnyǔ*, ZGC = *Zhànguóè*, MD = *Mòzǐ*, Zh = *Zhuāngzǐ*, XZ = *Xúnzǐ*, HF = *Hánfēizǐ*, LS = *Lǚshì chūnqiū*, GZ = *Guǎnzǐ*, LZ = *Lǎozǐ*, SJS = *Shāngjūnshū*, YZ = *Yànzǐ chūnqiū*, Sūn = *Sūnzǐ*, WL = *Wèilíáo*, LT = *Liùtāo*, HGZ = *Hèguānzǐ*, SHD = *Shuǐhǔdǐ*, XJ = *Xiàojīng*, Shèn = *Shènzǐ*

#### Monosyllabic terms and constituents:

*xíng* 刑/型 ‘casting mould > model’  
*fàn* 範 ‘bamboo mould > model > rule’  
*fǎ* 法 ‘model > law’

#### Commentary to distribution:

untraced, but starting already in *Shū* and *Shī*  
 1x *Shū*, 1x verbally MZ  
 untraced, but early and most general term,  
 incl. *Shū*

*shì* 式 ‘form > model’  
*zé* 則 ‘model, rule’  
*shuài* 率 ‘model, rule’  
*lǐ* 理 ‘structure, order > rule, principle’  
  
*wén* 文 ‘(a type of) pattern’  
  
*zhāng* 章 ‘(a type) of pattern’  
  
*jīng* 經 ‘warp’  
  
*wěi* 緯 ‘weft’  
*gāng* 綱 ‘head-rope of fishing net’  
*jì* 紀 ‘(main) head of silk thread’  
  
*wéi* 維 ‘rope’  
  
*tǒng* 統 ‘main silk thread’  
*suǒ* 索 ‘rope’  
*guàn* 貫 ‘string’  
  
*guī* 軌 ‘tracks’  
*jí* 極 ‘ridgepole’  
  
*xù* 序/敍 ‘order’  
  
*zhì* 秩 ‘order’  
*shù* 數 ‘number > method’  
*lún* 倫 ‘category’  
*lèi* 類 ‘category’, both > ‘rules of conduct’  
  
*yí* 彝 ‘constant, usual > constant  
(pattern > rule)’  
*cháng* 常 ‘constant, usual > constant  
(pattern > rule)’  
*héng* 恆 ‘constant, usual > constant  
(pattern > rule)’  
*diǎn* 典 ‘constant, usual > constant  
(pattern > rule)’

*Shū, Shī*, ZL (±), LJ (±), LZ, GZ (strange),  
SHD  
*Shū, Shī*, ZY, ZL, LJ, ZZ, GY, LY, MZ, MD  
rare; XZ, GZ  
untraced in detail; very frequent in  
later texts; from ZY  
  
almost everywhere, with various  
meanings; (a/m, c/a) ZY, ZL, GY (s), XZ  
(!), HF (d), LS, GZ (?), HGZ  
*Shī* (±), LJ (±), ZZ (±), GY, Zh (±), XZ, LS,  
YZ (±)  
everywhere, starting from *Shū*, earlier  
rather verbally  
only in compounds  
*Shū* (±), *Shī* (typ.), MD, HF=LS, HGZ  
both verbally and nominally; *Shī*, ZL, LJ,  
ZZ, GY, MD, Zh, XZ, HF, LS, GZ, YZ,  
LT, HGZ, SHD  
*Shī* (v), ZL (v), Zh (v, ?), GZ (!), YZ (?),  
HGZ (?)  
YL (?), XZ (!), GZ (?)  
ZZ  
XZ, but somewhat problematic, Zh  
dubious  
ZZ, Zh, HF (!), SJS (adj), GZ  
*Shū, Shī*, maybe HF, all problematic and  
unreliable  
*Shū, Shī*, ZY, LJ, ZZ, GY, MZ (±), Zh, XZ,  
HF (±), LS, GZ, YZ, HGZ (±)  
*Shū* (±), LJ (±±)  
untraced, extremely widespread  
*Shū, Shī*, LJ, LY, Zh, MZ (±), XZ, YZ (±)  
ZY and LJ special (±), practically limited  
to XZ (!)  
*Shū, Shī*  
  
practically everywhere, frequent, starting  
from *Shī*  
sometimes parallel with *cháng*, but usually  
‘constancy’, rare)  
*Shū, Shī*, ZL, LJ, ZZ, GY, MD (?), LS

