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Résumé

The present M.A. thesis is an investigation of the peculiarities of the functional-semantic field of quantity in John Fowles’ discourse in the framework of functional grammar.

In the thesis the peculiarities of the functional-semantic field of quantity in the novel “The Collector” by John Fowles on different language levels have been established. To achieve the goal the works on linguistics in the area of the category of quantity have been critically evolved as well as different approaches towards the classification of means of quantity representation have been employed that resulted in a new synthesized taxonomy presented in the thesis.

Анотація

Запропонована магістерська робота – це дослідження особливостей функціонально-семантичного поля кількості в дискурсі Джона Фаулза у рамках функціональної граматики.

У роботі відображено особливості функціонально-семантичного поля кількості у романі Джона Фаулза „Колекціонер” на різних рівнях мови. Для досягнення цієї мети було проаналізовано наукові праці з лінгвістики, присвячені категорії кількості, опрацьовано різні підходи щодо класифікації засобів вираження кількості, на базі чого розроблено нову синтезовану таксономію, подану у роботі.
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INTRODUCTION

Quantities are a ubiquitous and important part of our understanding of the world. Almost everything in this world is either counted or measured.

Up to now a number of attempts have been made to gain some insight into the complicated issue of the essence of quantity when it is treated as a category, especially its linguistic side.

The objective of our work is to establish peculiarities of the category of quantity representation in the novel “The Collector” by John Fowles.

For the achievement of this purpose the following tasks have been set:
• to study different approaches to the nature of the category of quantity;
• to outline the major ways of the quantity representation in English;
• to define the notions of the functional-semantic field and the discourse;
• to find the specific means of the author’s representation of the category of quantity in the novel “The Collector” by John Fowles.

The object of our analysis is the linguistic category of quantity. It is represented by 1534 units that are retrieved from the text the length of which is 84458 words.

The subject of the research is the peculiarities of the category of quantity representation on different language levels.

The topicality of the investigation is determined by the increased interest towards the problem of classification of the means of the category of quantity representation and the place of the functional-semantic field of quantity in functional grammar theory.

The material used for this paper is the novel “The Collector” by John Fowles.

The paper is written in the framework of the theory of functional grammar presented by A.V. Bondarko [12; 13; 15], V.Z. Panfilov [57], S.O. Shvachko [80], M.A. Halliday [85].

The methodological basis of the investigation includes the following methods:
• comparative method (to compare the functional-semantic field of quantity in the language system and in the author’s discourse);
• componential analysis (to distinguish the seme of quantity in lexical units);
• quantitative analysis (to give exact figures of means of quantity representation in author’s discourse and present the ratio of the actualization of the quantitative characteristics of substance, process and property);
• structural analysis (to define the structure of the functional-semantic field of quantity in Modern English).

The scientific novelty of the paper lies in the extension of the boundaries of the previous investigations performed in this field based on the new perspective on the classification of means of quantity representation.

The theoretical significance of the paper consists in the concrete elaboration of the problem of the collation of the units that belong to “ontological triad” and the units that belong to different levels of the language.

The practical significance of the research lies in the possibility of the deeper understanding of the nature of means that are used to express quantity; the opportunity to use the main principles and conclusions of the research work in the courses of English: during the lectures and seminars on linguistics, grammar, lexicology, etc.

The results of our investigation are reflected in the following articles:

• Петровська О.І. Засоби вираження категорії кількості в сучасній англійській мові // Матеріали ІІ международной научно-
The paper has the following structure:

Introduction highlights the topicality of the problem, the purpose and tasks of the investigation, discovers the object and the subject, the materials and methods used to the purpose of our research work.

Chapter 1 provides the general survey of the category of quantity from the philosophical and linguistic points of view and deals with the possible means of the category of quantity representation in modern English.

Chapter 2 offers the review of different approaches toward the term “discourse” and presents the understanding of the notion “functional-semantic field” in functional grammar.

Chapter 3 reveals the peculiarities of the category of quantity representation in the novel “The Collector” by John Fowles.

Glossary gives the definitions to the linguistic terms used in the paper.

Conclusions reflect the results of the research work.

Bibliography contains the list of the literature used.

Supplements graphically represent the results of the research work.
Chapter 1. General survey of the category of quantity. The ways of expressing the category of quantity in Modern English

1.0. General features

This chapter contains the theoretical basis of the problem of category of quantity. Here the scientific works and transactions dedicated to this issue are analyzed, two different approaches towards the classification of means of quantity representation are collated and on the basis of this collation a synthesized taxonomy is presented.

1.1. Linguistic and philosophical view of the category of quantity

Every object of the material world has some definite shape, length, size and mass, that is quantitative parameters.

The notion of quantity is quite broad, and there is a substantial literature in psychology, linguistics, philosophy and qualitative reasoning on many different aspects of it. From the point of view of dialectics, quantity and quality are inseparable [9, Pp.124-126]. These philosophical categories obey the law of reciprocal transition [74, Pp. 216-218].

Quantity and quality are the ontological categories which describe the objects of material world [28; 30; 34]. In this world the objects are constantly changing, they appear and disappear. Though, it doesn’t mean that they have no definite form of existence and are unstable, so that no one can distinguish one from the other; as from the point of view of relativism [73, Pp.388-389]. No matter how much the object changes, still it will remain for the time being itself, not the other qualitatively distinguished object. Qualitative determinacy of objects and phenomena is the thing that makes them stable, demarcates the multifariousness of this world.

Apart from the qualitative characteristics, every object has quantitative characteristics, i.e. it has definite measure, amount, mass, the degree of property
evolution, etc. The quantity is the characteristic of an object that helps us to divide it practically or cogitatively into congeneric parts and unite them. The kinship of these parts is the distinctive feature of quantity. Thus, we can say that the differences between the objects that are alike have qualitative character, while the differences between the similar objects – quantitative.

Unlike quality, quantity is not closely connected with the existence of an object. By this we mean that the changes in quantity do not lead to the disappearance or substantial change of the object. Only after reaching some measure quantitative changes may cause qualitative ones. We would like to mention that every single object has its definite measure in this case. Thus, we come to the conclusion that quantitative characteristics, in comparison to the qualitative ones, are “extra-related” with the nature of objects. That is why it is possible to isolate them from their content in the process of cognition (e.g., in mathematics) [88, P. 457].

The unity, interrelation and interdependence of quantity and quality are represented by the notion of degree. Every object, phenomena or process possesses its own degree, i.e. it has qualitative-quantitative determinacy. Degree is an extent to which quantitative changes may proceed. Within these boarders an object continues to be itself, not changing its quality – a set of its properties. The change of degree of an object leads to its transition into something new [74, P. 217].

So, as we have already mentioned, none of the objects has only quantitative or only qualitative characteristics, on the contrary, every object possesses the unity of a definite quality and quantity. The variation in their ratio may turn one object or phenomenon into the other object or phenomenon.

The ontological category of quantity is the result of the “mirroring” of the quantitative determinacy which is peculiar to all the objects existing in the objective reality. “Quantitative determinacy is the amount of something. Having undergone the process of comparison, this amount may be represented approximately (in formulae with the signs like: >, ≥, ≈, ≤, <) or precisely (in the form of numbers)” [25, P. 81].

Quantitative determinacy may be treated either as a discrete, or indiscrete quantity. The first one is represented by means of calculation, the second – by means
of measurement. According to this fact, there exist two main notions in the ontological category of quantity:

- *number*
- *size*

Thus, the entity of these two notions makes up the matter of the category [56, P. 227]. In the history of philosophy this point of view has been evolved by Aristotle:

“1. Quantity is either discrete or continuous. Moreover, some quantities are such that each part of the whole has a relative position to the other parts: others have within them no such relation of part to part.

2. Instances of discrete quantities are number and speech; of continuous, lines, surfaces, solids, and, besides these, time and place.

3. In the case of the parts of a number, there is no common boundary at which they join. For example: two fives make ten, but the two fives have no common boundary, but are separate; the parts three and seven also do not join at any boundary. Nor, to generalize, would it ever be possible in the case of number that there should be a common boundary among the parts; they are always separate. Number, therefore, is a discrete quantity.”[4, P. 52]

This point of view was later developed by Hegel [22]. This attitude towards the matter is also shared in modern philosophical researches [28; 70].

Linguistic and ontological categories shouldn’t be viewed as equal. One and the same quantity may be expressed differently not only in different language systems but also within one particular system. One should always keep in mind that while solving theoretical and practical problems of linguistics one shouldn’t think that logical and grammatical categories are in linear relations because “thought and language are correlated with the objects and phenomena of reality but while the first corresponds the relations of reflection, the second to those of signification” [37, Pp.16-17]. Language is a medium between consciousness and reality. Consciousness does not create objective reality but reflects it with the help of a language, assigns particular results of cognition to particular language elements. Thus, in a word meaning the cognitive background of quantity is consolidated [20, Pp.15-16].
Semantic components of the meaning of quantity are correlated with the properties of logical quantity. The meaning of quantity is realised by a number of semantic components forming a complex hierarchical structure of a semantic field. “Semantic field is formed by the multitude of meanings that have at least one semantic component, for example, size, weight, height, depth, length, intensity, etc., as well as their semantic derivates, including the words from other parts of speech” [1, P. 251].

The bulky scientific works are dedicated to the linguistic view on the category of quantity [2; 14; 15; 36; 50; 69; 72; 78; 80; 82]. The analysis of these works shows that morphemes, words and word combinations that realize the meaning of quantity build up the linguistic field of quantity.

S.O. Shvachko provides us with the following meanings of words that represent quantity:

- **Quantity** – amount, number, a large amount or number, an abundance, a figure or symbol representing this;
- **Amount** – the whole, the total unity;
- **Number** – quantity, amount, total collection of persons, things, very many, some, very often, that cannot be counted, a unit or sum of units, a figure representing such a unit or sum;
- **Measure** – size, quantity, weight, a unit or standard of capacity, length, area;
- **Size** – degree of largeness or smallness, dimensions, the relative mass of an object;
- **Weight** – the amount, expressed in some scale;
- **Length** – the measurement of a thing from end to end;
- **Area** – amount or degree of surface;
- **Rate** – amount or degree of something measured in proportion to something [80, P. 11].

Here the meaning of words is represented by means of transformation, substitution of one word for another word or a word combination, identical in
denotative meaning but different in morphological structure. The process of finding out the meanings of the words related with the notion of quantity with the help of semantic components is closely connected with the process of segmentation and differentiation. The general meaning of quantity is segmented into more specific, i.e. amount, number, measure. The meaning of these last is differentiated with the help of the units, correlated the notion of general quantity and quantity itself. The description of words by means of explanatory transformation helps to define general semantic meaning – the nucleus of semantic sphere, as well as its semantic components, represented by the words like amount, measure, size, degree, weight, area, length, etc. The explanatory formulae of the key words are the following:

Quantity is equal to amount, number and measure: \( Q = (A+N+M); \)
Amount is quantity of the whole weight, area and rate: \( A = (W+a+r); \)
Number is the quantity counted: \( N = Qc; \)
Measure is the quantity measured: \( M = Qm. \)

Amount is represented through \( Qc+Qm. \) It means that quantity is explained by two key words – measure and number. The words that are correlated with the notion of measure are explained in the following way:

- **Acre** – a definite measure of land – 4840 yards;
- **Bushel** – a measure – about 32,5 litres;
- **Fathom** – a measure of length – 6 feet;
- **Foot** – a measure of length – 12 inches;
- **Gallon** – a measure of liquids – 4 quarts;
- **Quart** – a measure of capacity, equal to a quarter of a gallon [80, P. 12].

The first part of the definition points out what is measured and the second one contains numerical indexes and correlates with other words of measure. Clear-cut boundaries of these words are illustrated in the following formula: \( X \) of \( (a, b, c, d, e) \), where \( X \) – measure, \( a \) – capacity, \( b \) – length, \( c \) – weight, \( d \) – land, \( e \) – area.

The meaning of number is segmented into semantic components a unit, a number of, amount, collection, sum of units, the figure, quantity. The words
representing general meaning of number and its elementary semantic components are correlated (as well as the words of measure and mass) with the linguistic units of the category of quantity.

![Semantic Model of the Linguistic Field of Quantity](image)

As we can see there’s a hierarchy of linguistic units that are correlated with quantity. There are 3 groups of such units. The principle of hyponymical\(^1\) relations is the major principle here. The first group is general, generic to the second one, which, in its turn, is simultaneously specific to the first group and generic to the third one.

Thus, the semantic model of the category of quantity depends on the actual relations of objects and phenomena of real world, historical experience, the results of quantity cognition as well as on some linguistic factors. Linguistic category of quantity is represented through definite material means, inherent to every given language. Linguistic field of quantity is characterized by a complex structure and includes a number of categories such as the semantic field of space, time, size, capacity, etc. The boundaries of such a field are determined by the quantity of elements that represent general invariant property [75, P. 127].

---

\(^1\) **Hyponymical; hyponym**: see: Glossary
In general, both, linguistic and philosophical perspectives on the category of quantity are the complement to each other. They help us to gain deeper insight into the category.
1.2. The means of quantity representation on different levels of the language

1.2.1. Linguistic means of quantity representation on the morphemic level

There are two different approaches to the grouping of all the means of quantity representation. The first is presented by S.O. Shvachko [80, Pp. 13-32]. In agreement with this approach, the abovementioned means are classified according to the levels of the language. Thus, in Modern English the meaning of quantity is realized through morphemic, morphological, lexical and syntactic means. Other linguists (Z. Turayeva and J. Birenbaum) take so-called “ontological triad” for the basis of their classification [80, P. 122]. “Ontological triad” deals with the main categories discriminated in sphere of existence: substances, processes and properties. The members of this ternary opposition can be called substance-quantity, process-quantity and property-quantity. The substance-quantity includes the count of objects (discrete spatial entities) or their constituent parts as well as the measure of indiscrete materials. The process-quantity deals with the count of particular isolated processes or the parts of one process (multiplicity), as well as the duration of a continuous process. Property-quantity is the degree of intensity of the substance- or process-quantity. We consider that both methods have their own positive and negative sides. Thus, we would like to present a fusion of these two approaches.

We begin with the morphemic level. The morphemes can be used for the representation of all three members of the “ontological triad”. The morphemes like uni-, mono-, di-, (semi-, bi-), tri-, poly-, deci-, hecto-, -let, -ie are usually used to render the meaning of number, plurality, singularity, duality, diminution, etc. They may realize substance- and property-quantity:

- **substance-quantity**: semi-circle, diphthong, decilitre, triangle;
- **property-quantity**: unidirectional, bilingual, polysyllabic, etc.

Some of the morphemes represent not only quantity but also perform some evaluation, subjective treatment of an object and its property. On the morphemic
level the units that represent quantitative properties with approximate evaluation are singled out: e.g. morphemes -let, -ie.

  e.g. girlie, birdie, auntie, leaflet, booklet, duckling, etc.

  Diminutive and intensifying affixes depending on their internal and external contexts may actualize the meaning of positive/negative evaluation, expressing hostility, disdain, anger, threat, or on the contrary, tenderness, caress, sympathy. Intensifying prefixes over-, out-, super-, hyper- and the prefixes that point to the insufficient intensity under- are the usual morphemic means of expressing property-quantity:

  e.g. overoptimistic, outbrave, super-efficient, hypersensitive, undercooked.

