

A Cognitive Study of the Noun Alternative One from the Perspective of Construction

Qian Cui Yabing Bai

(Master of School of Humanities, Southwest Jiaotong University;
Master of School of Foreign Languages, Jiangnan University)

Abstract: Using the COCA corpus as an auxiliary tool, this paper explores the usage status of Numeral One (1—one) and Anaphoric One (A—one). The results show that although the usage of 1—one and a—one is different, the two are closely related. When used as the cardinal number, 1—one, like other cardinal number words, generally refers to the number of a certain kind of countable object, and can be used as a determiner, a quantifier, an adjective or a noun. Once the quantitative meaning of the cardinal word (including 1—one) becomes prominent, its alternative meanings are minimized. When 1—one occurs by itself and there is no noun behind it (e. g. , Take ONE), the word is stressed in a sentence.), and it's hard to tell apart from a—one (e. g. , "TAKE ONE"). The only difference is pronunciation — when "ONE" is stressed, the quantitative meaning becomes more pronounced. The substitution of a—one is not only related to syntactic context, but also to human construal experience. By using the construction family theory to describe all the syntactic contexts in which the English word "one" appears, it is concluded that the syntactic and semantic features of "a—one" are inherited from the usage of "1—one".

Keywords: Noun substitution one; Cardinal Numbers; Structure type; Noun phrases

Author's brief introduction: Cui Qian(1997—), female, a native of Xuchang, Henan Province, School of Humanities, Southwest Jiaotong University.

Bai Yabing, Bai Yabing (1995—), female, a native of Xuchang, Henan Province, English teacher of High School, Pingyuan Foreign Language School.

DOI:10. 36012/fhe. v2i4. 2783

1. the introduction

Substitution is a grammatical means of connecting context to avoid repetition. This technique is characterized by the use of "substitute words" to replace specific words in the context. There are three kinds of substitution phenomena in English: nominal substitution, verbal substitution and clause substitution, so there are three kinds of substitution words: nominal substitution, verbal substitution and clause substitution. The substitution of a noun phrase or its central word with a nominal substitute

is called nominal substitution. One (plural ones) is a nominal substitute.

There are various studies on the nominal substitution of one. Macroscopically, from systemic-functional linguistics to cognitive linguistics, and then to constructional grammar; On the micro level, there are the differences between the alternative word one (a—one), the indefinite personal pronoun one and the cardinality word one (1—one), as well as the semantic and syntactic features of the alternative word one. In Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), Halliday & Hasan

(1976) collectively refer to allusion, ellipsis, substitution and connection as grammatical cohesive devices, but allusion emphasizes semantic synaphorism, ellipsis and substitution emphasize lexical grammatical relations, emphasizing wording rather than directly involving semantics (Halliday 1994: 316), and connection is the preset function of related words. Geoff Thompson (2008) regards substitution as a kind of omission. Substitution is to replace a specific word in the context by a substitute word, and ellipsis is to omit a specific word in the context, or ellipsis is to replace a specific word with a zero substitute word. Substitution and ellipsis are used interchangeably in many cases. The cognitive research of ellipsis started late, but some research results have been achieved. In terms of omission category research, Quirk et al. (1985:884) pointed out that ellipsis, like other categories, has the family iconicity. Quirk formulated five standards for ellipsis, and classified ellipsis into typical ellipsis and atypical ellipsis according to the degree of typicality of various types of ellipsis. In terms of the cognitive mechanism of omission, Wu Dilong and Zhao Yan (2010:70) put forward four cognitive models of omission by using the ideal cognitive model. Summer Light (2010:54) reveals the formation mechanism of ellipsis by using the figure-background theory. Yang Leida and Zhao Genglin (2013:37) proposed the cognitive model of omission. Wei-ping tang, Zhao Genglin (2016: 44) for omitting generated view, put forward to omit the cognitive view, think omit parts no syntactic structure, omit the syntax rules generated by the formation of the omitted from the use of language, omitted from the meaning of language knowledge and encyclopedic knowledge, omit the general solution of the process is a dynamic process of conceptualization. Culicover and Jackendoff (2005, 2012) studied various elliptical constructions from the perspective of construction grammar, including one-anaphora, do it/so anaphora, etc.