<i>yōng</i> 庸 ‘constant, usual > constant (pattern > rule)’	<i>Shū</i>
<i>jiù</i> 舊 ‘old (good methods) > ancient norms’	<i>Shī</i>
<i>dào</i> 道 ‘way > method > norm’	untraced, ubiquitous, general word, starting from <i>Shū</i>
<i>shù</i> 術 ‘way > method > right method’	ubiquitous except for <i>Shū</i> and <i>Shī</i>
<i>chéng</i> 程 ‘measure (in general)’	<i>Shī</i> (v); XZ, HF, SJS, SHD
<i>dù</i> 度 ‘length measure’	untraced, ubiquitous, general word, starting from <i>Shū</i>
<i>kuí</i> 揆 ‘direction measure’	MZ, HF (v, ±)
<i>quán</i> 權 ‘weight’	ZL (±), LJ, GY (m), MZ (v, m), XZ (v, m), SJS (m)
<i>héng</i> 衡 ‘arm of steelyard > balance’	( <i>Shū</i> c/s), (LJ c/s), LJ (m), XZ (!), HF (m), GZ (m)
<i>chèng</i> 稱/秤 ‘steelyard’	GZ, Sūn
<i>liàng</i> 量 ‘volume measure’	untraced, ubiquitous, general, from <i>Shū</i> (s) onward
<i>gài</i> 概 ‘levelling stick’	XZ (!), GZ (?)
<i>zhǔn</i> 準 ‘level’	XZ (m), HF, GZ, Shèn (v)
<i>guī</i> 規 ‘compass’	LJ (m), MD (m), HF (“admonish”), GZ
<i>jǔ</i> 矩 ‘carpenter’s square’	LJ (m), LY, MD (m), XZ (m), (LS m), GZ (m)
<i>shéng</i> 繩 ‘carpenter’s rope’	LJ (m), MD (m), Zh (m), XZ (!), HF (!), Shèn, LS, SJS, GZ, HGZ
<i>mò</i> 墨 ‘ink line (for straight sawing)’	only in compounds
<i>lǜ</i> 律 ‘tuning pipe’	( <i>Shū</i> s), ZY (!), LJ (v), ZZ, GY (±), XZ (!), SJS, GZ, WL, SHD (!)
<i>yí</i> 儀 ‘indicator’	<i>Shī</i> and <i>Shū</i> misleading, meaning usually ‘dignified manner’; ZZ, GY, MD, XZ (m, !), GZ
<i>biǎo</i> 表 ‘marking pillar’	LJ, XZ (m, !), HF (m, !), LS (m), HGZ (m), SHD
<i>niè</i> 臬 ‘gnomon’	<i>Shū</i>
<i>zhèng</i> 正 ‘upright > norm’	common, starting with <i>Shū</i>
<i>yì</i> 義 ‘social or moral appropriateness’	untraced, ubiquitous, beginning with <i>Shū</i>
<i>zhì</i> 制 ‘control > regulations, system, regime’	common; ZY (?), ZL, LJ, ZZ (!), GY (!), ZGC, MZ, MD, (Zh ?), XZ (!), HF, LS, SJS, GZ (!), YZ, WL, HGZ
<i>jié</i> 節 ‘bamboo joint > restrain(t); rhythm, standard, rules of conduct, moral integrity’	untraced, common word, all over later texts

( <i>jiǎn</i> 檢 ‘examine, restrain > laws, statutes’	only in a compound)
( <i>jī</i> 稽 ‘examine; control’ (both once in a binome),	only in a compound)
<i>fú</i> 幅 ‘cloth width (standard) > standard’	ZZ=YZ
<i>fāng</i> 方 ‘direction > method’	common, often non-normative “method”; LJ, ZZ, GY, ZGC, LY (±), MZ (±), MD, Zh (±), XZ, HF, LS, GZ
<i>xiàn</i> 憲 ‘decree’	<i>Shū, Shī</i> , ZL, LJ, GY, ZGC, MD, GZ
<i>lìng</i> 令 ‘order’	ubiquitous, general word, starting from <i>Shū</i>
<i>mìng</i> 命 ‘order’	ubiquitous, general word, starting from <i>Shū</i>
<i>jìn</i> 禁 ‘prohibition’	ubiquitous, but missing in <i>Shū, Shī</i> or ZY, later texts
<i>xùn</i> 訓 ‘instruct, instruction’	<i>Shū</i> , ZL, ZZ, GY, MZ
<i>dì</i> 的 ‘target’	HF (m)
( <i>zhì</i> 質 ‘target’	only in a compound)

#### Disyllabic words:

<i>wénzhāng</i> 文章 < ‘pattern’ + ‘(a kind of) pattern’
<i>wénlǐ</i> 文理 < ‘pattern’ + ‘structure, arrangement’

#### Commentary to distribution:

(ZGC ?). XZ (c/a, !), HF (c/a), YZ (c/a)

1x LJ, all XZ (!)