  Suffix -ish and compound words with the first component, which points to the part of a whole serve the same purpose:

  e.g. whitish; half-dressed, semi-retired.

  As to the means of expressing process-quantity on the morphemic level, we would like to name the following:

  - the morphemes -ce, -fold show for how many times the action was performed: twice, thrice, twofold, fourfold, fivefold. The equivalent here is the combination cardinal numeral (or another word with quantitative meaning) + “times” (three times, several times), however, in this case we already speak about syntactical level. As to the lexical means that are used to express the recurrent action are the following: often, sometimes, repeatedly, rhythmically, etc. It is noteworthy, that the morpheme -ce may actualize quantitative characteristics not only of an action (I met her twice) but also of property (a girl twice his age);

  - prefix re-: reopen, recheck, retry, etc. when added to the verb is used to show that the action is repeated;
• compound verbs in which the first element has quantitative meaning: to double-lock, etc.

• prefix ex- and postpositional combination to-be are used to express ordinal process-quantity: ex-girlfriend, teacher-to-be.

Thus, we have seen that the morphemic level presents a large number of means of expressing not only substance- but also property- and process-quantity.

1.2.2. **Linguistic means of quantity representation on the lexical level**

The quantitative relations existing in the objective reality are expressed not only by “morphemic” and grammatical means but also by lexical means. In every language there is a group of words that have some quantitative meaning, however they belong to different parts of speech. The primary quantitative actualization is realised by means of the forms of the grammatical category of number, while the secondary – by means of lexical units belonging to different lexico-grammatical classes.

Ontological types of quantity are usually expressed with the help of the parts of speech categorical meanings.

Substance-quantity in Modern English is generally expressed by nouns, process-quantity – by verbs, property-quantity – by adjectives and adverbs. Numeral is a special part of speech which is used to convey the substance-quantity directly and the process- and property-quantity by means of adverbial combinations:

* e.g. to meet three times, three times heavier

The verb due to its semantics rarely represents the meaning of quantity comparing with the other parts of speech. Though it is quite possible:

* e.g. to double, to ten, to quarter, etc.

The verbs that realize the seme of concrete number usually come from numerals.
As it has been already mentioned, **pronouns** are used to express quantity. Such a representation deals with the opposition one :: more than one. Personal, possessive, reflexive and demonstrative pronouns have the category of number by means of which the meaning of quantity is realized. This, however, concerns rather morphological than lexical sphere. As to the latter, it is also possible to use pronouns to express substance-quantity. In this case the semantics of the words is the phenomenon that makes us speak about quantity. Thus, the pronouns that indicate mutuality (*e.g.* each other, one another, both) belong to the lexical means of quantity nomination.

**The nouns** can bear quantitative meaning when used separately as well as perform the function of quantitative determinants. We can distinguish two groups of nouns:

1) those, related to calculation;
2) those, related to measurement.

Such a division arose due to the nature of the objects that are determined quantitatively.

If we trace back the origin of “quantitative” words (words of number and amount), we can see that they have originated to “non-quantitative” words, mainly the names of objects. “In earlier times people didn’t count with the help of figures. With their help they only marked down numbers. They counted either with the help of some objects, grouped into “a batch” of some particular size (fingers, stones, abacus beads, etc.) or with the help of the language, which actually was the equivalent to count on the fingers or on other objects.” [42, P. 89] The nouns have served as a basis to the formation of a number of numerals.

If we trace back the origin of words expressing mass and measure, we shall find out that they have originated from the names of the parts of a human body, vessels, pieces of land [80, P. 21]. To prove that these words have eventuated by means of semantic derivation from the words of everyday vocabulary, we would like to provide the following example:
Acre → a piece of land → some definite piece of land → a unit for measuring area of land;

Furlong → a furrow of any length → some definite furrow → a unit for measuring distance.

The model of such combinations, including the words expressing mass and measure, is made up of two components: quantity + substance. Words of number, amount, mass and measure represent quantitative meaning, while substance is actualized by the nomination of the object under measurement. The dependence of the elements of these combinations is the following:

two acres of land

The words of mass and measure correlate with terms, they are precise and systematic, not emotional, non-synonymic. The meaning of words of mass and measure is explained by means of definition. When used non-terminologically these words undergo the process of generalization; they become polysemous. The words of mass and measure form new paradigmatic relations that correlate with the notions “much/many/a lot of”, “little/few”. They have the tendency of making up phraseological units:

\textit{e.g.} tons of work – a lot of work;

\textit{bushels of letters} – many letters;

\textit{gallons of water} – much water;

\textit{dram of learning} – little learning.

An ounce of good life is better than a pound of pardon.

“Quantitative” nouns correlate with the objective and cognitive categories. The nouns, while expressing the notion of time, actualize the meaning which is being formed in the process of everyday cognitive activity. These words form the opposing
paradigmatic groups, the one of which corresponds to abstract quantitative meaning, the other – to the concrete quantitative meaning.

Compare:

\[ \text{time; eternity; period; } \text{second; day; year.} \]

The nouns that express abstract time have the tendency to be specified by the words that express concrete quantity:

\[ e.g. \ a \ bit \ of \ time \]

The nouns form the oppositions that correlate with the notion of:

- definite and indefinite quantity (monosyllabic :: polysyllabic, singularity :: plurality, solo :: choir, solitude :: multitude, etc.);
- large and small amount (majority :: minority, macroeconomics :: microeconomics, myriad :: particle, etc.);
- totality and partition (part :: parcel, number :: part, eternity :: bit, etc.)

Thus, we can see that nouns mentioned are used to express substance-quantity.

We can divide the adjectives that correlate with the category of quantity in Modern English into two groups:

1) those, associated with calculation: double, decimal, tripartite, etc.
2) those, associated with measurement: high, tall, wide, low, short, deep, thick, etc.

The pole of the “small” size on the scale has a limit, however, the pole of “big” size has none. One can increase the height or the depth endlessly but cannot decrease them ad infinitum. This fact influences the valency of these words.

**Degree of property representation** is conveyed through the forms of grammatical category of degrees of comparison of adjectives and adverbs. I.V.Arnold states that the lexico-grammatical meaning of property and quantity is realised in grammatical category of comparison [5, P. 53].

In Modern English there are two ways of expressing this category:

- syntactical
• analytical.

However, suppletion is also possible in this case. “The presence of suppletive forms in different languages shows that a man hasn’t learnt right away to express quantitative differences within qualitative characteristics. That is why, suppletion, from the historical point of view, shouldn’t be treated as a substitution of one adjective by another, but as a “discontinuity” of the grammatical series, the internal unity of which has been understood only afterwards.” [17, P. 266]

The **numerals** are rather significant in the totality of all the lexical units that have quantitative meaning. S.O. Shvachko considers them to be the “nucleus of the quantitative language signs” [80, P. 32]. They denote an abstract idea of number. Syntactically, numerals in Modern English function as “determiners” [65, P. 103]. Primarily, they express quantitative, not qualitative characteristic. This fact distinguishes numeral-attribute from the adjective-attribute.

Numerals name the quantity of items that are counted. They help to decode any abstract multitude [38, P. 97]. Unlike all the other quantitative words, numerals have the primary seme of quantity, which relates the name of a number not only to the general meaning of number but also with its actual manifestation.

Numerals have rather productive character. Their high combinatory properties can be traced not only in word combinations but also on the world-building level:

* e.g. *two*, *twice*, *two-headed*, *two-paged*, *two-seater*, etc.

The words that are derived from the numerals bear the seme of exact quantitative meaning. However, there also exist some examples when they appear as the bearers of a vague, indefinite quantitative meaning:

* e.g. *in the teens*.

On the paradigmatic level numerals appear as the bearers of an exact number, thus may be treated as absolute terms [3, P. 46; 67, P. 30; 77, P. 104; 81, P. 44]. These words are characterised by exactness, they tend to be unemotional and have no synonyms.
The analysis of numerals on the syntagmatic level, however, shows that these words, when used in the text, can realise the meaning not only of the exact number but also of an approximate or indefinite one:

*e.g.* He had the appearance of a man nearer eighty than sixty.

*In proverbs:* To kill two birds with one stone.

A stitch in time saves nine.

We would like to pay attention to the peculiarities of the *ordinal numerals.* In Modern English we can distinguish the adjectives that correlate with temporal characteristics, spatial characteristics, intensity, frequency and other quantitative characteristics. Quantitative adjectives also indicate the place in the series of objects, phenomena and events, as well as sequence and repetition. The difference between ordinal numerals and adjectives is rather a controversial issue in the linguistic circles. Adjectival nature of the word *last* that represents the meaning of sequence is obvious. However, the nature of the words like *first, second, third* causes disagreement. It is very important for the discovery of the units that belong the semantic field of quantity and the identification of the properties of valency of words that correlate with the abovementioned field to analyse of the nature of the given words, the define their status among the lexical means of quantity representation.

So, there are two approaches to the nature of the “ordinal words”:

a) they are treated as numerals;

b) they are treated as adjectives.

Both points of view are justified. Ordinal numerals have originated from cardinal numerals. Both ordinal and cardinal numerals can perform the function of an attribute. Ordinal numerals have stable structure:

*Root morpheme (of a cardinal numeral) + suffix (of an ordinal numeral)*

These facts show that ordinal numerals are actually numerals, not adjectives. This point of view is shared by V.N. Zhygadlo, I.P. Ivanova, L.L. Iofik [26, Pp. 45-49] and B.A. Ilyish [29, Pp. 142-145].
By means of ordinal numerals one cannot calculate the total number of something but merely present the position of something in a series. That is why some linguists claim that ordinal numerals cannot fully be treated as numerals just because of the fact that their root morphemes are similar to those of cardinal numerals. A.I. Smirnitsky treats ordinal numerals as adjectives because both groups of words perform identical functions and the specific property of the ordinal numerals to indicate the place in the series has no grammatical background [65, P. 163].

Unlike cardinal numerals that represent the totality, ordinal numerals represent the meaning of singularity.

Compare:

*There were three books on the table.* (There was a pile of books on the table.)

*She took the third book.* (She took only one book, the last one.)

From the paradigmatic point of view both cardinal and ordinal numerals are semantically similar: the first indicate total quantity, the second indicate the place in a “quantitative” series. However, in context the differences between them increase. Ordinal numerals gain the qualitative characteristics, while cardinal numerals represent both definite and indefinite number. In combination with nouns ordinal numerals do not influence the morphological form of the latter, while cardinal numerals concretize plurality expressed by the noun paradigm.

Compare:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One book</th>
<th>First book</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two books</td>
<td>Second book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three books</td>
<td>Third book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four books</td>
<td>Fourth book</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Modern English all cardinal numerals except *one* are used with nouns in Plural.

Not all of the ordinal numerals are correlated lexically with the names of cardinal numerals: *e.g.* first, second. The word *first* comes from OE *fyrst* – foremost; second comes from Latin *secundus* – following, next.
Ordinal numerals can form associative links with some non-quantitative notions. Thus, the word *first* can acquire a number of synonyms and antonyms:

1) **foremost in order:**

*Synonyms:* beginning, original, earliest, primary, prime, antecedent, anterior, initial, virgin, maiden, opening, introductory, inceptive, incipient, inaugural, premier, primeval, aboriginal, leading, rudimentary, fundamental

*Antonyms:* last, ultimate, final;

2) **foremost in importance:**

*Synonyms:* chief, greatest, prime, pre-eminent, principal [94].

When dealing with the ordinal numerals one cannot but state that there is some interference between the functional-semantic fields of quantity and quality [32; 33; 49]. The “ordinal words” are situated in the transition zone of these fields (Figure 1.2.).

Fig. 1.2. The interaction of the functional-semantic fields of quantity and quality

Thus, the words like *first, second, third*, etc. have specific semantic structure, originate mainly from cardinal numerals and have the properties peculiar to both: numerals and adjectives.
Adverbs are also used for the representation of process-quantity. The recurrence of an action is often represented by means of the words like often, sometimes, repeatedly, rhythmically, etc.:

Sometimes a littlun cried out from the other shelters and once a bigun spoke in the dark. (W. Golding “Lord of Flies”)

The connections may be invisible, he often preached to his symbology classes at Harvard, but they are always there, buried just beneath the surface. (D. Brown “The Da Vinci Code”)

It is also possible to use adverbs to express the meaning of quantity: they represent high, low, sufficient, insufficient, full, not full degree of property realisation. M. Blokh distinguishes the following "quantitative" adverbs:

a) "intensifiers": very, quite, entirely, utterly, highly, greatly, perfectly, absolutely, strongly, considerably, pretty, much;

b) the adverbs of excessive degree (direct and reverse): too, awfully, tremendously, dreadfully, terrifically;

c) the adverbs of unexpected degree: surprisingly, astonishingly, amazingly;

d) the adverbs of moderate degree: fairly, comparatively, relatively, moderately, rather;

e) the adverbs of low degree: slightly;

f) the adverbs of approximate degree: almost, nearly;

g) the adverbs of optimal degree: enough, sufficiently, adequately;

h) the adverbs of inadequate degree: insufficiently, intolerably, unbearably, ridiculously;

i) the adverbs of under-degree: hardly, scarcely [10, Pp. 226-227].

When combined with adjectives or numerals these “quantitative” adverbs perform either diminishing or intensifying function:

e.g. just two hours, nearly two o’clock

These combinations belong, however, not to the lexical means of quantity representation but to the syntactic ones.
1.2.3. Linguistic means of quantity representation on the syntactical level

People nowadays have reached the highest level of abstraction in understanding of quantity, thus they are able to use different stages of abstraction, therefore, different stages of concretisation while representing quantity and quantitative relations [78, P. 44].

The usage of numerals without their combining with nouns or other words that name the objects of calculation/measurement should be treated as the central and the basic syntactic structure that serves as means of representing an abstract idea of quantity without its connection with quality:

*e.g. Two plus two equals four.*

Quantitative relations are realised by means of word combinations, which can be proved by the following examples: *several days,* etc. The combinations like these are called “**quantitative word combinations**” [16]. They are composed of two or more notional words and have the following semantic model: *quantity + substance.* One element is a noun or its substitute, the second is a numeral or any other word with quantitative meaning. This is the first degree of concretisation:

*e.g. Fache immediately marched Sophie several steps away and began chastising her in hushed tones.* (D. Brown “The Da Vinci Code”)

**Three small children,** no older than Johnny, *appeared from startlingly close at hand where they had been gorging fruit in the forest.* (W. Golding “Lord of Flies”)

This type of concretisation has a quantitative character. It names the items counted without pointing on the quantitative peculiarities of each separate item. Thus, in the sentence *Three objects are on the table* the word combination *three objects* cannot inform us what objects are meant, the word combination *three books* does not supply us with the information what particular books are meant. In the combinations of this type the degree of abstraction of quality is sufficient for naming of the items counted, however is too high to be able to point to the qualitative peculiarities of each of them separately. According to V.Z. Panfilov, this degree of concretisation of quantity represents a definite stage of the category of quantity evolution. It was the
time when the ideas about definite quantities appeared, however, “they were not treated separately from the ideas of concrete objects that made up that quantity and, therefore, in the process of counting the quantitative indicators were always accompanied by the names of objects that were counted” [56, P. 285].

