

摘要

本论文采用田野调查的方法,结合语法调查大纲的使用,考察了浙江仙居方言中类“的”语法成分的功能分布与使用情况。调查结果表明:1)仙居方言中的状态形容词后缀包含“哇[θua^{24}]”、“□[ko^{42}]”、“喔[θuo^{22}]”三个不同的形式。状态形容词和复杂拟声词等语法单位在句子中作谓语和补语时,必须附加状态形容词后缀。2)仙居方言区分名词化标记“喔[θuo^{22}]”和定语标记“个[kə^{22}]”。各类语法单位一般需要后附“个[kə^{22}]”作定语,后附“喔[θuo^{22}]”作主语和宾语。状态形容词名词化时,可以先附加状态形容词后缀,再附加名词化标记,也可以直接附加名词化标记。3)仙居方言中有一个特殊的句末领属标记“□[ko^{213}]”。句末领属标记后附于名词、代词等语法单位之后,用以构建表领属义的判断句。4)仙居方言不使用副词后缀。

本论文从类型学视角出发,结合仙居方言的语言事实,对以类“的”语法成分为基础的方言类型划分问题展开了进一步讨论。已有研究认为,汉语方言中的类“的”语法成分可以分析为包含副词词尾、状态形容词词尾和名词化标记在内的三分格局,并能够以三者语音形式为标准,对汉语方言进行类型分类。由于仙居方言中副词后缀的缺失、状态形容词后缀在语音形式上的不唯一性、名词化标记和定语标记的分立、以及句末领属标记的存在,仙居方言中的类“的”语法成分并不满足前述的三分分类格局。从仙居方言的情况看,现阶段以类“的”语法成分为基础的方言类型划分应当首先考虑具体方言中类“的”语法成分的内部分类情况,不能完全以副词词尾、状态形容词词尾和名词化标记三者之间的语音形式异同作为唯一标准。

关键词: 仙居方言; 类“的”语法成分; 状态形容词; 名词化; 领属

Abstract

This thesis provides a comprehensive study on the classification and the usage of the equivalents of “de” in the Zhejiang Xianju dialect. The fieldwork shows that: 1) The three different suffixes of state adjectives in Xianju dialect are “[\emptyset ua²⁴]”, “[ko⁴²]” and “[\emptyset uo²]”. State adjectives and complex onomatopoeias must carry one of the above suffixes to be the predicate or complement in a sentence. 2) The nominalization marker “[\emptyset uo²]” in Xianju dialect is different from the attributive marker “[kə²]”. Words and phrases must carry the attributive marker to function as adnominals and carry the nominalization marker to function as subjects and objects. State adjectives can be nominalized either syntagmatically or paradigmatically. 3) There is a particular possessive marker “[ko²¹³]” occurring at the end of the judgment sentence in Xianju dialect. The possessive marker can attach to nouns or pronouns to construct judgment sentences with the possessive meaning. 4) There is no adverbial suffix in Xianju dialect.

From the perspective of typology, this thesis further discusses the typological features of the equivalents of “de” in different dialects. Previous studies concluded that those equivalents in dialects can be uniformly classified as three, namely the suffix of adverbs, the suffix of state adjectives and the nominalization marker. Various Chinese dialects therefore can be categorized into four different types based on the phonetic realizations of the aforesaid three morphemes. However, the equivalents of “de” in Xianju dialect fail to be incorporated into the tripartite model. The linguistic facts of Xianju dialect suggest that, the typological classification of Chinese dialects on the basis of the equivalents of “de” should not use the phonetic forms of adverbial suffix, state adjective suffix and nominalization marker as the only criterion, but should firstly take the diverse classification models of the equivalents of “de” in specific dialects into careful consideration.

Key words: Xianju dialect; equivalents of “de”; state adjectives; nominalization; possession