<i>biāoyí</i> 表儀 < ‘marking pillar’ + ‘standard’	ZZ, XZ, GZ, HGZ
<i>yíbiāo</i> 儀表 < ‘standard’ + ‘marking pillar’	HF, GZ
<i>dùchéng</i> 度程 < ‘length measure’ + ‘measure’	(LJ=LS s)
<i>fǎchéng</i> 法程 < ‘model’ + ‘measure’	LS
<i>chéngshì</i> 程式 < ‘measure’ + ‘pattern, model’	1x SJS, 3x GZ
<i>guǐchéng</i> 軌程 < ‘track’ + ‘measure’	GZ
<i>lǜchéng</i> 律程 < ‘tuning pipe’ + ‘measure’	SHD

<i>quánchèng</i> 權稱 < ‘weight’ + ‘balance’	XZ, GZ
<i>chèngliàng</i> 稱量 < ‘balance’ + ‘volume measure’	GZ

<i>jiùfú</i> 舊服 < ‘old’ + ‘rules’	<i>Shū</i>
<i>jiùzhāng</i> 舊章 < ‘old’ + ‘regulations (< patterns)’	<i>Shū</i>
<i>jiùdiǎn</i> 舊典 < ‘old’ + ‘standards’	ZZ, GY, LS

<i>jiùfǎ</i> 舊法 < 'old' + 'models, laws'	ZZ, GY
<i>jiùcháng</i> 舊常 < 'old' + 'constant rules'	GY
<i>jiùguàn</i> 舊貫 < 'old' + 'rules (< string)'	LY (±)
<i>quángài</i> 權概 < 'weight' + 'levelling stick'	(LS s)
<i>yílún</i> 彝倫 < 'constant rule' + 'category'	<i>Shū</i>
<i>yìxùn</i> 彝訓 < 'constant rule' + 'instruction'	<i>Shū</i>
<i>fēiyí</i> 非彝 < 'not be' + 'constant rule'	<i>Shū</i>
<i>yìxiàn</i> 彝憲 < 'constant (rule)' + 'statutes, rules'	<i>Shū</i>
<i>xíngbì</i> 刑辟 < 'punishment' + 'law'	ZZ, GY, XZ, HF, YZ
<i>fǎfèn</i> 法分 < 'model, law' + 'division; status'	GZ
<i>fǎzhèng</i> 法正 < 'model, law' + '(upright > norm'	XZ
<i>fǎlìng</i> 法令 < 'model, law' + 'order'	LJ, ZGC, MD, XZ, HF (!), LS, LZ, SJS (!), GZ, Sūn, LT, HGZ, WZ
<i>fǎxíng</i> 法刑 < 'model, law' + 'punishment'	GY, HFZ
<i>xíngfǎ</i> 刑法 < 'punishment' + 'model, law'	ZZ, GY
<i>fǎjìn</i> 法禁 < 'model, law' + 'prohibition'	HF, GZ, LT
<i>fǎbì</i> 法辟 < 'model, law' + 'norm, law'	HF, GZ
<i>gùfǎ</i> 故法 < 'old, former' + 'model, law'	HF, LS
<i>chángfǎ</i> 常法 < 'constant' + 'model, law'	ZZ, GY, XZ, HF, GZ, YZ, WL, Shèn
<i>jìnfǎ</i> 禁法 < 'prohibition' + 'model, law'	HF
<i>jìnfǎlìng</i> 禁法令 < 'prohibition' + 'model, law' + 'order'	SJS
<i>dàofǎ</i> 道法 < 'right way, method, norm' + 'model, law'	XZ
<i>lǐfǎ</i> 禮法 < 'ritual standards' + 'model, law'	XZ
<i>bǎikuí</i> 百揆 < 'hundred' + 'measure'	<i>Shū</i> , ZZ
<i>kuìdù</i> 揆度 < 'measure' + 'length measure'	HGZ
<i>diǎnxíng</i> 典型 < 'standard' + 'model (< mould)'	<i>Shū</i> , <i>Shī</i> , GY, MZ, XZ
<i>shuàidiǎn</i> 率典 < 'norm' + 'standard'	<i>Shū</i>
<i>diǎnlǐ</i> 典禮 < 'standard' + 'rite'	ZY
<i>diǎnyào</i> 典要 < 'standard' + 'key point'	ZY
<i>diǎncháng</i> 典常 < 'standard' + 'constant rule'	ZY