It is noteworthy, however, that some linguists consider that the combinations like two boys, i.e. those that contain numerals, are the morphological, not syntactical, means of substance-quantity representation.

The quantitative characteristics of an action that has been performed more than once as well as the degree of property representation can be expressed by means of the word combination cardinal numeral + “times”. When expressing the recurrence of the action one may use some other words that have quantitative meaning instead of the numeral. These combinations are common in Modern English, thus we may find them in the novels of contemporary writers:

**process-quantity:**

a) Simon, the mystic of the group, has a name clearly linked with an Apostle of Christ, the one, strange to say, who denied Him three times. (W. Golding “Lord of Flies”)

b) Because the documents remain the source of constant investigation and speculation even today, they are believed to have been moved and rehidden several times. (D. Brown “The Da Vinci Code”)

**property-quantity:** Six or seven times larger than even the most luxurious of office spaces, the knight’s cabinet de travail resembled an ungainly hybrid of science laboratory, archival library, and indoor flea market. (D. Brown “The Da Vinci Code”)

The quantitative characteristics may also be represented by nouns that denote:

- a group of people (crowd, gang, body) – a crowd of people;
- objects (set, parcel, series) – a set of furniture;
- units for measuring (bushel, peck, inch) – a bushel of coal;
- general amount (quantity, number) – a number of people;
- vessels (bottle, box, cup) – a cup of tea;
• quantitative segmentation (bit, slice, piece) – a slice of ham;
• an action (bite, drink, sip, gulp), etc.

Such combinations belong to the syntactical means of category of quantity representation.

Thus, we can state that nouns can perform the function of quantitative attributes. The meaning of quantity that a noun bears can be specified by special words (these words should match semantically):

e.g. a fair amount of money, a tiny number of people.

They found a bullet hole in the drawing room floor, signs of a struggle, a small amount of blood, a strange, barbed leather belt, and a partially used roll of duct tape. (D. Brown “The Da Vinci Code”)

A word of five letters, Langdon thought, pondering the staggering number of ancient words that might be considered words of wisdom ...the list was endless. (D. Brown “The Da Vinci Code”)

This, however, concerns not only nouns. It is also possible to express indefinite substance-quantity by means of combinations like a lot (of), plenty (of), etc.:

e.g. “You have to have a lot of metal things for that,” he said, “and we haven’t got no metal. But we got a stick.” (W. Golding “Lord of Flies”)

And since she couldn’t leave until the library closed, I had plenty of time to absorb some pithy phrases about the shift of royal dependence from cleric to lawyer in the late eleventh century. (E. Segal “Love Story”)

To point out the definite property one uses the word combinations of adjectives like dark, pale, deep, light with nouns denoting colour:

e.g. Out there, perhaps a mile away, the white surf flinked on a coral reef, and beyond that the open sea was dark blue. (W. Golding “Lord of Flies”)

The wood was a lustrous deep purple with a strong grain. (D. Brown “The Da Vinci Code”)

One more important syntactic means of process-quantity representation are the combinations would/used (to) + infinitive of the notional verb. They are used to express the habitual repeated action:

*e.g. We used to play* Tarot cards for fun, and my indicator card always turned out to be from the suit of pentacles. (D. Brown “The Da Vinci Code”)

*When she was young, often her grandfather would use* anagram games to hone her English spelling. (D. Brown “The Da Vinci Code”)

The *syntactic structures that include homogenous members*, i.e. structures in which there is an explanation of the word that concretizes the meaning of quantity may be treated as the next degree of concretisation:

*e.g. Tonight, the cryptographer in Sophie was forced to respect the efficiency with which her grandfather had used a simple code to unite two total strangers—Sophie Neveu and Robert Langdon.* (D. Brown “The Da Vinci Code”)

In Modern English the meaning of indefinite multitude is realised by means of *phraseological units*:

*e.g. one at a time, two heads are better than one, time and again, when two Sundays meet together, all of a sudden, out of blue,* etc.

These units extend the common understanding of the semantic category of quantity. Here we can distinguish the following structural models:

- prepositional-nominal: beyond measure, in number, up to the ears;
- comparative: as numberless as the sands;
- nominal-quantitative: oceans of time, world of troubles, the lion’s share;
- pleonastic: day after day, pile on pile [18, P. 152].

The repetition is a typical means of expressing substance-, property- and process-quantity. The repetition of a noun conveys multitude, the duplication of a verb – duration or recurrence, the repetition of an adjective or an adverb – intensity:

- **substance-quantity**: There were rows and rows of houses;
• *process-quantity*: James still waited and waited;
• *property-quantity*: He would have been *very, very* polite.
Conclusions to chapter 1

The category of quantity is the phenomenon that can be viewed from the philosophical (logical) and linguistic standpoint.

The ontological category of quantity is the result of the “mirroring” of the quantitative determinacy that is peculiar to all the objects existing in the objective reality. The linguistic category of quantity includes, in its turn, all the possible linguistic means of quantity nomination.

There are two different approaches towards the classification of means of quantity representation:

- the one based on the levels of the language (proposed by S.O. Shvachko)
- the one based on the ontological triad (proposed by Z. Turayeva and J. Birenbaum).

The collation of these taxonomies serves as the basis of our further investigation and helps us to gain the deeper insight into the nature of logical and linguistic categories of quantity, their constituent parts, semantico-grammatical properties, lexical content, the interrelation and correlation of the components.

Thus, according to this new taxonomy, the substance-quantity is realised by means of the morphemes -let and -ie on the morphemic level; nouns related to measurement and calculation, pronouns one another, each other, both and ordinal numerals on the lexical level. The syntactic means of substance-quantity representation are: a) repetition; b) word combinations like “a lot of/plenty of + noun”; c) word combinations with nouns denoting vessels, portions of medicine, groups of objects, quantitative segmentation and general amount; d) syntactic structures with homogenous members; e) word combinations with numerals.

The process-quantity is usually represented by the morphemes -ce, re- on the morphemic level; the adverbs often, sometimes, repeatedly, rhythmically and the verbs that realize the seme of concrete number on the lexical level. Among the syntactic means of process-quantoty representation we distinguish a) repetition;
b) word combinations with numerals (their substitutes) with *times*; c) word combinations with ordinal numerals with *time*; d) other word combinations with numerals; word combinations like “*used to/would* + infinitive.”

In Modern English the property-quantity is realised on the morphemic level by the morphemes *-ce* and *-ish* as well as by compound words with the first component that points to the part of a whole. The lexical means of process-quantity representation are: a) adjectives denoting measure and calculation; b) adjectives and adverbs in comparative and superlative degrees; c) derivatives from numerals. Repetition, special phraseological units and the word combinations with numerals are the common syntactic means of the property-quantity representation.

The structure of the functional-semantic field of quantity in Modern English is graphically represented in Supplement 23.
Chapter 2. Discourse and the functional-semantic field

2.0. General features

In the given chapter different approaches towards the term “discourse” and the general ideas dedicated to the problem of the definition of a “functional-semantic field” are presented. Special attention is given to the peculiarities of the author’s discourse, especially the one in Modern English literature, and its influence upon the semantic field of a literary text.

2.1. The notion of discourse in modern linguistics

There is no exact and conventional definition of the term “discourse” that can cover all the cases if its usage. This may be one of the reasons that has made this notion so popular and widely used in the last decades.

Discourse (from Medieval Latin discursus – argument, from Latin: a running to and fro, from discurrere – to run different ways, from DIS + currere to run) means speech, process of linguistic activity, etc. This polysemantc term is used in humanities the subject of which presupposes the study of a language functioning, i.e. linguistics, literary criticism, semiotics, sociology, philosophy, ethnology and anthropology [6; 7; 19; 23; 45; 46; 47; 51; 59; 66].

V.A. Kanke states that in modern philosophy the term “dialectics” (introduced by Zeno and Socrates) that is treated as “the art of finding out the truth through the collision of opposite truths” tend to be substituted by the term “discourse” that is treated as “the process of getting new knowledge on the basis of philosophically and scientifically independent judgements presented in a linguistic form” [35, Pp. 162-163].

In the given paper we focus on the usage of this notion in the sphere of linguistics.
One of the meanings of the term “discourse” aims at the specification of the traditional notions of style and individual language. Instead of expressions like “Fowles’ style”, “Fowles’ language” the following ones are used: “small group’s discourse” (M.L. Makarov, 1998), “discourse of memoirs” (N.M. Mokretsova, 2001), “business-plan discourse” (L.M. Hobrakova, 2001). This treatment of “discourse” presupposes the description of the manner of talking in different sorts of discourse. Here one should take into consideration not only purely linguistic characteristics, stylistic peculiarities, specificity of the subject-matter, etc. but also ideological slant of the text that comes from various social institutes.

The term “discourse” also has other definitions that appeared due to the new tendency in linguistics to investigate halting speech segments from the texts (1960s-70s). In the researches of English and American scholars one can find the tendency to use the term mentioned above to denote these segments. In a number of European countries, however, on the primary stages of the study of halting speech segments the term “text” was more preferable (Agricola 1979, Dressler 1973, Isenberg 1974, etc.). This term was also preferred by the linguists of the former Soviet Union (Galperin 1981, Referovskaya 1983, etc.). [58, P. 127].

It is not right, however, to consider that the term mentioned above has not been used in the linguistics of the former Soviet Union. T.M. Nikolayeva, for example, established the existence of this term in the linguistics of the 1970s. She proposed the following definitions of discourse:

1) halting text;
2) spoken form of a text;
3) dialogue;
4) a group of utterances that are meaningfully interconnected;
5) oral or written speech as it is given [55, P. 48].

In modern linguistics the term “discourse” semantically is closely connected with the concept “text”, however, it emphasizes the dynamic character of a language
communication, while the text, on the contrary, is treated as a static notion, i.e. the result of the linguistic activity.

According to O.I. Moskalskaya, text is, on the one hand, any statement that consists of one or more sentences and expresses a completed idea, on the other hand, it is a book or a play, or an article, etc. [52, P. 12].

In Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary we find the following definitions: Text (noun) 1) the main printed part of a book or magazine (not the notes, pictures); 2) any form of written material; 3) the written form of speech, a play, an article, etc.; 4) a book, play, etc., especially one studied for an exam [93, P. 1343].

Some scholars treat text as “a unity of interconnected utterances (usually in a written form) that make up a segment that is larger than a sentence”[41, P. 89].

Modern linguists E.S. Kubryakova and O.V. Aleksandrova that discourse is “a cognitive process, that is connected with the actual speech-making…; text, however, is a final result of the process of speech activity that takes a definite final (and fixed) form. Such an opposition of actual speech and its result also helps to understand in what meaning text can be treated as discourse: only when it is actually perceived and when it gets into a present consciousness of a perceiver.” E.S. Kubryakova and O.V. Aleksandrova state that discourse should be treated as a “processual and active phenomenon, i.e. as a synchronically performed process of creation or perception of the text” [39, P. 19]. Thus, the main difference between the notions “discourse” and “text” is that the first one includes both components: dynamic process of linguistic activity and its result, i.e. text. This point of view is preferable in the linguistic circles.

The term “dialogue” is also very close to the term “discourse”. The latter presupposes the existence of two fundamental roles – the speaker (the author) and the addressee. If there is an exchange between the speaker and the addressee then it is a dialogue. If the discourse is characterized by the predominance of the role of the speaker then we deal with a monologue. However, we consider that it is not correct to
treat the monologue as the discourse with a single participant. Even in this case the addressee is needed.

The notion “dialogue” is used in this paper to denote not only a conversation between the characters of a novel but also the dialogue between the three dimensions of the author’s personality. This will be explained later.

Actually the terms “text” and “dialogue”, being more traditional, have more connotations, thus cannot be used freely. That is why the term “discourse” is more convenient, being the generic term that unifies all the types of a language usage.

As the structure of discourse presupposes the existence of two opposed roles – the speaker and the addressee – the process of communication can be viewed in these two perspectives. The modelling of the processes of discourse construction and the modelling of the processes of discourse understanding are not the same. In the discourse studies there are two main trends – the research works dedicated to the discourse construction (e.g., the choice of a lexical means to name a certain object) and those dedicated to the understanding of the discourse by the addressee (e.g., the question whether the hearer understands shortened lexical means, or, as in our case, the perception of quantity (that is expressed by different linguistic means) by the addressee).
2.2. The peculiarities of the author’s discourse in Modern English literature

The author’s discourse in fiction aims at the creation of the author’s subjective world outlook in the spatial and temporal bounds of fiction. This world outlook is the result of a complicated process of dialogical relations that build up the mimesis:

1. I – reality;
2. I – possible realities;
3. I – The Other (self-expression).

In author’s discourse the first type of dialogical relations can be viewed only on the level of prototype as there is no actual referent in fiction. The second type of dialogical relations is truly mimetic because every literary text is one of the possible realities. The third type of relations is the auto-dialogue in which the conceptualization of the world outlook takes place. By this we mean that the author elaborates his basic concepts, metaphors and symbols. While creating his own reality the author not only establishes certain dialogical relations with The Other but also acts as The Other himself.

The first try to describe the literary text from the point of view of the heterogeneousness of its components was made by Czech linguist L. Doležel in 1960s. Following structural-functional principles of Prague Linguistic School, L. Doležel distinguished two planes in the literary text: the plane of narrator’s expressions (plane N) and the plane of characters’ expressions (plane Ch). Both planes are viewed from the point of view of a certain collection of linguistic properties (formal, semantic, functional-situational, stylistic and graphical) by means of which the distinction of the planes is the primary differentiation of the literary text.

According to L. Doležel in the classic prose of XVIII-XIX centuries the plane N is uniform and has the following features: the 3rd person Singular and the Past tense of the verbs. The plane Ch. is, on the contrary, inwardly heterogeneous not only formally (the 1st, 2nd and 3rd persons Singular and Plural are used in this case) but also
functionally (some emotional means are used), semantically (the means of subjective treatment are used), stylistically (the usage of colloquial speech) and graphically (direct speech is given in quotation marks). Here the secondary differentiation of the text takes place [63].

Modern prose is characterised by the interaction of the planes N and Ch. that results in the appearance of a new type of expression: “direct non-self” speech, i.e. ambivalent expression in which the author’s and the character’s voices are mixed. This is the peculiar characteristic of John Fowles’ discourse in “The Collector”. One and the same story is told from two different characters. It may seem that there is no plane N at all, however, the author presents two different world outlooks, being the co-author of each of them.

In the case of “direct non-self” speech the principle of heterogeneousness is used by L. Doležel only concerning the plane Ch. or marginal zone of interaction of two planes, while the plane N is left outside the field of vision.

In this plane the given principle becomes fully apparent because here “the zone of dialogical contact” begins. Heterogeneousness of elements is the principle of composition and the basic structural rule of literary text in general. This rule provides the work of art with the constant resistance of predictability. However, this rule arises not from the text itself but from the presence of The Other, dialogical interaction of the author with the readers and his characters.