The main usages of the English word one are a-one, 1-one, and the indefinite personal pro-

noun one, etc. There has been A lot of research on the differences between these usages, but little research on the relationship between them. Constructional grammar holds that language is non-modular and monolayers. Inheritance plays an important role in the grammatical generalization, knowledge organization and the acceptance of practical expressions of constructional grammar, and motivation is the objective basis for the existence of inheritance links between constructs. With the help of the Coca corpus, this paper analyzes and summarizes the syntactic, semantic/pragmatic features of 1-one and A-one, as well as the idiomatic construction containing ONE, and then explains the relationship between them from the perspective of constructional grammar.

2. theoretical basis

Goldberg(1995) defines a construction as: C is a construction if and only if C is a match of form and meaning $\langle F_i, S_i \rangle$, and some aspect of the form (F_i) or meaning (S_i) of C cannot be fully predicted from the constituent parts of C or other preexisting constructions. This definition has been questioned by some scholars. Langacker (2009) points out that from the perspective of psychology, it is obviously not advisable to arbitrarily exclude regular and fixed expressions from the construction through "unpredictability", and the definition of construction should also consider the frequency, degree of solidification and degree of convention related to use. Goldberg(2006) accepted some reasonable criticisms and suggestions from the academic community and adjusted the definition of construction, stating as follows: Any language structure can be considered as a construction as long as some aspect of form or function cannot be strictly predicted from its components or other known constructions. Even fully predictable language structures can be considered constructs if they occur with sufficient frequency. Therefore, "unpredictability" is no longer a necessary condition for confirming constructs. According to the principle of "the way humans construe the world" and "what you see is what you get", there is sufficient

frequency for fully predictable language constructs to be considered constructs. Thus, the definition of construction extends from the match between form and meaning to the match between form and function, which covers semantic, pragmatic and cognitive aspects rather than just general semantic analysis.

Motivation and inheritance are important concepts in the study of construction generalization. Reasoning is a concept between predictability and arbitrariness. Lakoff (1987) accurately defined this term in the theoretical framework of constructional grammar as follows: a construction is justified to some extent if its structure inherits the structure of other constructions in the language. Motivation is the objective basis for the existence of inheriting links between constructs. Inheritance is a method of linguistic generalization that describes the linguistic fact that two constructions are the same in some respects and different in others. The adjustment of construction definition affects the description of inheritance links between constructs. The double connection between form, meaning and function determines the inheritable expression of rationale.

Goldberg (2006) distinguished five kinds of "join" relation representation inheritances as objects, namely, subpart join, instance join, polysemous join, metaphorical extended join and marked join. Among them, the connection between the subpart and the instance represents the integral relationship and is used as the generalization of the straddle. Polysemy and metaphorical extension joins are generally used as the internal extension of constructs to form a family of constructs. Sometimes, the latter can also be used as a cross-structured join. Marked join is similar to polysemy join in that one stereotype is assumed and the other constructs are extended from one or more stereotype attributes to form a construct family. But the prototype of the token connection is just a generalization, there is no instance. Constructional grammar proposes that the purpose of inheritance is not to pursue complete prediction, but to explore the mo-

tivation of each construction. It can be provided by factors other than grammar, such as acquisition constraints, grammaticalization principles and discourse needs. It may also come from within the grammar, such as the hierarchy of inheritance. The hierarchy of inheritance and inheritance is the best way to express the rationale between constructs.

3. Research methods

3.1 Research hypothesis

Langacker says, "Language is a mixture of regularity and specificity." (Langacker, 2004: 411). With the help of Coca corpus, this paper searches some common example sentences containing a—one and 1—one, and also finds some idiomatic constructs containing ONE to summarize the syntactic, semantic and pragmatic features of these three different usages respectively. Then, through comparison, the differences and connections between them are obtained. Finally, the correlation analysis is made with the theory of construction grammar. This study assumes A family of ONE constructions, in which a—one inherits the use of 1—one, and 1—one inherits the use of the cardinal word. In other words, 1—one provides A justification for a—one, and cardinal words provide A justification for 1—one. There are asymmetric inheritance connections between semantically and syntactically related constructions. Thus, the rationality of the existence of the One family structure is explored.