<i>xiāndiǎn</i> 先典 < ‘former’ + ‘standard’ numeral + <i>diǎn</i> 典 genitive + <i>diǎn</i> 典	YL
<i>xùndiǎn</i> 訓典 < ‘instruction’ + ‘standard’	ZZ, GY
<i>lìngdiǎn</i> 令典 < ‘good’ + ‘standard’	ZZ
<i>sìdiǎn</i> 嗣典 < ‘inherit’ + ‘standard’	GY (±)
<i>diǎnfǎ</i> 典法 < ‘standard’ + ‘law’	Zh, GZ
<i>diǎnzhì</i> 典制 < ‘standard’ + ‘regulation’	XZ
<i>dàlún</i> 大倫 < ‘big’ + ‘category’	LJ (±), LY (±)
<i>lúnlǐ</i> 倫理 < ‘category’ + ‘structure’ (,)	LJ
<i>lúnlèi</i> 倫類 < ‘category’ + ‘category’	XZ
<i>lúnděng</i> 倫等 (?) < ‘category’ + ‘degree’	GZ
<i>lúnlìe</i> 倫列 (?) < ‘category’ + ‘row, rank’	MD
<i>bǎisuǒ</i> 百索 < ‘hundred’ + ‘rule (? < rope)’	XZ
<i>jiéwén</i> 節文 < ‘regulation, moderation’ + ‘pattern’	LJ, XZ
<i>jiùwén</i> 舊文 < ‘old’ + ‘pattern’	(XZ – rather concrete use)
<i>jīngjì</i> 經紀 < ‘guideline (< warp)’ + ‘guideline (< silk thread)’	LJ, XZ, LS, GZ, YZ, LT
<i>dàjīng</i> 大經 < ‘great’ + ‘guideline (< warp)’	LJ, ZZ, LS, GZ
<i>jīnglǐ</i> 經理 < ‘guideline (< warp)’ + ‘structure’	XZ
numeral + <i>jīng</i> 經	
<i>jīngwǎi</i> 經緯 < ‘warp (> guideline)’ + ‘weft (> guideline)’	often verbally, ZZ, GY, Zh, XZ
<i>chángjīng</i> 常經 < ‘constant’ + ‘guideline (< warp)’	ZGC, GZ
<i>jīngshì</i> 經式 < ‘guideline (< warp)’ + ‘model’	Zh
<i>jīngchén</i> 經臣 <i>jīngsú</i> 經俗 <i>jīngchǎn</i> 經產	GZ
<i>jīngcháng</i> 經常 < ‘guideline (< warp)’ + ‘constant rule’	GZ
<i>jīngzhì</i> 經制 (v) < ‘organize (< warp)’ + ‘regulate’	WL (v)
<i>jīnglìng</i> 經令 (v) < ‘organize (< warp)’ + ‘order’	WL (v)
<i>jīngfǎ</i> 經法 < ‘guideline (< warp)’ + ‘law’	HGZ

<i>lǐjīng</i> 禮經 < ‘ritual standards’ + ‘guideline (< warp)’	ZZ, XZ
<i>shànjīng</i> 善經 < ‘good’ + ‘guideline (< warp)’	ZZ
<i>shìjīng</i> 事經 < ‘affairs’ + ‘guideline (< warp)’	HF
numeral + <i>shù</i> 術	
genitive + <i>shù</i> 術 (large amounts)	
<i>fǎshù</i> 法術 < ‘law’ + ‘(ruling) method’	ZGC, HF (!), SJS, GZ, Shèn
<i>yàoshù</i> 要術 < ‘key’ + ‘method’	XZ
<i>shùshù</i> 術數 < ‘method (< way)’ + ‘method (< number)’	HF, GZ, HGZ
<i>jīngshù</i> 經術 < ‘guideline (< warp)’ + ‘method’	<i>Sùwèn</i>
<i>dàoshù</i> 道術 < ‘right method (< way)’ + ‘method (< way)’	MD, Zh (!), XZ, HF, LS, GZ, YZ
<i>fāngshù</i> 方術 < ‘method’ + ‘method (< way)’	XZ, LS
<i>běngāng</i> 本綱 < ‘basis’ + ‘head-rope of fishing net’	HF
<i>zhǔnshéng</i> 準繩 < ‘level’ + ‘carpenter’s rope’	MZ (c/a), LS (m), GZ (m)
<i>shéngzhǔn</i> 繩準 < ‘carpenter’s rope’ + ‘level’	GZ rather concretely
<i>zhǔnrén</i> 準人 < ‘level > norm, law’ + ‘people’	<i>Shū</i>
<i>shéngmò</i> 繩墨 < ‘carpenter’s rope’ + ‘ink lines’	ZGC (±), MZ (m), Zh, XZ, HF, SJS (!), GZ
<i>mínjì</i> 民紀 < ‘people’ + ‘guideline, rule (< silk thread)’	LJ, GZ
<i>jìlǜ</i> 紀律 < ‘guideline, rule (< silk thread)’ + ‘rule (< tuning pipe)’	ZZ
<i>jìjí</i> 紀極 < ‘guideline, rule (< silk thread)’ + ‘rule (< extreme)’	ZZ
<i>jìtǒng</i> 紀統 < ‘guideline, rule (< silk thread)’ + ‘guideline (< main thread of silk)’	GY
numeral + <i>jì</i> 紀	
<i>dàjì</i> 大紀 < ‘great’ + ‘guideline, rule (< silk thread)’	GY, LY