The analysis of English fiction of XVIII-XX centuries from the point of view of the heterogeneousness of author’s discourse shows that almost all outstanding English writers create their discourse dialogically.

The literary discourse brings every word into the dialogical dimension. Polyphony of contradictions characterise not only the literary discourse overall but also the author’s discourse as well as the ones of the characters and reader. The latter also takes part in the dialogue.

The general dialogical strategy of the author’s discourse is realized in every specific case of making the zone of contact by means of certain set of speech tactics. With the help of these tactics the author explains and specifies the course of
narration, expresses critical attitude towards what is represented, reveals its essence and gives his own appraisal to it. The author also draws our attention to the form, i.e. language.

All these characteristics of discourse are closely connected and take part in the creation of the semantic field of a literary text.
2.3. The notion of the functional-semantic field

The conceptual meaning of a word is not isolated, it exists in some correlation with the conceptual meanings of other words, particularly the words of one and the same semantic field.

The term “semantic field” is used to denote a more or less large group of words, namely their meanings that are connected with one and the same fragment of reality [68, P. 60]. The words that belong to the field make up a “thematic group”. For example, a group of words denoting time (time, season, year, month, week, etc. as well as spring, summer... morning, evening...); the terms denoting family relations (father, mother, son, brother, cousin, etc.); names of plants (or more specified subgroups: names of trees, mushrooms, etc.); words denoting senses of perception (to see, to hear, to notice, etc.). From the point of view of inner semantic relations of words that belong to one and the same thematic group should be treated as relatively independent lexical microsystem. This is a definition of term “semantic field” as presented by Ju.S. Maslov [48, P. 96]. Ukrainian linguist S.V. Zemchynsky considers that the ability of a lexeme to be simultaneously related to a couple of meanings is one of the most important peculiarities of lexemes as the parts of the lexical subsystem. By means of polysemy the number of elements that build up the lexical system decreases. With the help of polysemy one and the same lexeme can represent different meanings. As a result it can belong to different semantic fields. According to S.V. Semchynsky, semantic field is a group of lexemes that build up a “thematic group” that deals with a definite part of a physical or mental activity, which is allocated by means of our consciousness [64, P. 196]. We can say that this scholar treats “semantic field” as “lexico-semantic field”, i.e. he takes into consideration only lexemes. The term “functional-semantic field” gives us the possibility to treat linguistic means that belong not only to the lexical level but also to the other levels of the language as parts of a semantic field. The functional-semantic field is a phenomenon that is studied in the framework of the theory of functional grammar.
**Functional grammar** is a kind of grammar that studies the linguistic units that belong to different levels of the language and are united on the basis of the unity of their semantic functions [21, P. 58]

According to A.V. Bondarko, functional-semantic field is “a double-sided (semantico-formal) unity that is formed by grammatical (morphological and syntactic) means of a given language together with the interactive lexical, lexico-grammatical and word-building elements that belong to the same semantic zone”[13, P. 40].

Functional-semantic fields make up in a certain language some certain groupings (on the semantic basis). The description of interference on the transition zones of functional-semantic fields is an inseparable component of functional grammar. The connection and interference of certain functional-semantic fields point to a complicated multifold system of the whole functional-semantic field complex.

Sometimes it is very hard to define the status of a functional-semantic field as a separate field or the one related to a broader semantic area. The most easily defined are the functional-semantic fields that are based on grammatical categories (e.g. functional-semantic fields of temporality and comparison). The grammatical forms that represent these grammatical categories interact with the units of different levels of the language that bear the sense of peculiar to the members of the category.

The structure of functional-semantic fields can be either monocentric or polycentric [12, Pp. 61-62]. Separate grammatical forms (series of forms) can act as the basic components of the functional-semantic field. A complicated polycentric structure is peculiar to the functional-semantic field of quantity. The latter is based not only on grammatical category of number but also on numerals and quantitative-nominal word combinations, etc. In such a functional-semantic field the nucleus is rather “weak”, non-focused and blurred.

The study of a functional-semantic field in not just the enumeration of the means that can be used for the representation of a certain linguistic category it is also the description of the structure of this functional-semantic field. Thus, in the literature dedicated to this issue the components of the field are usually defined and the
understanding of the structure of the field as a special system (centre – periphery, relations between linguistic means – the components of the field, interference of functional-semantic fields, the content of semantic categories that are included into the functional-semantic field, their hierarchy, semantic structure of the field) is presented.

In this paper we focus on the functional-semantic field of quantity that goes far beyond the notion of number (e.g., number of objects) and includes also degree of property realisation, duration, etc. The latter are treated as parts of this field because in the process of cognition people perceive them as such. That is why, while analyzing the peculiarities of the functional-semantic field of quantity in author’s discourse, we will focus on the distinctive features of its means of quantity representation that different levels of the language.

2.3.1. The functional-semantic field of quantity in author’s discourse

The functional-semantic field of quantity in is a variety of linguistic means that can be used for the category of quantity representation.

According to A.V. Bondarko the functional-semantic field of quantity is based on the one hand on the grammatical category of number (mainly the category of number of nouns) and on numerals, quantititative word combinations, adjectival and adverbial determiners of quantitative relations on the other hand [69, Pp. 161-245].

In Modern English the functional-semantic field of quantity consists of the three main groups of means of the category of quantity representation that correspond two morphemic, lexical and syntactic levels of the language and are further subdivided into the means denoting substance-, process- or property-quantity.

Thus, on the morphemic level the substance-quantity can be represented by the morphemes -let and -ie; the process-quantity – by the morphemes -ce, -fold, re-, ex- and the postpositional combination to-be; the property-quantity – by the suffix -ish when it points to insufficient degree of property realization, morpheme -ce and compound words with the first component, which points to the part of a whole
expressing an insufficient degree of property realization. Other compound words with the first element that has quantitative meaning like hexachord, monophonic can express either substance or property-quantity.

On the lexical level the substance-quantity is usually expressed by ordinal numerals, nouns denoting measurement or calculation, pronouns that indicate mutuality each other, one another, both; the process-quantity – by adverbs that point to the recurrence of the action and verbs; the property-quantity – by the, derivatives from numerals, adjectives and adverbs used in the comparative of superlative degree, adjectives denoting calculation or measure.

As to the syntactic level, the substance-quantity is represented here by the syntactic structures with homogeneous members; word combinations like a lot of/plenty of + noun; word combinations with nouns denoting vessels, portions of medicine, group of objects, etc. The process-quantity can be expressed by the word combinations: used to/would + infinitive, cardinal numeral (substitute) + times, ordinal numeral + time. The property-quantity is usually represented special phraseological units as well as the word combinations with intensifying/diminishing adverbs. Word combinations with numerals and repetition express all the three types of quantity, i.e. substance-, process- and property-quantity.

The functional-semantic field of quantity in author’s discourse usually differ from the common linguistic field of quantity. The peculiarities of the functional-semantic field of quantity in author’s discourse depend on the author’s choice of means of the category of quantity representation. That is why in the process of the discourse analysis one should compare the peculiarities of the author’s usage of means of the category of quantity representation with the linguistic model of the functional-semantic field of quantity. This helps to establish the author’s peculiar model of the field.
Conclusions to chapter 2

In linguistics there’s no one conventional definition of the term “discourse”. In some cases it is substituted by the term “text”, however, there is a substantial difference between these two terms as the term “discourse” emphasizes the dynamic character of a language communication, while the text is treated as a static notion.

The author’s discourse is a specific kind of discourse that can be characterized as the dialogue between three dimensions of the author’s personality: I-reality, I-possible realities and I-The Other.

In the author’s discourse we distinguish two planes: the plane of the narrator’s expressions (plane N) and the plane of characters’ expressions (plane Ch). The interaction of these planes is the characteristic feature of modern English literature.

The peculiarities of the author’s discourse certainly have influence upon the peculiarities of functional-semantic fields that belong to the general semantic field of the literary text. This is caused by the peculiarities of the author’s choice of the means of a linguistic category representation.

The term “semantic field” can have two different meanings: a) lexico-semantic field (S.V. Semchynsky); b) functional-semantic field (A.V. Bondarko). The difference between these two notions lies in the fact that functional-semantic fields are based on morphological categories, while lexico-semantic fields concern lexical sphere.

As to the functional-semantic field of quantity, in Modern English it consists of three large groups of means of the category of quantity representation that correspond to the morphemic, lexical and syntactic levels of the language.
Chapter 3. The peculiarities of the category of quantity representation in the novel “The Collector” by John Fowles

3.0. General features

In this chapter we analyze the peculiarities of the category of quantity representation by John Fowles in the novel “The Collector”. In our investigation we focus on 3 levels of the language (morphemic, lexical and syntactic) and three types of quantity (substance-quantity, process-quantity and property-quantity).

3.1. The actualization of the quantitative characteristics of action, substance, and property on the morphemic level in the novel “The Collector” by John Fowles

The investigation begins with the morphemic level. As it has been mentioned in the previous chapter, morphemes can be used for the representation of all the members of the “ontological triad”. Having analyzed the novel we have found the examples that can prove this fact (see: Supplement 2).

The morpheme -let is the unit that represents quantitative properties with approximate evaluation. It is usually used to represent substance-quantity. In the novel there is only one example of this kind:

- Do you know I’ve given up hours and hours of my time to distribute leaflets and address envelopes and argue with miserable people like you who don’t believe anything? (John Fowles “The Collector”)

Diminutive and intensifying affixes that are usual means of property-quantity representation are not used, however, we may come across the suffix -ish and compound words in which the first component points to the part of a whole and serves the above-mentioned purpose. The 3 examples with the suffix -ish that we have found are:
But I see it as something very special, all black, umber, dark, dark grey, mysterious angular forms in shadow leading to the distant soft honey-whitish square of the light-filled door. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

I can see you’re a draughtsman, you’ve a fairish sense of colour and what-not, sensitive. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

She didn’t say anything, the cold air had made her cough and bring up, her face was the funny purplish colour, too. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

There are 4 examples of the compound words mentioned above and they are:

- She’s half-turned away, hanging up or taking down a dress from a hook. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- I’m restless. I can’t write here. I feel half-escaped already. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- The one that was so good only looked half-finished to me, you could hardly tell what the fruit were and it was all lop-sided. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- He wanted to run away, but he couldn’t, so he stood by his desk, half turned, while I knelt half-naked by the fire and let my hair down, just to make it quite obvious. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

As it can be seen from the examples above, in all these compound words the first component is half: All of them are adjectives, though, some of them, i.e. 75%, are derived from verbs (e.g. half-turned, half-escaped, etc.), while the other (e.g. half-naked) are derived from adjectives – 15%, respectively.

Theoretically, the number of means of process-quantity representation on the morphemic level is rather large. However, they are rare in the author’s discourse. Thus, we have found only 1 example of verb used with prefix re-, which points to the repetition of the action:
- **So he gets up, goes out, undoes the padlock holding the door open, locks the door, gets the sauce in the outer cellar, unlocks the door, re-padlocks it, comes back. (John Fowles “The Collector”)**

The morpheme -ce, also serves the above-mentioned purpose, nevertheless, it may also actualize the quantitative characteristics of property:

**process-quantity** (88.9% of all cases):

- **Twice** she called Minny Minny like she thought she was in the next room (it was her sister), and then she started to mumble a lot of names and words, all mixed up with bits of sentence. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- You can jolly well read “The Catcher in the Rye”. I’ve almost finished it. Do you know I’ve read it twice and I’m five years younger than you are? (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- He says now he will release me in another four weeks. Just talk. I don’t believe him. So I’ve warned him I’m going to try to kill him. I would now. I wouldn’t think twice about it. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- I was careful in Lewes, I never went to the same shop twice running so that they wouldn’t think I was buying a lot for one person. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

Thus, when the process-quantity is meant, the words with morpheme -ce are connected with verb-predicates:

- He likes me to smile at the camera, so twice I pulled shocking faces. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- A nice thing to end with. The Bach record came today, I’ve played it twice already. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- I went twice to the coffee-bar. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- In the end I got her to take a double dose of the pills, it said on the packet not to exceed the stated dose, but I heard once you ought to take twice what they
said, they were scared to make it too strong for legal reasons. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

When the words with morpheme -ce are used for the representation of property-quantity they are connected not to verb-predicates but to the word combinations your age and as difficult. In this case they act as predicates:

**property-quantity** (11,1% of all cases):

- I’m **twice** your age, I ought to take things like this in my stride—Christ only knows it’s not the first time. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- And it was **twice** as difficult with her, because I didn’t want to kill her, that was the last thing I wanted. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

In the novel we also come across the cases when the author uses the combination:

* a word with morphemes -ce (1) + or + a word with morphemes -ce (2).

This combination shows that the author is not sure as to the number of times the action took place, i.e. indefinite quantity is meant. Such “hesitation” is peculiar to the author’s style and happens in 22,2% of all cases:

- What this is all leading to is I got a bit drunk **once or twice** when I was in the Pay Corps, especially in Germany, but I never had anything to do with women. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- It was funny, we sat in silence facing each other and I had a feeling I’ve had **once or twice** before, of the most peculiar closeness to him—not love or attraction or sympathy in any way. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- **Once or twice** I saw tradesmen looking through, but people soon seemed to get the point. I was left alone, and could get on with my work. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
The words with morpheme -ce have the tendency to be used in comparative constructions to show that the action takes place more times than we have known about or to show that the property is realised more intensely:

- “Oh, Ferdinand!” she said. (She said it once) And then twice more, Ferdinand, Ferdinand, (plus two more times, so it equals three times) and she sort of prayed to heaven and acted someone in great pain, so I had to laugh, but suddenly she was all serious, or pretending it. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- I’d met her twice more at G.P.’s, when there were other people there—one was her husband, a Dane, some kind of importer. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- And it was twice as difficult with her, because I didn’t want to kill her, that was the last thing I wanted. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

What concerns the position of the words with this morpheme, they have rather wide distribution (see: Supplement 2). The most common positions are:

a) at the beginning of the sentence (33,3%):
   - Twice she struggled to get out of bed again, it was no good, she hadn’t the strength of a flea. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
   - Once or twice I’ve wondered whether it wasn’t all a trap. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

b) at the end of one of the clauses of a compound sentence (22,3%):
   - after the direct object (16,7%):
     - I did try to see him twice, but he was away all September. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
   - after the indirect object (5,6%):
     - I was careful in Lewes, I never went to the same shop twice running so that they wouldn’t think I was buying a lot for one person. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

c) in the middle of the sentence (44,4%):

**process-quantity**

- after the verb-predicate (22,2%):
  - *I went twice to the coffee-bar.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

- after the direct object (11,1%):
  - *I’d met her twice more at G.P.’s, when there were other people there—one was her husband, a Dane, some kind of importer.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

**property-quantity** (11,1% of all cases)

- *I’m twice your age, I ought to take things like this in my stride—Christ only knows it’s not the first time. No, let me finish now.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)
3.2. The actualization of the quantitative characteristics of action, substance, and property on the lexical level in the novel “The Collector” by John Fowles

As it has been mentioned in the previous chapter, ontological types of quantity are usually expressed in Modern English with the help of the parts of speech categorical meanings. The variety of lexical means that John Fowles uses in “The Collector” proves this idea.