According to the research content and hypothesis, this paper proposes three research questions:

- (1) What is the connection between A—one and 1—one?
- (2) What is the connection between A—one and 1—one?
- (3) Why is there A connection between A—one and 1—one?

3.2 Data collection and data analysis

Here are some examples of 1—one, a—one, and idiomatic noun—phrase constructions with ONE collected from the Coca Corpus:

- (1) 1—ONE: a. And so everything the federal

government does has to be focused on fixing that ONE problem.

b. Maybe they found ONE or two broomsticks.

c. a mere ONE

d. "Should the patients take ONE of them?"

e. "I did that for exactly one year."

f. "I hear she [still] has had a good one semester as a senior."

(2) A-ONE: a. I can answer THAT one.

b. we knew we had found one.

c. a happy one

d. "I felt a twist of pure misery, and a stronger one of anger."

e. "Miriam's relationship with Donatello rehearses the one that she maintained with the Model."

f. "I think one old law is worth two new ones."

(3) a. "There aren't any tourists. Not a one."

b. "One should not do everything oneself."

c. "I, for one, am prepared for anything."

d. one another

e. "that's a good one."

f. "Then grab lunch and a cold one at Moat Mountain Brewing Company."

g. "One hand washes the other."

h. "Not a one of them was on my side."

Through the analysis of the above examples, we find that the grammatical attributes of 1-one are not fixed and cannot absolutely belong to a certain grammatical category. In the examples above with 1-one usage, ONE in (1a) and (1c) is like a noun, ONE in (1b) is like a noun phrase, ONE in (1e) is like an indefinite article, ONE in (1f) is like a modifier, and ONE in (1d) is like a noun or quantifier. Therefore, 1-one and a-one cannot be compared by syntactic attributes. For example : (1a) that ONE is 1-one, while (2a) that ONE is a-one. The only difference between them is the position of focus reflected by the pronunciation.

We use the way of part of speech replacement to analyze the grammatical features of cardinality

words, focusing on four types of construction that do not follow the noun after 1-one, because such ellipsis construction is closely related to the usage of a-one.

3. 2. 1 [_____] = NP: Buy one, get one free

1-one occurs alone, without a noun center, and is equivalent to a noun phrase (e. g. 4A). The same applies to other cardinal words (e. g. 4b). However, the applicability of quantifiers with quantitative meanings (e. g. 4c) and nouns (e. g. 4d) in this syntactic context is different, and neither articles nor adjectives can be used in this syntactic context (e. g. 4e,f).

(4) a. "I'd like to have maybe two kids and adopt one." (one = "one kid")

b. I'd like to have maybe two kids and adopt three.

c. I'd like to have maybe two kids and adopt several/?? every. ^[1]

d. I'd like to have maybe six kids and adopt half/?? part.

e. I'd like to have maybe two kids and adopt ?? the/?? a.

f. I'd like to have maybe two kids and adopt ?? small.

In example sentences containing cardinal words, the overall meaning is not different from whether the cardinal word is followed by the noun center word (Example 5). However, this usage is limited to 1-one (5a), not A-one (Example 6).

(5) a. She bought one thing. ≈ She bought ONE. (1-ONE)

b. I only want those three things. ≈ I only want those three.

c. They are just three members of the set. ≈ They are just three of the set.

(6) She bought one thing. ≠ She BOUGHT one. (A-ONE)

3. 2. 3 [_____] of NP = NP: ONE of the set

1-ONE can appear in a figurative construction without a noun center. Other cardinal numbers (7b), quantifiers (7c), and quantitative nouns (7d) have the same usage, but definite articles (7e) and adjectives (7f) do not.