<i>dàoji</i> 道紀 < ‘right method’ + ‘guideline, rule (< silk thread)’	LZ (±)
<i>běnji</i> 本紀 < ‘basic’ + ‘guideline, rule (< silk thread)’	GZ (?)
<i>zhèngjì</i> 正紀 < ‘correct’ + ‘guideline, rule (< silk thread)’	GZ
<i>gāngjì</i> 綱紀 ‘hear-rope of fishing net’ + ‘guideline, rule (< silk thread)’	<i>Shī</i> (v), XZ
<i>sìwéi</i> 四維 < ‘four’ + ‘guideline (< rope)’	GZ
<i>wéigāng</i> 維綱 < ‘guideline (< rope)’ + ‘guideline (< head-rope of fishing net)’	Zh, GZ
<i>zhìdì</i> 質的 < ‘target’ + ‘target’	XZ (m)
<i>dìgòu</i> 的殼 < ‘target’ + ‘shooting range’	HF (m)
<i>zhèngdì</i> 正的 < ‘norm (< correct)’ + ‘target’	HF (m)
<i>guǐliàng</i> 軌量 < ‘track’ + ‘volume measure’	ZZ (±), but strange
<i>bùguī</i> 不軌 < ‘not’ + ‘track’	ZZ
<i>guǐyí</i> 軌儀 < ‘track’ + ‘standard’	GY
<i>guǐjié</i> 軌節 < ‘track’ + ‘regulation’	HF
<i>guǐdù</i> 軌度 < ‘track’ + ‘measure’	ZZ (v), LS
<i>guījǔ</i> 規矩 < ‘compass’ + ‘carpenter’s square’	LJ (m), MZ (m), MD, Zh (m), XZ, HF (m, !), LS, GZ, YZ
<i>guīshéng</i> 規繩 < ‘compass’ + ‘carpenter’s rope’	XZ
numeral + <i>cháng</i> 常	
genitive + <i>cháng</i> 常	
<i>dàcháng</i> 大常 < ‘great’ + ‘constant rule’	Zh
<i>gǔcháng</i> 古常 < ‘ancient’ + ‘constant rule’	YZ
<i>yǒucháng</i> 有常 < ‘have’ (or prefix?) + ‘constant rule’	<i>Shū</i>
<i>héngcháng</i> 恆常 < ‘constant (rule)’ + ‘constant rule’	GY
<i>gùcháng</i> 故常 < ‘old, original’ + ‘constant rule’	Zh, HF
numeral + <i>jí</i> 極	
<i>mínjí</i> 民極 < ‘people’ + ‘law (< extreme)’	<i>Shū</i> , ZL
<i>tiānjí</i> 天極 < ‘heaven’ + ‘law (< extreme)’	GZ (?)

<i>bǎidù</i> 百度 < ‘hundred’ + ‘(length) measure’	GY
<i>zhìdù</i> 制度 < ‘regulation’ + ‘(length) measure’	LJ, ZZ, GY, XZ (!), SJS, GZ, WL
<i>dìngdù</i> 定度 < ‘fix’ + ‘(length) measure’	GZ
<i>fǎdù</i> 法度 < ‘law’ + ‘(length) measure’	Shū, ZZ, ZGC, LY, Zh, XZ, HF (!), SJS, GZ (!), LT, Shèn, HGZ, SHD (LJ=LS c/s)
<i>dùchéng</i> 度程 < ‘(length) measure’ + ‘measure’	
<i>dùliàng</i> 度量 < ‘(length) measure’ + ‘(volume) measure’	LS (s), GY, MZ, XZ (!), HF (!), SJS, GZ, Shèn, HGZ
<i>dùyí</i> 度儀 < ‘length measure’ + ‘gnomon, indicator’	GZ
<i>dùshù</i> 度數 < ‘length measure’ + ‘number (> method)’	ZL, LJ, Zh, HF (!), SJS, GZ, HGZ
<i>lǜdù</i> 律度 < ‘regulation (< tuning pipe)’ + ‘(length) measure’	ZZ, GZ
<i>yìdù</i> 義度 < ‘social propriety’ + ‘(length) measure’	Zh
<i>shùdù</i> 數度 < ‘number’ + ‘(length) measure’	ZY (s), (ZL), Zh (±)
<i>dédù</i> 德度 < ‘virtue’ + ‘(length) measure’	ZZ, but spurious
<i>quándù</i> 權度 < ‘weight’ + ‘(length) measure’	ZL, GZ
<i>liàngdù</i> 量度 < ‘(volume) measure’ + ‘(length) measure’	ZL
<i>fǎshì</i> 法式 < ‘model, law’ + ‘model, pattern’	Zh, XZ, LS, GZ
<i>jīnshì</i> 矜式 (v) < ‘advocate’ + ‘model, pattern’	MZ
<i>chángshì</i> 常式 < ‘constant’ + ‘model, pattern’	GZ
<i>yìshìxíng</i> 儀式型 (v) < ‘model, standard’ + ‘model, pattern’ + ‘(mould >) model’	Shī
<i>jiǎnshì</i> 檢式 < ‘laws, statutes (< control < examine)’ + ‘model, pattern’	GZ
<i>jīshì</i> 稽式 < ‘laws, statutes (control < examine)’ + ‘model, pattern’	LZ
<i>fēiyì</i> 非義 < ‘be not’ + ‘social propriety’	ZZ
<i>bùyì</i> 不義 < ‘not’ + ‘socially proper’	LJ, ZZ, ZGC, MZ, XZ, HF, LS (!), GZ, WL, XJ
<i>rényì</i> 人義 < ‘man’ + ‘social propriety’	LJ