Numerals are the bearers of the seme of quantity, that is why we treat them as the most basic and genuine means of quantity representation.

Numerals, being productive, are the means of word-building. The derivatives bear seme of quantity because it is peculiar to the numerals they are derived from. In the novel we come across the 10 derivatives from cardinal numerals (see: Supplement 3). All of them are adjectives that perform the function of an attribute in the sentence:

- It was two-inch seasoned wood with sheet metal on the inside so she couldn’t get at the wood. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- Four-letter words. All sorts of bitter cynical things about the Slade and various artists—things I know he doesn’t believe. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- She was like all women, she had a one-track mind. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- Every week I did the same five-bob perm. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

These derivatives come mainly from the combination of nouns with a) the words of measure, namely inch (in 4 cases) and foot (1 example):

- It was an old six-inch nail, I don’t know how she’d got hold of it. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
• *In the end I got up some wood and boarded across the frame, three-inch screws, so she couldn’t signal with the light or climb out.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• *He said, you’re like a kid trying to see over a six-foot wall.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

b) the words denoting monetary units:

• *To show how I was, I put five five-pound notes I had on me in an envelope and addressed it to Miss Miranda Grey, the Slade School of Art... only of course I didn’t post it.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• *She went up to the fireplace where the wild duck were, there were three hung up, thirty-bob each and before you could say Jack Knife she had them off the hook and bang crash on the hearth.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

Ordinal numerals also have productive character, however, their productiveness is not so spread as that of cardinal ones. The author uses ordinal numeral derivatives only thrice in his novel, i.e. in 23 % of all cases:

• *She is one of our most promising second-year students.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• *Caroline was furious, trying to slide out of it. (“He’s always like that, he does it deliberately.”) Sneering at his painting all the way home (“second-rate Paul Nash”—ridiculously unfair).* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• *G.P. as an artist. Caroline’s “second-rate Paul Nash”—horrid, but there is something in it.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

It is noteworthy, that all of these numeral derivatives are originated from the ordinal numeral *second* that serves as the first part of a compound adjective.

Though the nature of so-called “ordinal words” causes much disagreement in linguistic circles, we consider that these words bear the seme of quantity giving us the
possibility to treat them as lexical means of quantity representation. This is clearly seen from the examples below:

- *The Invention* I like best is the one after the one he loves best—he loves the fifth, and I the sixth. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- She was sitting in a second loom at the back. I sat on a stool at the counter where I could watch. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- The first one I made didn’t work, but the second one was better. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- It’s the seventh night. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- Well, she had a second glass and then we went through to the other room where I’d slipped my present in her place, which she saw at once. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- I was furious, that first night. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

It is noteworthy, that when the author uses ordinal numerals, the actualisation of the qualitative-quantitative characteristic of substance takes place (see: Supplement 4):

- What I did in the first cellar was I put in a small cooker and all the other facilities. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- The first one I made didn’t work, but the second one was better. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- Perhaps she didn’t always use the tube to go home, I didn’t see her for two days, but then the third day I saw her cross the road and go into the station. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- But it’s wet, I said. And cold. It was the second week in October. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- But there’s a mysterious fourth part I can’t define. It can’t be friendship, I loathe him. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
The next morning she made the first attempt to escape. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

It was like not having a net and catching a specimen you wanted in your first and second fingers (I was always very clever at that), coming up slowly behind and you had it, but you had to nip the thorax, and it would be quivering there. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

In this case the ordinal numerals are used with nouns or noun substitutes they define and express, as it has been mentioned above, substance-quantity. However, if the ordinal numeral is followed by the word time, we should regard it as means of process-quantity representation on the syntactic level.

The most frequently used ordinal numeral by John Fowles is the first (80,2% of all ordinal numerals used in the novel):

“Am I the first girl you’ve ever kissed?” (John Fowles “The Collector”)

It was the first sign of life she’d shown for three days. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

One day three or four after her first bath she was very restless. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

So I must not jump at the first chance. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

This is the first proper daylight I’ve seen for two months. It lived. It made me cry. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

Numerals can also be used in proverbs and sayings and denote indefinite quantity. We have found only one examples of this type in “The Collector”:

Two birds with one stone. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

Some of the numerals, being used idiomatically, have lost their primary quantitative meaning, which is proved by the sentences below:
• It was just what I didn’t want, I knew she was due, and I nearly gave up then and there. But I bent right down, they passed talking nineteen to the dozen, I don’t think they even saw me or the van. (talk incessantly) (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• She had me all at sixes and sevens that evening. (in confusion) (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• The technically accomplished buggers are two a penny in any period. (easily obtained and so almost worthless). (John Fowles “The Collector”)

As to the other parts of speech we cannot but mention that John Fowles uses different possible lexical means of quantity representation, in particular, adjectives, adverbs nouns and pronouns.

The author of “The Collector” uses adjectives of two types:
a) those denoting calculation (1,2% of all cases):

• In the end I got her to take a double dose of the pills, it said on the packet not to exceed the stated dose, but I heard once you ought to take twice what they said, they were scared to make it too strong for legal reasons. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• I locked the door down double quick and got into the house and locked that door and all the bolts home. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

b) those, denoting measure (98,8% of all cases):

• The best were when she stood in her high heels, from the back. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• The window was high, I knew she couldn’t get out without my hearing, and it was quite a drop. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• I sat on the divan and he on his high stool by the bench. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
• *I couldn’t pretend I was ill. I’d put shoes on. He had something (a hammer?) in his hand, peculiar wide eyes, I’m sure he was going to attack me.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• *The doctor came out just then to call in the next patient, he was a tall man with a moustache, and he said, “Next” as if he was sick of seeing all these people.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• *It was another large cellar, four big steps down from the first one, but this time with a lower roof and a bit arched, like the rooms you see underneath churches sometimes.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• *He’s six feet. Eight or nine inches more than me. Skinny, so he looks taller than he is.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• *I know he is short, only an inch or two more than me.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• *I had the cords in my pocket and after a bit of a struggle I got them on her and then the gag, it was her own fault if they were tight, I got her on a short rope tied to the bed and then I went and fetched the camera and flash equipment.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• *However I was very lucky, the axe wasn’t all that sharp and it glanced off my head, it looked a horrible jagged wound but it wasn’t deep.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• *A thick round wall of glass.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• *It was another large cellar, four big steps down from the first one, but this time with a lower roof and a bit arched, like the rooms you see underneath churches sometimes.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• *What I did in the first cellar was I put in a small cooker and all the other facilities. I didn’t know there wouldn’t be snoopers and it would look funny if I was always carrying trays of food up and down.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)
• She was wearing a narrow blue skirt I bought her and a big black jumper and a white blouse, the colours really suited her. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• I fixed up a screen in one corner and behind it a wash-table and a camper’s lavatory and all the etceteras—it was like a separate little room almost. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

Such adjectives as big, little and small that denote measurement are used most frequently. They take 23.3%, 43.9% and 13.4%, respectively (see: Supplement 5):

• She had great big clear eyes, very curious, always wanting to find out. (Not snoopy, of course.) (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• She was wearing a narrow blue skirt I bought her and a big black jumper and a white blouse, the colours really suited her. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• The little drops and the ocean are the same thing. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• I had prepared a little note, written in my smallest writing, and I slipped it into the envelope when he wasn’t looking. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• She lucked and struggled, but of course she was too small and I may not be Mr. Atlas but I am not a weakling either. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

It is noteworthy, that John Fowles also uses words derived from this kind of adjectives, thus actualizing quantitative characteristics of property. There are, however, only 3 examples of this kind:

• Short and broad and broad-faced with a hook-nose; even a bit Turkish. Not really English-looking at all. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• He was scraping the glue away from a broken Chinese blue-and-white bowl he’d bought in the Portobello Road, and repaired, two fiendishly excited horsemen chasing a timid little fallow-deer. Very short-fingered, sure hands. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
• It wasn’t just that. It was frightened in a funny little-boy way, too. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

The degree of property representation is conveyed through the forms of grammatical category of degrees of comparison of adjectives and adverbs. Thus, we can find 190 examples of the usage of adjectives in the comparative and superlative degree in the novel. The ratio of the usage of adjectives in comparative and superlative degree is 60% and 40%, respectively:

**comparative degree:**

- I dropped my handkerchief so that I could get a closer look. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- As it so happens, anyway, as soon as I woke up I began to have more sensible ideas, it’s just like me to see only the dark side last thing at night and to wake up different. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

**superlative degree:**

- You go to the nearest big town and post it.
- I knew that if I made the slightest false step he would leap at me.
- He looked so innocent and worried when he stopped me. He said he’d run over a dog. I thought it might be Misty. Exactly the sort of man you would not suspect. The most unwolflike. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

One can distinguish some groups of adjectives that are used in comparative and superlative degrees. They are:

a) adjectives denoting age (15,5%):

- They look much older and younger. It sounds impossible in words. But that’s exactly it. I am older and younger. I am older because I have learnt, I am younger because a lot of me consisted of things older people had taught me. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
b) adjectives denoting measurement (11%):

- *Downstairs what he (he would) called “the lounge” is a beautiful room, much bigger than the other rooms, peculiarly square, you don’t expect it, with one huge crossbeam supported on three uprights in the middle of the room, and other crossbeams and nooks and delicious angles an architect wouldn’t think of once in a thousand years.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- *I felt my face was red, I stared at the words but I couldn’t read, I daren’t look the smallest look—she was there almost touching me.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

c) adjectives denoting distance (5%):

- *Old cottage, charming secluded situation, large garden, 1 hr. by car London, two miles from nearest village* ...(John Fowles “The Collector”)
- *I dropped my handkerchief so that I could get a closer look.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

d) adjectives denoting positive/negative emotions (5,5%):

- *I really think he’d be happier if he wore starched collars. So utterly not with it. And he stands.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- *Then there was a strange silence, as if we’d come to a full stop, as if he’d expected me to react in some other way. Be more angry or shocked, perhaps.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

e) adjectives denoting positive/negative features of character (3,3%):

- *Then, here, she said and held out the drawing. It was really good, it really amazed me, the likeness. It seemed to make me more dignified, better-looking than I really was.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• I like bed, I like the female body, I like the way even the shallowest of women become beautiful when their clothes are off and they think they’re taking a profound and wicked step. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

f) adjectives denoting positive/negative mental characteristics (3,9%):
• And then I did something even more stupid than the having gone there in the first place. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
• Being cleverer (as I thought) than most men, and cleverer than all the girls I knew. I always thought I knew more, felt more, understood more. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

g) adjectives denoting positive/negative physical state (5,3%):
• It was not my fault. How was I to know she was iller than she looked. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
• I asked her if she was better. Sarcastic, of course. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

h) adjectives denoting positive aesthetic treatment of an object/person (30,4%):
• I showed her a drawer of Chalkhill and Adonis Blues, I have a beautiful var. ceroneus Adonis and some var. tithonus Chalkhills, and I pointed them out. The var. ceroneus is better than any they got in the N.H. Museum. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
• His studio. The most beautiful room. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

i) adjectives denoting negative treatment of an object/person (5,3%):
• Well, that is foul. But Caliban’s England is fouler. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• And I think the most disgusting thing of all is that Alan Sillitoe doesn’t show that he’s disgusted by his young man. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

j) other (18,4%):
• But it was no good, little bits fell out, and I’d started in the most obvious place, where he’s bound to spot it. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
• He seemed so absolutely serious and clinical. Not the faintest line of humour or tenderness, even of sarcasm, on his face. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

The ratio of adjectives denoting positive and negative characteristics is 82% and 18%, respectively. When talking about this correlation, we take into consideration not only the adjectives denoting positive/negative aesthetic treatment of an object/person but also adjectives denoting positive/negative emotions, features of character, mental characteristics and physical state. The results of the investigation are represented graphically in the Supplement 6.

In “The Collector” John Fowles uses the degrees of comparison of adverbs less frequently – there are only 36 examples of this kind (see: Supplement 7). The ratio of adverbs used in comparative and superlative degree is 91,7% and 8,3%, respectively:

**comparative degree:**
• And I asked him earlier today why he collected butterflies. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
• One of the electricians later said it was a smugglers’ place when they used to be going to London from Newhaven. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

**superlative degree:**
• And I said I wished I could go and sniff the various scents to see which I liked best. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

Some special adverbs are often used by the author for the representation of process-quantity (see: Supplement 8). Namely, the adverbs like sometimes, often, etc.
denote the recurrence of an action. The ratio of the adverbs *often* and *sometimes* that are used by John Fowles in the novel is 27% and 73%, respectively:

- **But when I had her there my head went round and I often said things I didn’t mean to.** (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- **Often I had an itch to touch it.** (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- **Sometimes when I looked at the books before she came, it was what I thought, or I didn’t know.** (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- **I must have a bath sometimes.** (John Fowles “The Collector”)

As to the position of the adverbs that are used for the representation of process-quantity, they have rather wide distribution. Their most common positions are:

a) at the beginning of the sentence (27.5 %) or a clause of a complex sentence (15%):

- **Often I did think she would go away when we agreed, a promise was a promise, etcetera.** (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- **Often I put on a record.** (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- **Often they would slow as they passed Fosters, some would reverse back to have another look, some even had the cheek to push their cameras through the front gate and take photos.** (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- **Sometimes she made me welcome, she usually wanted her walk in the outer cellar.** (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- **Sometimes I wanted to say to her, please do it again, please let your hair fall forward to toss it back.** (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- **When I had a free moment from the files and ledgers I stood by the window and used to look down over the road over the frosting and sometimes I’d see her.** (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- **I always wanted to do photography, I got a camera at once of course, a Leica, the best, telephoto lens, the lot; the main idea was to take butterflies living like the famous Mr. S. Beaufoy; but also often before I used to come on things out collecting, you’d be surprised the things couples get up to in places you think**
they would know better than to do it in, so I had that too. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

b) at the end of the sentence (17.5%) or a clause of a complex sentence (12.5%):

- *A toy I’ve I have a strange illusion quite often.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- *I couldn’t follow all her moods sometimes.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- *He puts on a special dry face for me sometimes.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- *I could swear you want it sometimes.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- *It was another large cellar, four big steps down from the first one, but this time with a lower roof and a bit arched, like the rooms you see underneath churches sometimes.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- *I kept remembering how people in Lewes seemed to look at me sometimes, like the people in that doctor’s waiting-room.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

When the adverb *sometimes* is used in this position, the interaction of lexical (adverb) and syntactical means of quantity representation (*used to* + infinitive) takes place in 5 cases. This helps John Fowles to emphasize the repeated character of the action:

- *The photographs (the day I gave her the pad), I used to look at them sometimes.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- *Uncle Dick used to call me it sometimes, joking.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- *Aunt Annie is a Nonconformist, she never forced me to go to chapel or such like, but I was brought up in the atmosphere, though Uncle Dick used to go to the pub on the q.t. sometimes.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

c) in the middle of the sentence (21, 25%):

- *Then there was supper and after supper we often talked a bit more.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