- (7) a. "one of the holy grails"
 b. three of the holy grails
 c. all of the men/some of the men
 d. part of the problem/half of the solution
 e. ?? the of the problem
 f. ?? tall of the children

3. 2. 4 [$\langle \text{def. det} \rangle (\text{adj}) * \text{ }^{[2]} \text{ } ______]$: The/ that ONE

You can add a definite article or demonstrative pronoun before ONE and other cardinal words (8a, b), and nouns that indicate quantity (8d). You can also add a definite article or demonstrative pronoun to some quantifiers (8c) and adjectives (8f), but not to definite article (8e).

- (8) A. that B. that C. that D. that
 b. those three
 c. those few/?? some/%all/
 d. those parts/pieces
 e. ?? the the
 f. the poor/?? the pinkish

[A] a mere ONE [B] a mere ONE [C] a mere ONE

It can be used with the indefinite article a if and only if the cardinal word is preceded by an attributive adjective, as in example 9. The number of cardinal words modified by these adjectives is a range based on context. This usage also applies to 1—one (Example 9c). The adjective here can also describe the unexpressed object, rather than its quantity (e. g. 10). If it is one, however, it is generally interpreted as a—one (Example 10c,d).

(9) A. "I was struck by Henry Hyde saying we've whittled it down to a pitiful three."

B. "The team's overall figure (67 percent) improves to a burlesque 74."

C. "Out of the almost two billion needed, a scant one was inside the protection of the Bridge."

(10) Thousands entered the room, but only a lucky two were selected to fly out to California.

B. "An unfortunate three were in their path, though, and the alligative had no time to go around them."

C. She was a good beachcomber, a lucky one.

D. "He had jobs of all kinds and tried to im-

prove himself with a burlesque one."

4. Conclusion and discussion

4.1 The cardinal word one (1—one)

When cardinal numbers are not preceded by a specific determiner, they are used like indefinite articles or some indefinite pronouns (e. g. , some); that is, they have a general meaning. Therefore, you cannot add the indefinite article a before 1—one, which would be redundant, but you can add the definite article to indicate that the object has already been mentioned in the preceding paragraph. If the cardinal number is preceded by an adjective modifier, then it can be used with the indefinite article a, as in Example 12. Because the cardinal number is no longer a determiner, but a modifier.

(11) A. She saw three man.

b. Context: I just met a few new people including three women and three man.

The three man left early.

(12) A. Butterfat content for sherbet might be a mere one percent or less.

B. a scant one week after he died

C. "TV star Kirstie Alley lost a cool 30 pounds."

D. "The site has grown to a quantity of 60 million members."

The basic meaning of cardinal words is the number of countable noun objects. Some theorists believe that cardinality implies a minimum. For example, in the absence of context, three means at least three (Ansombre & Ducrot, 1983; Horn, 1989). The answer to Example 13 seems to prove the point, because even if the respondent is over 21 years old, he can still say yes. But Koenig (1991) has a different view. He thinks that if three means at least three, then why does the expression at least three still exist in English? According to Koenig (1991) and most native speakers, three means "3". The cardinal number word can have two sides of meaning, can refer to both upper and lower limits.

(13) [Bartender:] Are you 21?

But what about the lower bound implied by

the cardinal word 21 in example 13? Goldberg (2016) argues that satisfaction is crucial in such cases. Cardinality words have a lower bound meaning only in a certain context. In Example 13, the bartender asked because 21 is the minimum legal age to drink alcohol in the United States. Further, the context of example 13 determines that the meaning of 21 is at least 21, because other ages are not relevant to the question. Conversely, if an ideal date asks you, "Are you 35? "When your age is 55, saying Yes sounds like you're lying. Therefore, whether cardinal words have lower or upper meanings is completely determined by the context. Similarly, the meaning of 1—One should be "the number of objects, and this number can be a specific 1, or can be an interval, not more than 1 or not less than 1".

According to the above analysis, the usage of 1—one is somewhat overlapping with other cardinal words, but the usage of cardinal words is both the same and different from that of quantifiers, determiners, adjectives and nouns. 1—one has the following characteristics in common with other cardinal words; 1. The cardinal words themselves have a general meaning, so there can be no indefinite article a before the cardinal words; 2. 2, the cardinal word refers to a specific number, but in a certain context is an interval, 1—one refers to the number is "not more than 1 or not less than 1"; 3. Cardinality words have no plural form, except when used to denote groups or labels by metonymy; 4. In some constructions, there is little difference in the overall meaning of whether there is a noun center after the cardinal number, but this usage is different from the use of determiners, quantifiers, adjectives, quantitative nouns, etc.