<i>lǐyì</i> 禮義 < ‘ritual propriety’ + ‘social propriety’	ZY, LJ, ZZ, GY, ZGC, MZ, Zh, XZ (!!), HF, GZ, YZ, HGZ
<i>lǐyì</i> 理義 < ‘structure, order’ + ‘social propriety’	MZ, LS, GZ
numeral + <i>yì</i> 義	
<i>gōngyì</i> 公義 < ‘public’ + ‘propriety’	MD, XZ, HF, Shèn
<i>fēnyì</i> 分義 < ‘social role’ + ‘social propriety’	XZ
<i>dàyì</i> 大義 < ‘great’ + ‘(social) propriety’	ZY, LJ, ZZ, GY, Zh, XZ, LS, GZ, YZ, LT
generally many genitives + <i>yì</i> 義 and <i>yì</i> 義 + noun	
<i>zhèngyì</i> 正義 < ‘correct > correctness, standard’ + ‘social propriety’	XZ, LS
<i>fǎyì</i> 法義 < ‘law’ + ‘social propriety’	HF, HGZ
<i>gāoyì</i> 高義 < ‘lofty’ + ‘moral principles’	ZGC, Zh, HGZ
<i>chángyì</i> 常義 < ‘constant’ + ‘principles’	GZ
<i>tōngyì</i> 通義 < ‘general’ + ‘principle’	MZ, XZ
<i>jiéyì</i> 節義 < ‘social rules’ + ‘social propriety’	GY, GZ
<i>yìzhèng</i> 義正 < ‘social propriety’ + ‘(correct >) norm’	MD, GZ
<i>yìfǎ</i> 義法 < ‘social propriety’ + ‘law’	MD, XZ
<i>yìshuài</i> 義率 < ‘social propriety’ + ‘norm’	<i>Shū</i>
<i>yìlǐ</i> 義理 < ‘social propriety’ + ‘order, correct structure’	LJ, HF, LS, GZ, YZ
<i>yìlǐ</i> 義禮 < ‘social propriety’ + ‘ritual propriety’	GZ
<i>dàoyì</i> 道義 < ‘right method (< way)’ + ‘socially proper conduct’	ZY, LJ, XZ, GZ, YZ
<i>yìdào</i> 義道 < ‘socially proper conduct’ + ‘right method (< way)’	LJ, GZ
<i>lǜlìng</i> 律令 < ‘regulations (< tuning pipe)’ + ‘order’	ZGC, SHD
<i>fǎlǜ</i> 法律 < ‘law’ + ‘regulations (< tuning pipe)’	Zh, HF, LS, GZ, SHD
<i>lǜguàn</i> 律貫 < ‘regulations (< tuning pipe)’ + ‘guidelines, system (< string)’	XZ
<i>zhènglǜ</i> 正律 < ‘(correct >) norm’ + ‘regulations (< tuning pipe)’	SJS
<i>dàlǜ</i> 大律 < ‘great’ + ‘regulations (< tuning pipe)’	SJS
<i>xiànlǜ</i> 憲律 < ‘statutes’ + ‘regulations (< tuning pipe)’	GZ

