

Alina Kwiatkowska

ON THE PRO-FORM *ONE*

In this article I should like to make some observations on the word *one* in its anaphoric function, i. e. when used as a pro-form for noun phrases or nouns previously mentioned. I shall not discuss here other uses of the word, more specifically its use as a numeral or as an impersonal pronoun. Part of my article will be devoted to Polish equivalents of this English pro-form.

Although in common use, *one* has been rather neglected in the generative theory, although some hints in various practical grammars let us suspect that we are faced with an interesting problem. The problem is: since *one* is traditionally called an indefinite pronoun (with 'pronoun' here stressed for our purpose), how is it related with and how does it differ from other pronouns, particularly from definite (personal third person) pronouns? To what extent is the One-Rule, if we a-priori assume the existence of such a rule, similar to Pronominalization, being here understood as the insertion of definite pronouns, and how do the constraints on the two rules differ? In discussing these questions, I shall be using the generative semantics model as my theoretical basis.

Starting with pro-forms for entire noun phrases, let us examine a pair of sentences:

1. Piglet saw a Heffalump and Pooh saw it, too;
2. Piglet saw a Heffalump and Pooh saw one, too.

The difference between them, to be seen at first glance, is that where there is *it* in the first sentence, there is *one* in the other. This has an immediate effect on the reading of the sentences: there is *one Heffalump* in the first

sentence, and two different Heffalumps in the second one. More technically, at the level of semantic inputs to derivations, we have something like:

1a. Piglet see Heffalump₁ - Pooh see Heffalump₁,

where both indexed forms refer to the same individual, and

2a. Piglet see Heffalump₁ - Pooh see Heffalump₂,

where Heffalump₁ and Heffalump₂ are two different individuals.

Of course, at this semantic level Piglets and Poohs and Heffalumps are only abstract entities. The referential indices attached to them, represent the identity/difference of these entities.

In the course of the derivation, the NP's are ascribed indefinite or definite status. Since in 1a. there is coreference between the two abstract Heffalumps, the second occurrence of Heffalumps is obligatorily definitized, the basic condition on the Definitization transformation being that the two NP's involved must have the same referent. Since this condition is not fulfilled in 2a., the Definitization is blocked. Thus, at the last-but-one stage of the derivation, where the lexical items have in the meantime been inserted, we get:

1b. Piglet saw a Heffalump and Pooh saw the Heffalump (too);

2b. Piglet saw a Heffalump and Pooh saw a Heffalump (too);

which show lexical congruity without, however, exhibiting referential equivalence. These may be left as they are, or the optional pronominalizing rules may operate on 1b. and 2b., Pronominalization replacing the Heffalump by *it/him* and One - rule replacing the second occurrence of a Heffalump by *one*.

We shall be examining the nature of One-Rule closer as the article proceeds; however, one difference between this rule and Pronominalization is worth noting here: at the stage Pronominalization operates, the second occurrence of an NP must be already definite, while it cannot be definite in case of One-Rule. Notice that in the case of Pronominalization, the two entities must be specific, while in case of the input to One-Rule they may be either specific or non-specific, i. e. they may be preceded by a specific -as in 2. - or a generic variety of the indefinite article *a* - as in 3.:

3. Dora wants to marry a linguist, and Jane wants to marry a linguist, too (not a hurdy-gurdy man).

The second occurrence of a linguist cannot be definitized, since its referent is not sufficiently specified. Again, the One-Rule may operate, yielding:

3a. Dora wants to marry a linguist, and Jane wants to marry one, too.

Both Pronominalization and the One-Rule operate late in the derivation. Observe, however, that when seeking explanation for such phenomena as definite pronominalization, we must make use of such subtle semantic notions as reference and specific/non-specific distinctions (since the rules operate on the basis of coreference). It seems unnecessary to refer to these notions in case of One-Rule, i. e. when defining the conditions on this rule, it is not necessary to state overtly that the two occurrences of an NP must be noncoreferential. At the stage this rule operates, morphological identity is quite enough.

Let me hypothesize, that the order of the rules in question is as follows: first, obligatory Definitization operates on all NP's coreferential with the previously uttered ones. Optional Pronominalization may then follow. The definitized NP's are morphologically different from their antecedents (have different determiners). What remains from this pass of the Definitization rule, are sequences like 2b:

2b. Piglet saw a Heffalump and Pooh saw a Heffalump (too).