---

**Note:** The OCR may have introduced some minor errors in the text, particularly around punctuation and capitalization. The natural text reflects the intended content.
• She had moods that changed so quick that I often got left behind. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
• It finally ten days later happened as it sometimes does with butterflies. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
• Then perhaps you’d tie me up and gag me and let me sit sometimes near an open window. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
• I have an irresistible desire sometimes to get to the bottom of him, to drag things he won’t talk about out of him. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
• It is still my principle, but I see you have to break principles sometimes to survive. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
• You think that because I can sometimes see what’s trivial and what’s important in art that I ought to be more virtuous. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

d) in parenthetical phrases (6,25%):

• She and her younger sister used to go in and out a lot, often with young men, which of course I didn’t like. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
• Well, every day it was the same: I went down between eight and nine, I got her breakfast, emptied the buckets, sometimes we talked a bit, she gave me any shopping she wanted done (sometimes I stayed home but I went out most days on account of the fresh vegetables and milk she liked), most mornings I cleaned up the house after I got back from Lewes, then her lunch, then usually we sat and talked for a bit or she played the records I brought back or I sat and watched her draw; she got her own tea, I don’t know why, we sort of came to an agreement not to be together then. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
• She was cold all over, she began to shiver terribly, and then to sweat more and she was delirious, she kept on saying, get the doctor, get the doctor, please get the doctor (sometimes it was general practitioner—G.P., G.P. she kept on,
over and over again, like a rhyme), it wasn’t her ordinary voice but what they call sing-song, and she didn’t seem to be able to fix her eyes on me. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

- All in one pigtail coming down almost to her waist, sometimes in front, sometimes at the back. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

The adverbs that are used to denote process-quantity are often used after pronouns:

- She often went on about how she hated class distinction, but she never took me in. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- I often feel that with him—a horrid little cringing good nature dominated by a mean bad one. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- Piers Broughton, a fellow-student and close friend of Miranda, told me in the coffee-bar he often took Miranda to, that she seemed perfectly happy the day of her disappearance and had arranged to go to an exhibition with him only today. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- But now I sometimes forget he’s here. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- Just as he sometimes lets me beat him at chess. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

In “The Collector” the words so (4 examples), very (1 example), quite (2 examples), and too (1 example), are used in combination with the adverb often to stress the frequency of an action performance:

- He so often seems young in a way I can’t explain. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- Minny and I have so often despised D for putting up with her. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- I so often hate him, I think I ought to forever hate him. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- I didn’t dare look very often and the light in the other room wasn’t very good. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• A toy I’ve I have a strange illusion quite often. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
• I have a strange illusion quite often. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
• A toy I’ve played with too often. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

In “The Collector” we also come across such means of category of quantity representation as nouns. It is obvious that not all the nouns are suitable here. We take into consideration only those, which have some quantitative “sub-meaning”.

In the novel the author uses the nouns that denote units of measuring. The author uses only 3 nouns denoting units of measuring. The are: inch(es), mile(s) and foot (feet). The ratio of their usage is 38,9%, 33,3% and 27,8%, respectively (see: Supplement 9). These nouns are often defined by numerals:

• He’s six feet. Eight or nine inches more than me. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
• I said (later, of course I was gagged outside), are we near the sea? And he said, ten miles. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
• The inner one must have been five or six feet under the earth. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

The words of mass and measure are sometimes defined by some other words like few, quarter, etc. This helps the author to gain the exactness of the utterance:

• Suddenly I saw I’d thought myself into thinking her completely gone out of my life, as if we didn’t live within a few miles of each other (I was moved into the hotel in Paddington then) and I hadn’t anyhow got all the time in the world to find out where she lived. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
• There is a farmhouse about three-quarters of a mile away down the hill, the nearest house. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

They may also be used to convey some figurative meaning, which is proved by the following example from the novel:

• I don’t trust you half an inch, I said. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

Here the author means that one character doesn’t trust the other at all. This happens because we associate the word *inch* with very small amount of something. The word *half* performs intensifying function in this case. One cannot imagine anything smaller that “half an inch”. However, there is only one example like this in the novel.

Having analyzed the usage of the nouns denoting units of measurement in the novel, we would like to state that it is used for the representation of both definite and indefinite quantity.

Compare:

- *I’ve grown to know every inch of this foul little crypt, it’s beginning to grow on me like those coats of stones on the worms in rivers.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- *Old cottage, charming secluded situation, large garden, 1 hr. by car London, two miles from nearest village...* (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- *He’s six feet. Eight or nine inches more than me.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

The author also uses the word combination *noun denoting unit of measurement + or + numeral* to represent the indefinite quantity. We have found 6 examples of this kind. Here are some of them:

- *It had worked. I pulled on some socks and shoes and ran to the iron door. It had sprung back an inch or two—was open.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- *Sometimes I don’t seem real to myself, it suddenly seems that it isn’t my reflection only a foot or two away.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

The following sentence contains the equivalent of this combination: *noun denoting unit of measurement + or so*. It is used only once:

- *She lives in a village the other side of Lewes from here, in a house a quarter mile or so from the bus-stop.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)
Some of the pronouns express, the same as nouns, quantitative meaning (see: Supplement 10). In the novel John Fowles uses the following pronouns that indicate mutuality (in this case two people/things are meant):

a) each other (51,4%):

- *It seemed like we became more intimate, although of course we still did not know each other in the ordinary way.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- *We never give each other a chance.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- *It was funny, we sat in silence facing each other and I had a feeling I’ve had once or twice before, of the most peculiar closeness to him—not love or attraction or sympathy in any way.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

b) both (48,6%):

- *And they both have the one man’s name I really can’t stand. George. Perhaps there’s a moral in that.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- *You are sensitive, you are eager, you try to be honest, you manage to be both your age and natural and a little priggish and old-fashioned at the same time.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- *We’re both terrible lookers-through.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- *And they both lived happily ever afterwards.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

It is noteworthy, that there is no example of the pronoun *one another* to be found in the novel “The Collector” at all.

The verb, though having a wide range of functions in other fields of linguistics, due to its semantics rarely represents the meaning of quantity. Usually, the verbs of such kind are derived from numerals. However, there is no example of such kind found in the novel.
3.3. The actualization of the quantitative characteristics of action, substance, and property on the syntactic level in the novel “The Collector” by John Fowles

The means of quantity representation that belong to the syntactic level of the language are rather significant among all the other means of quantity representation. The usage of means of category of quantity realization is, actually, not strictly subdivided. The problem is that the words are rarely used separately. This concerns, for example, numerals.

As it has been already mentioned, numerals are the bearers of the seme of quantity, that is why we treat them as the most basic and genuine means of quantity representation. It is possible to treat numerals as lexical means of quantity representation. However, denoting an abstract idea of number, numerals often perform the function of noun determiners. They can also be used in combination with other words, for example, the adverb o’clock. Being used in combination with other words, numerals are treated as syntactical means of quantity representation. These numeral-attributes are often used by John Fowles in his novel (see: Supplement 11):

- I was careful in Lewes, I never went to the same shop twice running so that they wouldn’t think I was buying a lot for one person. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- I’ve begun to collect some “tools.” A tumbler I can break. That will be something sharp. A fork and two teaspoons. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- If you can pick it in three guesses you can have it for nothing when I go. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

Four weeks, I said. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

The most frequently used numeral in these combinations is one (30,7%). The combinations of this kind aim to express substance-quantity:

- I was careful in Lewes, I never went to the same shop twice running so that they wouldn’t think I was buying a lot for one person. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
• *The dress was right off her shoulder, I could see the top of one stocking.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• *One keyholeful of light in seven days.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

The numeral two is used 68 times, i.e. in 25.5% of all cases, in combinations with nouns. These combinations express:

a) substance-quantity:

• *Just the two cups and the little copper vriki and his hand.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• *Well, we went back upstairs and out. When he locked the door and put the key back under a flowerpot, it was like down there didn’t exist. It was two worlds.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• *Two old women with umbrellas (it began to spot with rain again) appeared and came up the road towards me.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

  It is noteworthy, that in 12 cases John Fowles omits nouns, however, we include even these examples here because the author presupposes the existence of these nouns:

  • *She said, “Jenny, we’re absolutely broke, be an angel and let us have two cigarettes.” The girl behind the counter said, “Not again,” or something, and she said, “Tomorrow, I swear,” and then, “Bless you,” when the girl gave her two.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

b) process-quantity:

• *One day I spent nearly two hours there pretending to read a book, but she didn’t come.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• *The next days I watched the tube station. Perhaps she didn’t always use the tube to go home, I didn’t see her for two days, but then the third day I saw her cross the road and go into the station.* (John Fowles “The Collector”
c) property-quantity:

- I helped her behind the screen, she was so weak I knew she couldn’t run away, so what I decided was I would go up and try and get **two hours’ sleep** and then I’d carry her upstairs and I’d go down to Lewes and get another doctor out. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

There are also many other cardinal numerals used in such combinations:

a) **three** – 25 times:

- **Three Indian mats** and a beautiful deep purple, rose-orange and sepia white-fringed Turkish carpet (he said it was the only one “they” had, so no credit to his taste). (John Fowles “The Collector”)

b) **four** – 14 times:

- I soon saw what it was, it was **four stones** she had made loose, to make a tunnel, I suppose. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

c) **five** – 13 times:

- **To show how I was, I put five five-pound notes** I had on me in an envelope and addressed it to Miss Miranda Grey, the Slade School of Art... only of course I didn’t post it. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

d) **six** – 6 times:

- **His condition was six weeks.** A week ago **six hours** would have been too much. I cried. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

e) **seven** – 3 times:

- **Seven days ago. It seems like seven weeks.** (John Fowles “The Collector”)

f) **eight** – once:

- **Eight or nine inches more than me.** (John Fowles “The Collector”)

g) **nine** – twice:

- **Nine years younger than D.** (John Fowles “The Collector”)

h) **ten** – 18 times:
I stood beside him once in Barclays waiting to pay in and I heard him say, I’ll have it in fivers; the joke being it was only a cheque for ten pounds. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

i) eleven – once:

- It’s eleven o’clock in the morning. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

j) twelve – once:

- I made him take me round and round, ten or twelve times. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

k) fourteen – once:

- He came in this morning with fourteen different bottles. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

l) twenty – 6 times:

- We didn’t speak twenty words together all that day. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

m) twenty-one – once:

- He’s twenty-one years older than I am. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

n) twenty-eight – once:

- I was worried about her, I wanted to clinch it, so I said, I meant a calendar month, but make it twenty-eight days. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

o) thirty – once:

- What will happen to me, how I’ll develop, what I’ll be in five years’ time, in ten, in thirty. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

p) thirty-five – once:

- She sat three seats down and sideways to me, and read a book, so I could watch her for thirty-five minutes. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

q) forty – twice:

- He’d ransacked all the chemists’ shops. It’s mad. Forty pounds’ worth. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

r) forty-three – once:
• I added up their cost this afternoon. **Forty-three pounds.** (John Fowles “The Collector”)

s) **fifty** – 3 times:
• **If fifty people** came to me, real honest respectable people, and swore blind you wouldn’t escape, I wouldn’t trust them. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

t) **sixty** – once:
• It was partly that she had to borrow cigarettes because she had no money and I had **sixty thousand** pounds (I gave Aunt Annie **ten**) ready to lay at her feet—because that is how I felt. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

u) **seventy** – once:
• Why didn’t you pay back the money then? What was it—**seventy thousand** pounds? (John Fowles “The Collector”)

v) **ninety** – once:
• I don’t think she believed me in the store, but it was a good sale—I paid out nearly **ninety pounds** that morning. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

w) **ninety-nine** – once:
• I know it would be a terrible risk with **ninety-nine** men out of a hundred, but I think he’s the hundredth. He’ll stop when I tell him. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

x) **hundred** – 8 times:
• This evening—as I knew I would and could—I coaxed and bullied him, and he wrote out a cheque for a **hundred pounds**, which he’s promised to send off tomorrow. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

y) **thousand** – 4 times:
• Say I’m too young, he wasn’t ever really serious, and—a **thousand** things. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
Numerals that are used in the word combinations mentioned above are used by the author to express substance-, process- and property-quantity. The ratio of these types of quantity is 82.4%, 13.1% and 4.5%. This is graphically represented in the Supplement 11.

Numerals without their combining with nouns or other words that name the objects of calculation/measurement serve as means of representing an abstract idea of quantity without its connection with quality. This is the central and the basic syntactic structure that performs this function. Yet, the structure is rarely used. We have found only one example of this type in “The Collector”. It is used to denote property-quantity:

- First, the outside air, being in a space bigger than **ten by ten by twenty** (I’ve measured it out), being under the stars, and breathing in wonderful wonderful, even though it was damp and misty, wonderful air. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

The quantitative characteristics of an action that has been performed more than once as well as the degree of property representation can be expressed by means of the word combination **cardinal numeral + “times”**.

**process-quantity:**

- Then suddenly she was kneeling in front of me, with her hands up high, touching the top of her head, being all oriental. She did it **three times**. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- I’ve called him Ferdinand (not Caliban) **three times**, and complimented him on a horrid new tie. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- And she said that **two or three times** while I tried to pat her calm, it seemed it really distressed her. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- She walked to and fro **four or five times** more. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- I made him take me round and round, **ten or twelve times**. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
• She drew them about ten times, and then she pinned them all up on the screen and asked me to pick the best. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• Two or three more times she went up and down. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

**property-quantity:**

• I remember being one of the most disgusted when Susan Grillet married a Beastly Baronet nearly three times her age. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• I stood there, I couldn’t say anything, he made me furious, they made me furious and anyhow I was ten times more embarrassed than furious. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

As to the ordinal numerals, they are used with the noun time in Singular and also express process-quantity, however, it is not possible to use the word combination of this type for the representation of property-quantity (see: Supplement 4):

• It was the first time I touched her for days. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

The most frequently used ordinal numeral in this case is first (16 examples), however, the author also uses other ones.

Compare:

• That I’ve done for the first time in my life something original. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• It was the first time she’d given me a kind look. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• It must have been about the fourth or fifth time I went round to see him. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• And a third time, and each time I said don’t talk about it, but she didn’t seem to hear. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
When expressing the recurrence of the action John Fowles also uses some other words that have quantitative meaning instead of the numeral in 50% of all cases:

- *I saw her several times outside too.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- *She saw me a few times in the town, I suppose, perhaps she saw me out of the windows of their house sometimes, I hadn’t thought of that, my mind was all in a whirl.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- **Several times I saw him look to see how many pages more he had to read.** (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- *The silly thing was I told myself a dozen times before I mustn’t tell her I loved her, but let it come naturally on both sides.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- *I felt sulky so I was sulky. I asked him to go away after lunch and I asked him to go away after supper, and he went away both times.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- *I saw him a few times more, but never alone, I wrote him two letters when I was in Spain, and he sent a postcard back.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

The combinations of this type have rather large distribution. John Fowles uses them:

a) at the beginning of a simple sentence (13,6%):

- **Several times he’s tried to speak, but I’ve shut him up.** (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- **Two or three more times she went up and down.** (John Fowles “The Collector”)

b) in the middle of the sentence (31,8% - process-quantity; 9,1% - property-quantity)

- *I must have gone down four or five times that morning, I was that worried.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• She saw me a few times in the town, I suppose, perhaps she saw me out of the windows of their house sometimes, I hadn’t thought of that, my mind was all in a whirl. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• I saw him several times in there when I was, and talking with Mr. Singleton. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• I stood there, I couldn’t say anything, he made me furious, they made me furious and anyhow I was ten times more embarrassed than furious. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

c) at the end of a simple sentence (18,2%):

• I made him take me round and round, ten or twelve times. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• She walked to and fro four or five times more. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

d) at the end of a clause of a compound sentence (22,7%):

• She drew them about ten times, and then she pinned them all up on the screen and asked me to pick the best. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• She began to breathe in a funny quick way like she’d just run upstairs, as she said she was stifled, and she spoke several times—once she said, please don’t, and another I think she said my name but it was all blurred—well, I felt she was asleep and after I said her name and she didn’t answer, I went out and locked up and then set the alarm for early the next morning. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

e) in parenthesis (4,6%):

• Of course it wasn’t all peace and light, several times she tried to escape, which just showed. Luckily I was always on the look-out. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
The ratio of process- and property-quantity realization by this means is 90.9% and 9.1%, respectively. This is graphically represented in the Supplement 12.