4.2 Nominal substitute one (a—one)

A—one has two major syntactic functions; ONE is to replace the antecedent noun to avoid repetition, and the other is to serve as the sentence component that should be served by the antecedent noun in the sentence, so as to complete the sentence structure.

Sometimes, the substitution words one/ones and the center word of the noun phrase they replace may differ in syntactic function, and may also differ in "number." One /ones can often be used to replace countable nouns (a/an + n.) or entire noun groups centered around countable nouns (often a/an + adj. + n.) in the context, or the central word of a noun group, which refers to both people and things. When the substitute word one does not have any premodifier, the object of its substitution is the whole noun phrase, which has the semantic feature of general reference. Thus it can be seen that substitution is not a substitute relation in the form of language expression. Strictly speaking, substitution is a process of creating new objects of reference on the conceptual level. And this process is related to human cognitive experience. Langacker (1999) points out that there is no direct connection between the anaphor and the antecedent, and the reason why they can refer to each other is that they are both projected to the same entity in the current space. With or without a determiner, one refers to an object that has an associative similarity to a known object in a known context or other situation. A language speaker may use the word one to compare a pair of objects in the same situation (e. g. , I have a better one.); It may want to highlight an individual (e. g. , The youngest one is in college now.), or describe A repeated event (e. g. , Another one showed up.) In short, The use of a—one implies A similar relationship between objects driven by The situation. (Culicover & Jackendoff, 2012; LuperFoy, 1991).

This study argues that the difference between 1—one and A—one is caused by the syntactic context, which can also be reversed.

To explain the prominence of the a—one usage. A—one must have an adjective modifier (e. g. , A yellow ONE), related to the question Which ONE. When there is no noun center after the 1—one, it is stressed to emphasize the quantitative meaning of the word.

It follows that if there is no noun — center

word after one, it is interpreted as 1 – one if and only if it is construed as a focus argument or a new information or a contrastive information. When it is construed as 1 – one, its quantitative meaning is highlighted. When construed as a – one, its quantitative meaning is hidden and contextualized. In A sentence containing a – one, ONE refers to A non – focal or known or uncontrasting argument and is therefore not stressed when pronounced.

4.3 The association between a – one and 1 – one

The following noun phrase constructions all have 1 – one usage (n stands for cardinal number). In the examples 1) to 5), the cardinal word one is followed by the noun center word; (1) A) One B) One C) One C) One D) One It can be seen that the use of a – one overlaps with the use of 1 – one. It can also be said that the use of a – one is inherited from the use of 1 – one. The inheritance here is a polysemy join and an internal extension of the construction.

1) [n = noun, n = number, adj. = 0, + = 0 or more, * = 1 or more, def. = definite, det = determiner] n + n: one book

2) a * n N: a mere one member

3) N n : chapter 1

4) N N of the N: one book of the series

5) N : That one book

6) n; buy ONE/ONE

7) n of NP: ONE/one of the set

8) * n; that ONE/one; those ones

9) a + n; a scant one; a happy one

The common features of a – one and 1 – one are as follows : (1) Both can be used in elliptical constructions, that is, there is no noun center in these constructions; (2) The number of a certain object. (3). The main differences are: (1) only 1 – one can be followed by A noun center (e. g. , ONE boy), whereas a – one is never used with A noun; (2) When there is no noun behind 1 – one, the sentence should be stressed to highlight its numerical meaning. A – one is de – focused and unstressed, so its quantitative meaning is contextualized. (3) A – one can appear in the plural form (ones), indicating multiple entities, while 1 – one

cannot.

4.4 Idiomatic construction with one

The study of construction grammar started from idioms, and later Goldberg extended it to the study of general argumentation structure, realizing the transformation from specialization to generalization. So, after looking at the common use of one, let's look at idiomatic constructions with one.