Only then on the basis of formal identity does One-Rule operate.

Before we go on to make some speculations as to the nature of the rule, let us examine sentences like:

4a. George hears music and John hears it, too.

4b. George hears music and John hears one, too.

We see that *one* cannot substitute for mass nouns. This constraint is indeed a strong one; consider the sentences:

5a. George composes an opera in his kitchen, and John composes one in his bathroom.

5b. George composes music in his kitchen, and John composes it in his bathroom.

It seems strange that in 5b. *it* should be used, as the music George and John compose, respectively, may be of quite a different variety/kind, and, moreover, at the stage Pronominalization operates, *music* is not definite. Still, we cannot use *one* because of this very strong mass nouns constraint. Since it would not be very handy to repeat the noun phrase, *it* is here not quite justifiably used in lack of a more specialized pronoun.

The reason that *one* does not usually replace mass nouns is probably that even in its pro-nominal function it still retains its numerical connotations. After all, an identical form exists functioning as a cardinal numeral signifying oneness.

Let us examine some more examples:

6. True love is like seeing ghosts: we all talk about it, but few of us have ever seen one.

7. Tigers are dangerous animals. I saw one in a Zoo.

8. It is a vegetable. It doesn't look like one, but it is.⁺

Observe that the antecedent of *one* in 6. and 7. are plural *ghosts* and *tigers*, respectively.

In such cases, it seems that *one* is a remain of a deleted phrase *one of the ---* (one number of the class of objects called ---); if this assumption is true, then One-Rule operates in two steps:

I. on the basis of morphological identity it replaces the second occurrence of an NP by *one of the ---*, and

II. it optionally deletes everything except *one*, leaving it as a representer.

Notice, that 8. has been translated into Polish⁺ as:

9. To warzywo. Wcale nie jest podobne do warzyw, ale jest jednym z nich.

(It's a vegetable. It does not look like vegetables at all, but it is one of them).

Let us at this point examine briefly some Polish equivalents of the utterances containing *one*.

The most common translation of 2,

⁺ All examples marked with this sign (+) are taken from *Alicja in Wonderland*, and its Polish translation by Maciej Słomczyński.

(2. Piglet saw a Heffalump and Pooh saw one, too).
would be

10. Prosiaczek widział Słonia i Puchatek też.

Still, this is ambiguous between the coreferential and non-coreferential readings, owing to the fact that what has been deleted in the second part of this sentence may be either:

- i Puchatek też go widział, or
- i Puchatek też widział Słonia.

Equally ambiguous is

11. I Prosiaczek widział Słonia, i Puchatek.

Is there really no unambiguous equivalent in Polish of the English sentences with *one*? Let us go back for a while to the pair of sentences 1. and 2.

At the level of semantic inputs, Polish and English representations do not differ (the compared sentences have congruous semantic inputs). The same two possibilities exist: either we ascribe identical referential indices to the abstract entities involved, or the indices would be different. As the derivation proceeds, we get:

12a. Prosiaczek widział Słonia₁ i Puchatek też widział Słonia₁.

12b. Prosiaczek widział Słonia₁ i Puchatek też widział Słonia₂.

12a. then undergoes, on the basis of coreference, a pronominalizing transformation, which is obligatory and equivalent to Definitization plus Pronominalization in English, giving:

13. Prosiaczek widział Słonia i Puchatek też go widział.

which exhibits referential and lexical congruity with 1.

(1. Piglet saw a Heffalump and Pooh saw it too).

As to 12b., the second occurrence of *Słonia* cannot be definitized and subjected to Pronominalization. It is referentially and lexically equivalent to 2b., and when used in this form, almost unambiguously signals the noncoreference of the two NP's.