In the previous chapter we have mentioned that the quantitative characteristics may be represent by nouns that denote a group of people, objects, units of measuring, etc. In the novel “The Collector” John Fowles uses nouns denoting containers for measuring the substances rather often (9 examples – 33% of all cases of this kind; see: Supplement 13):

- *She gave me a list of things to buy at the posh grocer’s in Lewes, and then she asked if I’d buy sherry and a bottle of champagne and of course I said I would.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- *Time passed, it must have been midnight or more and I went up to see how she was, to see if she’d drink a cup of tea, and I couldn’t get her to answer me, she was breathing faster than ever, it was terrifying the way she panted, she seemed to catch at the air as if she could never get it fast enough.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- *I handed her a cup of coffee, which she took.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- *When I won a hobby prize for a case of Fritillaries he gave me a pound on condition I didn’t tell Aunt Annie.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- *Can I have a glass of sherry?* (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- *Like being terribly thirsty and gulping down glass after glass of water.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

The last example shows the reader that there were many glasses of water. This fact becomes obvious because the author repeats the name of the container. In this case we have the combination of lexical and syntactical means of quantity representation.
We have also found two stylistic coinages that are based on the ability of the nouns denoting containers to express quantitative meaning (2 examples, i.e. 7,4%):

- And it was so lovely to see a bathful of hot water and a proper place that I almost didn’t care. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- He thinks of everything. He padlocks the door open. It was worth it. One keyholeful of light in seven days. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

The noun dose serves the same purpose denoting a portion of medicine. This is proved by the example below (3,7% of all cases):

- In the end I got her to take a double dose of the pills, it said on the packet not to exceed the stated dose, but I heard once you ought to take twice what they said, they were scared to make it too strong for legal reasons. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

The author also uses nouns denoting:

a) a group of objects (14,9%):

- This morning I drew a whole series of quick sketches of bowls of fruit. Since Caliban wants to give, I don’t care how much paper I waste. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- It hurt like a series of slaps across the face. I’d made up my mind that he would like some of my work. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- I’ve come to a series of decisions. Thoughts. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- You can’t talk about it with him because the word “art” starts off a whole series of shocked, guilty ideas in him. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

b) quantitative segmentation (33,3%):

- I walked and I suddenly felt I’d like to have a woman, I mean to be able to know I’d had a woman, so I rang up a telephone number a chap at the cheque-giving ceremony gave me. If you want a bit of you-know-what, he said. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
A chap in Public Analysis let me have it. It doesn’t go weak but just to make sure I decided to mix in a bit of carbon tetrachloride, what they call CTC and you can buy anywhere. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

There was a sapphire and diamond necklace lying on a bit of black velvet, shape of a heart I remember—I mean they’d arranged the necklace into a heart shape. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

The bath was delicious. I knew he might burst in (no lock on the door, couldn’t even shut it, there was a screwed-in bit of wood). (John Fowles “The Collector”)

c) general amount (7,4%):

It’s typical of the states I get in here—I suddenly told myself that the digging would have to be done over a number of days, the only stupid thing was to expect to do it all in one. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

It’s as if somewhere in me a certain amount of good-will and kindness is manufactured every day; and it must come out. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

These combinations are sometimes specified by special words like little, small and certain:

We got here just after half past ten. I drove into the garage, went and looked about to make sure nothing had happened in my absence, not that I expected anything. But I didn’t want to spoil the ship for the little bit of tar. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

The thing that made me feel he was more normal was this little bit of dialogue. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

Well she went and got a small bottle of Dettol she had, she diluted some with cotton wool and came back. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
We would like to pay attention on the noun *dozen* that presupposes the existence of twelve units of something, or, in other cases, large amount of something, i.e. indefinite quantity (see: Supplement 14):

- *I could always find a dozen reasons to put it off.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- *There was caviare and smoked salmon and cold chicken (he buys them ready-cooked somewhere)—all things he knows I like—and a dozen other things he knows I like, the cunning brute. It’s not the buying them that’s cunning, it’s just that I can’t help being grateful (I didn’t actually say I was grateful, but I wasn’t sharp), it’s that he presents them so humbly, with such an air of please-don’t-thank-me and I-deserve-it-all.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

This noun is used:

a) in combination with other nouns or their substitutes to denote substance-quantity (40%):

- *One dozen pants and three slips and vests and bras.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- *And there’re a dozen others—Peter. Bill McDonald. Stefan.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

b) in combinations like *dozens + of + noun* with the same purpose (50%):

- *Then I think of nothing but the sky. June sky, December, August, spring-rain, thunder, dawn, dusk. I’ve done dozens of skies.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- *It’s not worth dozens of things he’s done since.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- *In dozens of books.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

c) with the word *times* to denote process-quantity, namely the recurrence of the action (10%):
• *The silly thing was I told myself a dozen times before I mustn’t tell her I loved her, but let it come naturally on both sides.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

It is noteworthy, that if the noun *dozen* is used to convey an indefinite quantity, the fact whether it is used in plural or singular makes no difference:

• *What difference would a dozen specimens make to a species?* (John Fowles “The Collector”)
• *He said, I’ve met dozens of women and girls like you.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

This means of category of quantity representation is also used by John Fowles in combination with the other syntactic means, namely, repetition:

• *I want to see dozens and dozens of strange faces.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

In “The Collector” one comes across the combinations *adverb + numeral/adjective/adverb*, which aim to perform diminishing or intensifying function, i.e. represent high, low, sufficient, insufficient, full, not full degree of property realisation (see: Supplement 15).

Among the “quantitative” adverbs we distinguish:

a) "intensifiers": very, quite, utterly, perfectly, absolutely, much (74% of all cases):

• *Of course I was acting it a bit. It was a very difficult situation.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)
• *She started to talk in a low hoarse voice, quite normal mentally, though.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)
• *It’s so utterly impossible—even if I could overcome the physical thing, how could I ever look in any way but down on him?* (John Fowles “The Collector”)
• *Absolutely sexless (he looks).* (John Fowles “The Collector”)
• Piers Broughton, a fellow-student and close friend of Miranda, told me in the coffee-bar he often took Miranda to, that she seemed perfectly happy the day of her disappearance and had arranged to go to an exhibition with him only today. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• Suddenly much, much older than me. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

b) the adverb of excessive degree too (13,7%):

• Then he smiles as if I’m too naive to have any right on my side. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

c) the adverb of moderate degree rather (3%):

• And she was rather nice to me in her glittery at-home sort of way. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

d) the adverb of low degree slightly (0,2%):

• There’s something slightly unbalanced about the whole composition, as if there’s a tiny bit missing somewhere. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

e) the adverbs of approximate degree: almost, just, nearly (4,7%):

• Piers looked deflated, almost frightened. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• The collection of books on art. Nearly fifty pounds’ worth, I’ve added them up. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• I know Piers is morally and psychologically ugly—just plain and dull, phoney. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

f) the adverb of optimal degree enough (4%):

• I’m not egocentric enough. I’m a woman. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

g) the adverb of inadequate degree intolerably (0,2%):

• How the days drag. Today. Intolerably long. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

h) the adverb of under-degree hardly (0,2%):

• I said he was so square he was hardly credible. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

The most frequently used is the adverb very (55,8%). It is combined with:
a) adjectives:

- One day three or four after her first bath she was very restless. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- I saw her game, of course. She was very artful at wrapping up what she meant in a lot of words. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- He loves me desperately, he was very lonely, he knew I would always be “above” him. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

b) adverbs:

- “Where is this, who are you, why have you brought me here?” She said it very coldly, not at all violent. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- He turned and very slowly, very carefully, poured the coffee into the cups. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- And then, pour “une” princesse lointaine. The “une” was very heavily underlined. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

c) word combinations with numerals:

- I can’t say what it was, the very first time I saw her, I knew she was the only one. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- I didn’t sleep much that night, because I was shocked the way things had gone, my telling her so much the very first day and how she made me seem a fool. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

The adverb too is also frequently used by John Fowles – in 13,7% of all cases. The intensifying function of this adverb is performed through its combination with:

a) adjectives:

- He’s six feet. Eight or nine inches more than me. Skinny, so he looks taller than he is. Gangly. Hands too big, a nasty fleshy white and pink. Not a man’s hands. Adam’s apple too big, wrists too big, chin much too big, underlip bitten in, edges of nostrils red. Adenoids. He’s got one of those funny inbetween voices,
uneducated trying to be educated. It keeps on letting him down. His whole face is too long. Dull black hair. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

- I was too nervous, I tried to be as if I knew all about it and of course she saw, she was old and she was horrible, horrible. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- But the New People are too mean to give and too small to admit it. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

b) adverbs:

- I said hallo, too brightly. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- We passed indoors too quickly for me to do anything then. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- I lifted her, she was not so heavy as I thought; I got her down quite easily; we did have a bit of a struggle at the door of her room, but there wasn’t much she could do then. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- Tried not to plagiarize too flagrantly. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

The adverb nearly is used by John Fowles to show an insufficient degree of property representation. It is mainly used with the word combinations with numerals (5 examples), however, there’s one combination with the adjective ideal:

a) with adjective ideal:

- It was nearly ideal. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

b) word combinations with numerals:

- I don’t think she believed me in the store, but it was a good sale—I paid out nearly ninety pounds that morning. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- One day I spent nearly two hours there pretending to read a book, but she didn’t come. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- It must be nearly two hundred already. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- I remember being one of the most disgusted when Susan Grillet married a Beastly Baronet nearly three times her age. (John Fowles “The Collector”)


The author also used this combination once with the preposition *for* to express approximate duration of an action:

- *He’s been secretly watching me for nearly two years.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

Some adjectives (i.e. *dark, pale, deep, etc.*) are used in combination with nouns denoting colour. In this case they point out the definite property, describing the shade of a colour:

- *Three Indian mats and a beautiful deep purple, rose-orange and sepia white-fringed Turkish carpet (he said it was the only one “they” had, so no credit to his taste).* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

- *And suddenly we saw swallows flying low over the corn. I could see their backs gleaming, like dark blue silk.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

- *She was quiet half an hour or so, but then she began talking to herself, I said are you all right, and she stopped, but then later on she began talking again, or rather muttering and then she called my name out really loud, she said she couldn’t breathe, and then she brought up a mass of phlegm. It was a funny dark brown, I didn’t like the look of it at all, but I thought the pills might have coloured it.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

- *She all pretty with her pale blonde hair and grey eyes and of course the other men all green round the gills.*

- *Today I asked him to bind me and gag me and let me sit at the foot of the cellar steps with the door out open. In the end he agreed. So I could look up and see the sky. A pale grey sky.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

- *I put several layers of insulating felt and then a nice bright orange carpet (cheerful) fitting the walls (which were whitewashed.) I got in a bed and a chest of drawers.* (John Fowles “The Collector”)

The most frequently used adjective here is *dark* – 66.7% of all cases (see: Supplement 16):
• She was in a check dress, dark blue and white it was, her arms brown and bare, her hair all loose down her back. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• She’d taken to wearing her hair long, tied up with a dark blue ribbon that was one of the things she wrote down for me to buy. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• She took off the paper and there was this dark blue leather case and she pressed the button and she just didn’t say anything. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• She’d taken her blue jumper off, she stood there in a dark green tartan dress, like a schoolgirl tunic, with a white blouse open at the throat. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

The author also uses the repetition of this adjective to emphasize the shade of grey colour:

• I’ve been making sketches for a painting I shall do when I’m free. A view of a garden through a door. It sounds silly in words. But I see it as something very special, all black, umber, dark, dark grey, mysterious angular forms in shadow leading to the distant soft honey-whitish square of the light-filled door. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

The indefinite substance-quantity can be expressed by means of combinations like a lot of, plenty of + noun. John Fowles, however, rarely uses the latter combination – there’s only two examples found:

• I know most men would only have thought of taking an unfair advantage and there were plenty of opportunities. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• There’s plenty of air, I said. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

The first word combination, however, is used quite often in the novel “The Collector”. We have found 39 examples of this type (see: Supplement 17):
• Then she wrote down food to buy, she had to have fresh coffee, and a lot of fruit and vegetables and greens—he was very particular about that. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• If you are on the grab and immoral like most nowadays, I suppose you can have a good time with a lot of money when it comes to you. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• I think a lot of nice things are ugly and a lot of nasty things are beautiful. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• Aunt Annie let me smoke cigarettes after a lot of rows when I came out of the army, but she never liked it. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

The syntactic structures that include homogeneous members, i.e. structures in which there is an explanation of the word that concretizes the meaning of quantity, are also peculiar to the author’s style (see: Supplement 18). These words are either both (66.7% of all cases) or the word combination “two + noun” (33.3% of all cases). The examples with both are:

• You are sensitive, you are eager, you try to be honest, you manage to be both your age and natural and a little priggish and old-fashioned at the same time. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• I mean, both the filthy way she behaved and in looks. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• I want to make him relax, both for his own good and so that one day he may make a mistake. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• Two people in a desert, trying to find both themselves and an oasis where they can live together. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

The examples with the word combination “two + noun” are:

• So there are two possibilities: you’re holding me to ransom, you’re in a gang or something. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
• **Belonging**’s **two things. One who gives and one who accepts what’s given.**
  
  (John Fowles “The Collector”)

One of the ways to realize the meaning of indefinite quantity is the usage of special phraseological units. John Fowles rarely uses this way of category of quantity realization (see: Supplement 19). There are only four examples in the novel and three of them are the represented by one and the same phraseological unit **all of a sudden**:

• **Just as it came up to the house, she reached with her foot like to warm it, but all of a sudden she kicked a burning log out of the hearth on to the carpet, at the same moment screamed and ran for the window, then seeing they were padlocked, for the door.** (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• **I asked her if she wanted any tea, she didn’t answer, all of a sudden I realized she was crying.** (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• **And then all of a sudden she was kissing me again, I even felt her tongue.** (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• **Sometimes she’d come out of the blue with funny questions.** (John Fowles “The Collector”)

Nominal-quantitative structural model **seas and oceans of stars** extends the common understanding of the semantic category of quantity:

• **Like lying on one’s back as we did in Spain when we slept out looking up between the fig-branches into the star-corridors, the great seas and oceans of stars.** (John Fowles “The Collector”)