(1) One for all. In many registers, one serves as a third – person pronoun to refer to a person. The one here is any one of the people.

(2) A. one B. one C. one D. one He's a brave one, dammit.

(3) for one. Here so limits the meaning of one to a human or other living object. The phrase means "at least one person has this trait" and indicates "there may be other people with this trait". Example: And I for one, I've always dreamed of eating a hot pocket with the president And Batman.

(4) This is a mutual appellation, not limited to living objects, but in the corpus search, it is often used with living objects. Example: I'm happy to do this radio interview with you today, and, you know, I write books, and all these things are connected to one another.

(5) A good one (a joke); A cold one (a beer). In the absence of context, a good one means a joke. A cold one can refer to "beer" or "bad weather," but in the corpus, "beer" is more common. Example: "Mr. Lesko: Langhs, 'That's a good one.'"

(6) One... The other... The one in this idiomatic construction has a special meaning and a contrastive function, but not the contrastive function with 1 – one. In this construction, one refers to a comparison of an object with another of its kind, while 1 – one is a comparison with other quantities. B: I'd like to be the same with you, too.

(7) A one. This expression is often used with A negative to mean A single one. There aren't any tourists.

In examples 1 – 3, one can refer to someone in general, and this is an alternate use of one itself.

In Example 4–7, each idiomatic construction has a special meaning, and the quantitative meaning of one in the construction has a significant impact on its overall meaning.

5. the conclusion

Through research, we find that the usage of 1–one is the same as other cardinal words, while the usage of a–one is the same as the partial usage of 1–one. These similarities allow us to link idioms with one to the common uses of 1–one and a–one, thus forming A network of constructions. Sententialists usually divide a word into grammatical categories in order to determine its linguistic context. However, we see that in constructions containing 1–one and a–one, the slots of 1–one and a–one can also be filled with determiners, quantifiers, adjectives, or nouns. Therefore, this study is based on the perspective of construction grammar; construction permits these associative phenomena, rather than being driven by a central word. The meaning and usage of 1–one provide A justification for A–one. For example, A–one can only refer to countable entities, and it also has A general meaning. These are the uses of cardinal words including 1–one. In addition, A construction that works with A–one will also work with 1–one. They differ only in the role of information structure; 1–one is usually construed as the focal argument or the new information in the discourse; Accordingly, when 1–one is followed by no noun center word, ONE is stressed, while a–one is not. A complete construction network should have both conventional usage description and idiomatic usage description, so as to obtain the relatively complete semantic usage characteristics of the word one. However, the collection and analysis of idiomatic constructs containing ONE in this study is not sufficient, and advanced statistical analysis

techniques are not used, which may be lack of persuasion. These deficiencies need to be taken into consideration in future studies.

References

- [1] Adele E. Goldberg, Construction — A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure[M], Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1995.
- [2] Adele E. Goldberg, Constructions: A New Theoretical Approach to Language[J], Journal of Foreign Languages, 2003.
- [3] Adele E. Goldberg, Constructions at work: The nature of generalization in language[M], Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- [4] Adele E. Goldberg, Corpus evidence of the viability of statistical preemption[J], Cognitive Linguistics, 2011.
- [5] Adele E. Goldberg, One Among Many: Anaphoric One and Its Relationship With Numeral One[J], Cognitive Science, 2016.
- [6] Bybee, J. , Language, usage and cognition [M]. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- [7] Culicover. P. W & Jackendoff. R. Simpler syntax [M]. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- [8] Culicover. P. W & Jackendoff. R. , Same—except: A domain—general cognitive relation and how language express it[J]. Language, 2012.
- [9] Florent Perek, Argument Structure in Usage—Based Construction Grammar [M], Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2015.
- [10] Langacker, R. Grammar and Conceptualization [M]. Berlin/ New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1999.
- [11] Oxford. The Oxford Handbook of Construction Grammar [M]. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- [12] Payne, J. , Pullum, G. K. , Scholz, B. C & Berlage, E. Anaphoric one and its implication [J]. Language, 2013.
- [13] Traugott, E. C. & Trousdale, G. , Constructionalization and constructional Changes [M]. Oxford University Press, 2013.