

摘要

作为绝大多数语言中普遍存在的两大语义范畴，反身义结构与相互义结构一直是语言学界的关注热点，两者存在诸多方面的差异，本文以跨语言比较的事实为依据和出发点，通过对比、梳理、综合已有文献，从两者对其回指先行语在性和数等方面的要求、动作方向性、形态结构、句法分布、所表达语义事件和使用表达策略六个方面归纳其不同。但是，在同一语言内及跨语言层面，反身义与相互义表达又表现出在句法和形态上的相似性。在句法层面，生成学派将反身义与相互义标记都看作照应语。形态上，一些语言使用在共时层面形态相同或语义概念范畴相似的词汇表达两种语义；在历时角度，许多语言中的两种标记间存在由反身义标记单向演变出相互义的发展关系。如此不同的两个语法范畴却能在共时和历时层面表现出“重合”现象，其背后动因值得探究。但是，对于产生这一现象的背后动因，目前受到较少学者关注。其中，Seth Cable (2014) 从形式语义学角度提出一个可能的动因。他基于复数名词、动词累积性普遍原则等语义学理论，将复数名词和动词的多重事件特征应用于包含反身标记且以复数名词做反身标记回指先行语的句子中，提出一条形式语义推导，说明当句中反身标记回指先行语为复数时，该反身标记所能表达的语义事件中包含相互义。Cable 在其研究中仅关注到部分能使用相同形式表达反身义与相互义的语言（如法语中的 *se*），通过形式语义推导为这些语言中反身标记能表达相互义的内在逻辑性提供了较为合理的解释。本文基于 Cable 提出的形式语义推导，解释了自然语言中反身义与相互义表达存在差异却又在共时和历时角度表现出相似性这一现象的背后动因。

但分析发现，Cable 提出的形式语义推导是超越具体语言，从形式语义和逻辑层面提出的，其本质具有演绎性质。基于此，“反身标记所能表达语义事件中包含相互义”这一结论逻辑上应具有普遍性，我们从而可得出一个理论上更具普遍性的假设，即：自然语言中包含反身标记的句子，当反身标记回指先行语为复数时，原则上反身标记都可以表达相互义。为考察该理论假设是否具有事实的支持，本研究尝试迈出第一步。Cable 从形式语义角度解释了法语、西班牙语等语言可使用相同形式表达反身义与相互义可能的内在逻辑性，本研究则探究使用不同形式表达反身义与相互义的语言中是否存在上述语义蕴含的可能性。综合考虑多方因素后选择英语作为调查对象，基于 Cable 的相关研究，创设包含其他事件

参与者与反身标记回指先行语所指称参与者构成对比的特殊情境,通过对英语母语者进行问卷调查和个别访谈,考察包含英语复数反身代词 *themselves* 的句子是否也能表达相互义。调查结果说明,英语中的复数反身代词 *themselves* 可以表达相互义,当创设特殊情境后,认为英语复数反身代词可表达相互义的母语者数量明显增多,为本文基于 Cable 具有演绎性质的形式语义推导所提出的普遍性假设提供了事实支撑。此外,调查还发现,对部分英语母语者而言,原本被认为仅能表达反身义的英语复数反身代词 *themselves* 在独立于具体情境的句中时也能表达相互义这一语义特征。

关键词: 反身与相互; 对比研究; 语义蕴含

Abstract

Reflexivity and reciprocity have always been the central issues in linguistics. As two major semantic categories that are common in most languages, reflexivity and reciprocity are different in many respects. The two differ in their requirements for the number and gender property of their anaphoric antecedents, in the event structures which they express, and in their respective morphological and syntactic codings and strategies. However, reflexives and reciprocals also show similarities in syntax and morphology. In generative grammar, both reflexive and reciprocal expressions are treated as “anaphors”. Besides, from the cross-linguistic perspective, some languages use words of the same form or of the same semantic category to express reflexivity and reciprocity, and in many languages the reciprocal expression is diachronically developed from the reflexive markers. To account for this “overlapping” phenomenon, Cable (2014) developed a formal semantic univocal analysis which is deductive, based on the Cumulativity Universal Principle, and proposed that reflexively marked predicates with plural arguments can describe situations of reciprocal action in languages which show an extensive overlap between reflexive and reciprocal markers (such as French, which uses *se* to express both reflexivity and reciprocity). Developing on Cable’s formal semantics ideas, the present study further proposes that theoretically reciprocal meaning is an inherent semantics of reflexive meaning in all languages, whether or not reflexive and reciprocal markers overlap in forms. To verify this hypothesis, the present study makes a survey on the semantic interpretation of plural reflexive pronouns in English, a language where reflexives and reciprocals are of different form. The survey results turn out that with a created special situation, where there are other salient entities that can contrast with the antecedent of the reflexive anaphor, the plural reflexive pronouns in English can also be used to describe reciprocal situations, lending support for the above assumption. Besides, the results show that the plural reflexive pronouns in English can also express reciprocity in basic, out-of-the-blue contexts.

Key Words: reflexives and reciprocals; comparative study; semantic implicature