<i>shìlǜ</i> 事律 < ‘affair’ + ‘regulations ( < tuning pipe )’	GZ
<i>yònglǜ</i> 用律 < ‘employ(ed)’ + ‘regulations ( < tuning pipe )’	SHD
numeral + <i>yí</i> 儀	
<i>zhèngyí</i> 正儀 < ‘(correct> ) norm’ + ‘standard’	XZ
<i>dàyí</i> 大儀 < ‘great’ + ‘standard’	GZ
<i>fǎyí</i> 法儀 < ‘law’ + ‘standard’	MD, GZ, YZ
<i>yíxíng</i> 儀型 < ‘standard’ + ‘model’	Shū
<i>yídì</i> 儀的 < ‘standard’ + ‘target’	HF
<i>yífǎ</i> 儀法 < ‘standard’ + ‘law, model’	MD, YZ
<i>yízé</i> 儀則 < ‘standard’ + ‘rule’	Zh
<i>yíjié</i> 儀節 < ‘standard’ + ‘regulation, rules’	ZZ
<i>héngyí</i> 衡儀 < ‘(arm of) steelyard’ + ‘standard’	GZ
<i>lǐyí</i> 禮儀 < ‘rites’ + ‘standard’	ZL, LJ, XZ
<i>jiézhì</i> 節制 < ‘regulations, rules’ + ‘regulations’	XZ, WL
<i>zhìjié</i> 秩節 < ‘order’ + ‘regulations, rules’	LJ
<i>dàjié</i> 大節 < ‘great’ + ‘regulations, rules’	ZZ, GY, LY, XZ, YZ
<i>dàzhāng</i> 大章 < ‘great’ + ‘pattern’	GY
<i>tǒnglèi</i> 統類 < ‘guideline ( < main thread of silk )’ + ‘(category >) rule of conduct’	XZ, special
<i>běntǒng</i> 本統 < ‘basis’ + ‘guideline ( < main thread of silk )’	XZ
<i>tǒngshuài</i> 統率 (v) < guide ( < main thread of silk )’ + ‘guide’	(LS)
<i>zhìliàng</i> 制量 < ‘regulation ( < control )’ + ‘(volume) measure’	GY
<i>zhìshù</i> 制數 < ‘regulation ( < control )’ + ‘method ( < number )’	XZ
<i>fǎzhì</i> 法制 < ‘law’ + ‘regulation ( < control )’	LJ, ZZ, GY, HF, LS, SJS (!), GZ (!!), WL, Shèn, HGZ
many genitives + <i>zhì</i> 制	
<i>héngzhì</i> 恆制 < ‘constant’ + ‘regulation ( < control )’	GY

<i>shèngzhì</i> 聖制 < ‘sage’ + ‘system of regulation’	LS
<i>lǐzhì</i> 禮制 < ‘rites’ + ‘system of regulation’	LJ, XZ, GZ
<i>quánzhì</i> 權制 < ‘weight’ + ‘regulation (< control)’	SJS 1x
<i>zhìlìng</i> 制令 < ‘regulation (< control)’ + ‘order’	ZZ, ZGC, SJS, GZ
<i>zhèngquán</i> 正權 < ‘(correct >) norm’ + ‘weight’	XZ (m)
<i>héngquán</i> 衡權 < ‘(arm of) steelyard’ + ‘weight’	ZGC, Zh, XZ, HF, LS, SJS, GZ, WL, Shèn, SHD
<i>quánliàng</i> 權量 < ‘weight’ + ‘(volume) measure’	(ZL c/a), LY
<i>quánhéng</i> 權衡 < ‘weight’ + ‘(arm of) steelyard’	SHD
<i>shùliàng</i> 數量 < ‘number’ + ‘(volume) measure’	(XZ c/a)
<i>xiànlìng</i> 憲令 < ‘statute’ + ‘order’	ZZ, GY, HF, GZ
<i>xiànfǎ</i> 憲法 < ‘statute’ + ‘law’	GY, GZ
<i>xiànzé</i> 憲則 < ‘statute’ + ‘rule’	ZL, GY
<i>xiànshù</i> 憲術 < ‘statute’ + ‘right method (< way)’	GZ
<i>xiànzhāng</i> 憲章 (v) < ‘statute’ + ‘pattern’	LJ
<i>lǐxiàn</i> 禮憲 < ‘ritual standards’ + ‘statutes, rules’	XZ
<i>chángxiàn</i> 常憲 < ‘constant’ + ‘statutes, rules’	Shū
<i>chéngxiàn</i> 成憲 < ‘completed, fixed’ + ‘statutes, rules’	Shū
<i>dàshù</i> 大數 < ‘great’ + ‘method (< number)’	LJ, ZZ, GZ (±), LT, HGZ
<i>běnrshù</i> 本數 < ‘basic’ + ‘method (< number)’	Zh
<i>fǎshù</i> 法數 < ‘law’ + ‘method (< number)’	XZ, HF, GZ
<i>chángshù</i> 常數 < ‘constant’ + ‘method (< number)’	ZGC, XZ
<i>shùyào</i> 數要 < ‘method (< number)’ + ‘key point’	ZL
<i>fǎzé</i> 法則 < ‘law’ + ‘rule’	LJ, ZZ, MD, Zh, XZ (!), LS, WL, HGZ