In most cases the derivation stops at this point. It does not mean, however, that the One-Rule has no parallel in Polish. Let us examine a version of 12b.:

12c. Prosiaczek widział (kiedyś) Słonia i Puchatek też widział
jednego (też jednego widział).

and of 7.:

7a. Tygrysy to niebezpieczne zwierzęta. Widziałam jednego w Zoo,
and the translation of 14.:

14. I've seen a good many little girls in my time, but never one
with such a neck as that! +

14a. Widywałem wiele małych dziewczynek swego czasu, ale ani jed-
nej z szyją taką jak ta! +

We see that not only can we find in Polish an equivalent of
one, but it has also developed out of a numeral signifying one-
ness, or singularity. Therefore, the mass nouns constraint is
also valid for Polish.

We have so far been investigating *one* and its Polish equi-
valent *jeden* as pro-forms for noun phrases. Let us now shift
our attention to *one* substituting for a 'bare' noun, as in:

15. Sue has a red dress, and I have a blue one.

16. Which book can I take? - Take the one with the torn covers.

Since we cannot have

15a. *Sue has a red dress, and I have a blue it.

16a. *Which book can I take? Take the it with the torn covers.

the conclusion is that *it* (and other definite pronouns) does not
substitute for bare nouns, as *one* does.

Examine now the pair:

17a. The crocodile lost his tail, but he grew it back.

17b. The crocodile lost his tail, but he grew a new one back.

In 17a., *it* substitutes for the whole NP *h i s t a i l*,
and Pronominalization operates on the basis of morphological
identity plus coreference (since, basing ourselves on per-
haps not too well-grounded extra-linguistic belief that the
crocodile grew back the same tail he had lost, we ascribe core-
ference relation to the two NP's).

In 17b., *one* substitutes for *t a i l* only, the One- in-
sertion rule operating on the basis of formal identity. As we
have had the occasion to notice during the earlier applications
of this rule, the notion of reference is here irrelevant. In
fact, in sentences like

18. The table was a large one, but the three were all crowded
together at one corner of it. +

one may even replace for a noun coreferential with the first -
but since it is only a noun, not a noun phrase, it cannot be re-
placed by a definite pronoun.

In Polish, the equivalent of 18. is

18a. Choć stół był wielki, siedzieli stłoczeni we trzech w jednym jego końcu.⁺

-that is, where the transformation in English first deletes the noun and then inserts *one*, the equivalent transformation in Polish stops at the noun-deletion stage.

Another example of this is the pair

19. This here ought to have been a red rose tree, and we put a white one in by mistake.⁺

19a. Ta róża powinna być czerwona, ale omyłkowo zasadziliśmy białą.⁺

It is now time to sum up the answers to the questions we have asked ourselves at the beginning: how does *one* differ from definite pronouns, and how does One-Rule differ from Pronominalization? In the light of the above discussion, we may here draw the following conclusions:

Both Pronominalization and One-Rule operate on morphologically identical units. Pronominalization is obligatorily preceded by Definitization, operating on the basis of coreference. Definitization plus Pronominalization precede One-Rule in rule ordering. Since after the pass of these rules all coreferential nominals are definitized, the One-Rule needs not, and it does not, make use any more of the notion of reference. Pronominalization replaces noun phrases, regardless of whether their heads are count or mass nouns: One-Rule can replace both noun phrases or noun phrase heads, but it refuses to substitute *one* for mass nouns, because of its numerical connotations.

Institute of English Philology
Department of English Linguistics
University of Łódź

AliŃa Kwiatkowska

O ZAIMKU *ONE*

W swoim artykule omawiałam angielski zaimek *one*. Zakładając istnienie osobnej reguły transformacyjnej wprowadzającej ten zaimek, próbowałam usta-

lić, w jaki sposób ona działa oraz jakie są podobieństwa i różnice między tą regułą a regułą transformacyjną wprowadzającą zaimki określone (*he, she it, they*). Przy okazji porównywania tych reguł doszłam również do pewnych wniosków co do kolejności ich działania: Pronominalizacja (wprowadzanie zaimków określonych), poprzedzona obligatoryjną Definityzacją, wyprzedza regułę wprowadzającą zaimek *one*. Dlatego, między innymi, ta ostatnia reguła nie musi odwoływać się do koreferencyjności lub nie-koreferencyjności dwóch wchodzących w grę grup nominalnych i może działać wyłącznie na podstawie identyfikacji formalnej.

Część mojego artykułu poświęcona jest omówieniu polskich odpowiedników zdań angielskich z *one*.