ABSTRACT
This paper supports and extends the results of previous studies, such as Pulleyblank (1986) and Chang (2012), that argue that the choice of 至 or 於 in Classical Chinese is not random, but rather is conditioned by the features of the preceding verb. Through a close examination of the co-occurrence of 至 and 於 with the high-frequency verb 至 in six Warring States period texts, it is shown that additional semantic and syntactic factors influence the choice between the two. Semantically speaking, while both 至 and 於 occur followed by a noun indicating a place, a time, or a person—all of which can be described as [+concrete] goals—it is only 於 that occurs followed by a degree, result, or extent, which can be described as [-concrete] goals. The [-concrete] goals that appear as objects of 於 include a near demonstrative pronoun 此, a noun (including an abstract noun) or noun phrase, a verb phrase, and even a sentence. Syntactically speaking, only "於 + Noun" appears in nominalized contexts in complex syntactic structures, such as before a nominalizer 者, before or after a relativizer 所, and as a head noun after a
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The semantic and syntactic difference between 但不限 and 但不限 provide additional support for the claim that 但不限 and 但不限 represent distinct lexical items, with distinct semantic feature sets in Classical Chinese.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The origins of and functional differences between 但不限 and 但不限 have long been controversial. 但不限 appears as early as in the oracle-bone inscriptions with wide range of usages, whereas 但不限 starts to appear only sporadically and with very limited usages in Shang Shu 尚書 (The Book of Documents) and Shi Jing 诗经 (The Book of Odes). Based on data from both transmitted and excavated texts, the author (Chang 2012) has previously argued that 但不限 originated from a verb of movement, whose feature set can be described as [+lexical, +movement (=mvt), +goal, -source] or [+lexical, +mvt, -goal, +source], whereas 但不限 originated from a locative verb, whose feature set can be described as [+lexical, -mvt, -goal, -source]. The grammaticalization path of 但不限 is similar to that of verbs of movement in other languages, while 但不限 followed a grammaticalization path typical of locative verbs. That is, while 但不限 first grammaticalized into a goal marker (or allative marker) with spatial meaning and further grammaticalized into a recipient marker co-occurring with V[+give], 但不限 first grammaticalized into a locative marker. This is in accordance with the idea of Pulleyblank (1986) that the choice between 但不限 and 但不限 is mainly conditioned by the features of the previous verb. For instance, in Yi Li 儀禮 (The ceremonies and rites), where the ratio of 但不限 to 但不限 is approximately 9:1, 但不限 is by far preferred when the previous verb is a verb of movement or V[+give], while 但不限 is preferred when the previous verb is a stationary verb or a verb with no sense of directionality. When 但不限 started to replace 但不限, the instances of 但不限 in which the feature set was closely related to the original core feature set of 但不限 resisted replacement better, while the instances of 但不限 in which the feature set was more distant from the original feature set were the first to be replaced by 但不限.
The semantic and syntactic difference between 至于 and 至於


戦國文献裡出現的‘至于’、‘至於’的語法意，語法上的差異
張廷任
嘉泉大學（韓國）

提要
本文經過調查戰國文獻裡出現的‘至于’和‘至於’的例子來證明它們肯定有語意上、語法上的差異。在語意上，只有‘至於’後邊出現表示程度或者結果的成分。表示程度或者結果的成分包括近指代詞‘此’，名詞句(包括抽象名詞)、動詞句，甚至連主謂結構都可以出現在‘至於’的後邊表示‘達到這樣的程度或者結果。’在語法上，只有‘至於’在複雜的語法結構裡出現。‘複雜的語法結構’就是說含有名詞性標記‘者’、‘所’、‘之’等的句子。前文本者曾主張過‘于’或‘於’的選擇常常跟前邊的動詞的性質有關。本文強調‘于’或‘於’的選擇不但跟前邊的動詞的性質有關，而且跟後邊的名詞的性質和‘于’或‘於’出現的句子的語法結構有關。

關鍵詞
至于 至於 于 於 戰國文獻
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