many genitives + <i>zé</i> 則	
<i>bǎizé</i> 百則 < ‘hundred’ + ‘rule’	GY
<i>běnzé</i> 本則 < ‘’ + ‘rule’	GZ
<i>xùnzé</i> 訓則 < ‘instructions’ + ‘rules’	GY
<i>lǐzé</i> 禮則 < ‘ritual norms of conduct’ + ‘rules’	ZZ
<i>qiánxùn</i> 前訓 < ‘former’ + ‘instructions’	GY
<i>míngxùn</i> 明訓 and similar	GY
<i>gǔxùn</i> 古訓 < ‘ancient’ + ‘instructions’	Shū
<i>dàxùn</i> 大訓 < ‘great’ + ‘instructions’	Shū
<i>jiàoxùn</i> 教訓 < ‘instruction’ + ‘instructions’	ZZ, GZ, YZ
<i>xiàxùn</i> 夏訓 < ‘Xià’ + ‘instructions’	ZZ
<i>xùncí</i> 訓辭 < ‘instructions’ + ‘formulations’	ZZ, GY
<i>yíxùn</i> 遺訓 < ‘leave over’ + ‘instructions’	GY
<i>dàfāng</i> 大方 < ‘great’ + ‘method’	Zh, LS, LZ
<i>wěifāng</i> 偽方 < ‘deceive’ + ‘method’	LT, rather non-normative “method”
<i>fāfāng</i> 法方 < ‘model’ + ‘method’	XZ
<i>fāngshù</i> 方術 < ‘method’ + ‘method (< number)’	Zh, XZ, HF, LS
<i>fānglüè</i> 方略 < ‘method’ + ‘strategy’	XZ
<i>fāngjì</i> 方技 < ‘method’ + ‘technique, art’	MD
<i>fāngzhèng</i> 方正 < ‘upright’ + ‘correct’	HF
<i>fāngxīn</i> 方心 < ‘upright’ + ‘thinking, attitude’	GZ
<i>yifāng</i> 義方 < ‘social propriety’ + ‘method’	ZZ, GY
<i>gōnglǐ</i> 公理 < ‘(pro)-public’ + ‘structure, pattern > order > rules’	GZ
<i>sīlǐ</i> 私理 < ‘(pro)-private’ + ‘structure, pattern > order > rules’	GZ
many genitives + <i>lǐ</i> 理	
<i>dàlǐ</i> 大理 < ‘great’ + ‘structure, pattern > order > rules’	XZ, HF, LS, GZ
<i>shìlǐ</i> 事理 < ‘affair’ + ‘structure, pattern > order > rules’	XZ
<i>chénglǐ</i> 成理 < ‘complet(ed)’ + ‘structure, pattern > order > rules’	Zh
<i>tínglǐ</i> 廷理 < ‘courtyard’ + ‘structure, pattern > order > rules’	HF

<i>dìnglǐ</i> 定理 < ‘fix(ed)’ + ‘structure, pattern > > order > rules’	HF
<i>wùlǐ</i> 物理 < ‘thing’ + ‘structure, pattern > order > rules’	HGZ
<i>zhìlǐ</i> 治理 < ‘order’ + ‘structure, pattern > order > rules’	HF
<i>fēilǐ</i> 非理 < ‘not be’ + ‘structure, pattern > order > rules’	GZ
<i>zhènglǐ</i> 政理 < ‘political measure’ + ‘structure, pattern > order > rules’	GZ
<i>tiáolǐ</i> 條理 < ‘system, order’ + ‘structure, pattern > order > rules’	MZ (±)
<i>chánglǐ</i> 常理 < ‘constant’ + ‘structure, pattern > order > rules’	HGZ, HF, Shèn
<i>dàolǐ</i> 道理 < ‘right way’ + ‘structure, pattern > order > rules’	Zh, XZ, HF (!), Shèn, ZGC
<i>zhènglǐ</i> 正理 < ‘upright, correct (> norm)’ + ‘structure, pattern > order > rules’	HF, GZ
many genitives + <i>dào</i> 道 ‘way > method > right methods’	
<i>bùdào</i> 不道 ‘not’ + ‘way > method > right methods’	ZZ, GY, MD
<i>fēidào</i> 非道 ‘not be’ + ‘way > method > right methods’	XZ
<i>dàdào</i> 大道 ‘great’ + ‘way > method > right methods’	LJ, ZZ, MZ, Zh, XZ, HF, LS, LZ, GZ, WL, Shèn, HGZ
<i>zhèngdào</i> 正道 ‘correct’ + ‘way > method > right methods’	LJ, XZ, HF, GZ, Shèn
<i>duāndào</i> 端道 ‘correct’ + ‘way > method > right methods’	HF
<i>zhìdào</i> 至道 ‘ultimate’ + ‘way > method > right methods’	LJ, ZGC, Zh, XZ, GZ, LT, HGZ
<i>miàodào</i> 妙道 ‘superb’ + ‘way > method > right methods’	Zh
<i>míngdào</i> 明道 ‘bright’ + ‘way > method > right methods’	LZ
<i>yàodào</i> 要道 ‘key > crucial point’ + ‘way > method > right methods’	ZGC, XJ
<i>shéndào</i> 神道 ‘supernaturally efficient’ + ‘way > method > right methods’	ZY

<i>chángdào</i> 常道 ‘constant’ + ‘way > method > right methods’	ZGC, XZ, HF, LZ, GZ, Shèn
<i>shùdào</i> 術道 ‘way > method’ + ‘way > method > right methods’	XZ
<i>dàoběn</i> 道本 ‘way > method > right methods’ + ‘basis’	ZL
<i>dàoguàn</i> 道貫 ‘way > method > right methods’ + ‘string > basic method’	XZ