Repetition is the most significant among the syntactic means of quantity representation. It deals with the highest degree of abstraction, with the cognitive processes. It belongs to the sphere of stylistics, namely expressive means of stylistics on the syntactical level. These means are syntactic models of sentences which bear additional, logical or expressive information helping to intensify the pragmatic effectiveness of speech.
There are different kinds of repetition used in “The Collector” (see: Supplement 20):

a) ordinary repetition (86.9%):

**process-quantity:**
- Oh, I could learn and learn and learn and learn. I could cry, I want to learn so much. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- I felt I was going mad last night, so I wrote and wrote and wrote myself into the other world. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

**substance-quantity:**
- I want to see dozens and dozens of strange faces. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- What irritates me most about him is his way of speaking. Cliche after cliche after cliche, and all so old-fashioned, as if he’s spent all his life with people over fifty. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

**property-quantity:**
- I suddenly realized that I was going mad too, that he was wickedly wickedly cunning. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- It’s just that there’s so much time to get through. Endless endless endless time. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- “You can change, you’re young, you’ve got money. You can learn. And what have you done? You’ve had a little dream, the sort of dream I suppose little boys have and masturbate about, and you fall over yourself being nice to me so that you won’t have to admit to yourself that the whole business of my being here is nasty, nasty, nasty—” (John Fowles “The Collector”)

Parallel construction is used to stress the repeated character of the action:
- “I don’t want to die,” she said. And then, “I don’t want to die,” again. And a third time, and each time I said don’t talk about it, but she didn’t seem to hear. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
b) chain repetition (2.2%):

- More and more suffering for more and more. And more and more in vain. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

c) extended repetition (10.9%):

**process-quantity:**

- Everything’s locked and double-locked. There’s even a burglar-alarm on my cell door. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

**substance-quantity:**

- The way people talk and talk about tachism and cubism and this ism and that ism and all the long words they use—great smeary clots of words and phrases. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

**property-quantity:**

- There it is, Minny. I wish you were here and we could talk in the dark. If I could just talk to someone for a few minutes. Someone I love. I make it sound brighter so much brighter than it is. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

The combinations “used to/would + infinitive” are used in the novel to denote repeated habitual action in the past (see: Supplement 21). John Fowles uses the first combination, i.e. used to + infinitive, more frequently – in 71.4% of all cases:

- I was smiling, I used to smile when she attacked me as a sort of defence. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- I used to go out of the farmhouse at night, into the garden. Look south. You do understand? (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- I used to have daydreams about her, I used to think of stories where I met her, did things she admired, married her and all that. Nothing nasty, that was never until what I’ll explain later. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- She and her younger sister used to go in and out a lot, often with young men, which of course I didn’t like. When I had a free moment from the files and
ledgers I stood by the window and used to look down over the road over the frosting and sometimes I’d see her. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

We have found one sentence with this combination in which John Fowles uses Indefinite Passive Infinitive, in all the other cases Indefinite Active Infinitive is used. Compare:

- I used to be told I was good at English. That was before I knew you. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- Uncle Dick used to call me it sometimes, joking. Lord Ferdinand Clegg, Marquis of Bugs, he used to say. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

It is also noteworthy, that in the majority of cases the infinitive is used after “used to”, however, there is one sentence in which the author uses the infinitive before this word combination:

- Then one day after breakfast she asked me to sit down as I used to in the beginning so she could draw me. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

One can trace the tendency (60% of all ceases) of the usage of “used to” mainly with the infinitives of the verbs denoting:

a) mental activity (20% of all cases), mainly with the infinitive of the verb to think (15% of all cases):

- Even Toinette, getting into bed with anyone. I used to think it was messy. But love is beautiful, any love. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- I used to think about it. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
- He said he used to imagine us lying in bed together. Just lying. Nothing else. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

b) feelings (7,5 %):


• You’re no better than a common street-woman, I said. I **used to respect** you because I thought you were above what you done. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• **I used to love** staying with her. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

c) the process of speaking (30% of all cases), mainly with the verb to **say** (17.5% of all cases):

• Crutchley **used to say** you had to push nowadays to get anywhere, and he **used to say**, look at old Tom, look where being slimy’s got him. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• **Easy does it**, as Uncle Dick **used to say** when he was into a big one. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• Anyway after she **used to write down** almost every day what we had to buy, she **used to tell** me how to cook it too, it was just like having a wife, an invalid one you had to do shopping for. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• senses of perception (7.5%):

• When she was home from her boarding-school I **used to see** her almost every day sometimes, because their house was right opposite the Town Hall Annexe. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

• **The photographs** (the day I gave her the pad), I **used to look** at them sometimes. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

In the rest of the cases (40%) “**used to**” is used with the infinitives of the verbs **to do, to laugh, to get**, etc.:

• Then she went and beat her fist against the wall. She **used to do** that sometimes. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

All the time she **used to get** at me, you’d think we were talking about something quite innocent, and suddenly she’d be digging at me. I didn’t speak. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

She hated dirt as much as I do, although she **used to laugh** at me about it. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

I always wanted to do photography, I got a camera at once of course, a Leica, the best, telephoto lens, the lot; the main idea was to take butterflies living like the famous Mr. S. Beaufoy; but also often before I **used to come on things out** collecting, you’d be surprised the things couples get up to in places you think they would know better than to do it in, so I had that too. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

The combination “**would** + infinitive” is also used in “The Collector” to represent the repeated habitual action in the past. We come across it 16 times in the novel. In some sentences the author use this word combination separately:

- She had moods that changed so quick that I often got left behind. She liked to get me stumbling after her (as she said one day—poor Caliban, always stumbling after Miranda, she said), sometimes she **would call** me Caliban, sometimes Ferdinand. Sometimes she **would be nasty and cutting**. She **would sneer** at me and mimic me and make me desperate and ask me questions I couldn’t answer. Then other times she **would be really sympathetic**, I felt she understood me like no one since Uncle Dick, and I could put up with everything. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

- Often they **would slow** as they passed Fosters, some **would reverse back** to have another look, some even had the cheek to push their cameras through the front gate and take photos. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

However, one comes across the sentences in which both combinations “**would** + infinitive” and “**used to** + infinitive” are used:
Aunt Annie and Mabel used to despise my butterflies when I was a boy, but Uncle Dick would always stick up for me. He always admired a good bit of setting. He felt the same as I did about a new imago and would sit and watch the wings stretch and dry out and the gentle way they try them, and he also let me have room in his shed for my caterpillar jars. (John Fowles “The Collector”)

“Fred’s looking tired—he’s been having a dirty week-end with a Cabbage White,” he used to say, and, “Who was that Painted Lady I saw you with last night?” Old Tom would snigger, and Jane, Crutch-ley’s girl from Sanitation, she was always in our office, would giggle. (John Fowles “The Collector”)
3.4. The comparative analysis of the functional-semantic field of quantity in the language system and in the author’s discourse

The functional-semantic field of quantity in the language system is a variety of linguistic means that can be used for the category of quantity representation. It consists of three main groups of means that correspond to the three levels of the language, i.e. morphemic, lexical and syntactic. The means of category of quantity that belong to these levels are further subdivided according to the peculiarities of each of the levels.

The morphemic level is characterised by the following means of quantity representation:

a) morphemes -let, -ie that are used with nouns (e.g. booklet, auntie, etc.) and perform diminishing function;

b) morphemes -ce; -fold that expresses the recurrence of the action (e.g. twice, twofold, etc.);

c) morpheme re- that points to the repetition of the action performed before (e.g. reopen, retry, etc.);

d) suffix -ish when it points to insufficient degree of property realization (e.g. greyish, reddish, etc.);

e) compound words with the first component, which points to the part of a whole expressing an insufficient degree of property realization (e.g. semi-professional, half-asleep, etc.);

f) other compound words with the first element that has quantitative meaning (e.g. double-decker, hexachord, monophonic, etc.);

g) intensifying prefixes over-, out-, super-, hyper- (e.g. overactive; outbid; supernatural; hypercritical, etc.);

h) diminishing prefix under- (e.g. underpaid; underdone, etc.);

i) prefix ex- and postpositional combination to-be (e.g. ex-president; mother-to-be, etc.).
Among the means of quantity representation on the lexical level in Modern English one can distinguish:

a) ordinal numerals (e.g. first, second, etc.);

b) derivatives from numerals (e.g. two-paged, three-angled, etc.);

c) nouns related to calculation and measurement (e.g. inch, foot, etc.);

d) pronouns that indicate mutuality (e.g. each other, one another, both);

e) adverbs that point to the recurrence of the action (e.g. repeatedly, rhythmically, often, etc.);

f) adjectives denoting measure and calculation (e.g. decimal, tripartite; high, low, etc.);

g) adjectives and adverbs used in comparative and superlative degrees (e.g. more beautiful, easiest; sooner, the most beautifully etc.);

h) verbs (e.g. to double, to ten, to quarter, etc.).

The functional-semantic field of quantity in Modern English includes the following lexical means of quantity representation:

a) repetition (e.g. I was very, very excited, etc.);

b) syntactic structures with homogeneous members (e.g. She saw both: the boy and the girl, etc.);

c) word combinations with nouns denoting vessels, portions of medicine, group of objects, etc. (e.g. a box of chocolates; a crowd of people, etc.);

d) word combinations like a lot of /plenty of + noun (e.g. a lot of money; plenty of work, etc.);

e) word combinations with numerals (e.g. three sisters, five pounds, etc.);

f) word combinations: cardinal numeral (substitute) + times; ordinal numeral + time (e.g. five/several times; for the second time, etc.);

g) word combinations used to/would + infinitive (e.g. He used to come to our place; he usually would sit and stare at my mother knitting etc.);

h) word combinations adverb + numeral/adjective/adverb, which aim to perform diminishing or intensifying function, i.e. represent high, low,
sufficient, insufficient, full, not full degree of property realisation (e.g. very first time; too complicated; quite friendly, etc.);
i) special phraseological units that are used for the indefinite quantity representation (e.g. one at a time, two heads are better than one, time and again, etc.).

The functional-semantic field of quantity in John Fowles’ discourse is a typical example of the functional-semantic field of quantity that is peculiar to the functional-semantic field of quantity in Modern English. There are, however, some slight differences between these two fields. This is caused by John Fowles’ turning down of some of the possible linguistic means of quantity representation. The choice of the means used by the author determines the peculiarities of the author’s discourse.

Thus, having compared the functional-semantic fields of quantity in the language system and the author’s discourse, we state that in “The Collector” John Fowles uses all the means of quantity representation, except for:

a) morphemes -ie, -fold, ex- and postpositional combination to-be in the morphemic level;

b) verbs that express quantitative meaning; nouns denoting calculation; pronoun one another on the lexical level.

In the novel “The Collector” the author uses all the possible syntactic means of quantity representation peculiar to Modern English.

The comparative analysis of the functional-semantic fields of quantity in the language system and in John Fowles’ discourse has shown that there is no substantial difference between these two fields.
Conclusions to chapter 3

Having analysed the morphemic, lexical and syntactic means of quantity representation in the novel “The Collector” by John Fowles we have come to the following conclusions. The most frequently used means of quantity representation are those that belong to the syntactic level – 902 examples. Among these means we distinguish: a) word combinations with cardinal numerals; b) word combinations with ordinal numerals with the noun time; c) the combinations with numeral substitutes with times; d) word combinations with nouns denoting vessels, portions of medicine, groups of objects, quantitative segmentation and general amount; e) word combinations with intensifying/diminishing adverbs; f) word combinations with the adjectives denoting the shades of colour with the nouns denoting colour; g) special phraseological units; h) syntactic structures that include homogeneous members; i) the combinations “used to/would + infinitive”; j) repetition; k) word combinations “a lot of/ plenty of + noun”. In “The Collector” they are used for the representation of property- (49,3%), substance- (34,4%) and process- quantity (16,3%).

The second large group of means of quantity representation belongs to the lexical level (39,4%). It includes: a) derivatives from numerals; b) ordinal numerals; c) adjectives denoting calculation and measure; d) adjectives and adverbs used in the comparative and superlative degrees; e) adverbs often and sometimes; f) pronouns each other and both; g) nouns that denote units of measuring. These means are used mainly for the actualization of the quantitative characteristics of property (67%), however, they also actualize quantitative characteristics of substance (19,8%) and process (13,2%).

The smallest group of means of quantity representation is the one that belongs to the morphemic level of the language (1,8%). In this group we distinguish the following means of quantity representation: morphemes re-, -ce, -ish, and -let as well as the morpheme half (in compound words). The author uses them for the
representation of process-quantity (63%), property-quantity (33.3%) and substance-quantity (3.7%).

The general ratio of substance-, process- and property-quantity representation is 28.1%, 15.9% and 56%, respectively.

The information mentioned above is graphically represented in Supplement 22. Supplement 24 illustrates the structure of the functional-semantic field of quantity in the novel “The Collector”.

The comparative analysis of the functional-semantic field of quantity in the language system and in the author’s discourse has shown that there is no substantial difference between these two fields. The author does not use some of the possible morphemic (morphemes -ie, -fold, ex- and postpositional combination to-be) and lexical (verbs that express quantitative meaning; nouns denoting calculation; pronoun one another) means of quantity representation, however, he uses all of the available syntactic means. The Supplement 25 graphically represents the differences between the functional-semantic field of quantity in Modern English and John Fowles’ discourse.
General conclusions

A critical review of the works on linguistics in the area of the category of quantity has given the opportunity to state that this very complicated issue is observed in the frameworks of many branches of science. The origin of this notion is traced back to ancient times and is associated with ancient Greek philosopher Aristotle who laid the basis of modern categorial understanding of the world.

The linguistic category of quantity is a specific phenomenon that includes the linguistic means of quantity representation. It is a complex system characterised by a complicated polycentric structure and inner transitivity. A systematic approach towards the study of linguistic means of quantity representation gives an opportunity to deeper understand of essence of the category of quantity.

There is no one commonly accepted classification of means of quantity representation. In the linguistic science there are two main approaches towards the issue (a classification based on linguistic levels and a classification based on the ontological triad) that have been analysed in this paper in detail and synthesized into a new taxonomy based on their fusion.

Accordingly, there are three groups of means of the category of quantity representation that correspond to the levels of the language (morphemic, lexical and syntactic). These means are further subdivided to express substance-, process- or property-quantity.

Thus, the means that belong to the morphemic level express substance-quantity (morpheme -let), process-quantity (morphemes re-, -ce), property-quantity (morpheme half (in compound words) and morphemes -ish, -ce).

The lexical means express: a) substance-quantity (nouns that denote units of measuring; ordinal numerals; pronouns each other, one another and both); b) process-quantity (adverbs often, repeatedly, rhythmically and sometimes; verbs that realize the seme of concrete number); c) property-quantity (derivatives from numerals; adjectives denoting calculation and measure; adjectives and adverbs used in the comparative and superlative degrees).
The syntactic means represent: a) substance-quantity (repetition; word combinations with nouns denoting vessels, portions of medicine, groups of objects, quantitative segmentation and general amount; word combinations with cardinal numerals; syntactic structures that include homogeneous members; word combinations “a lot of/plenty of + noun”); b) process-quantity (word combinations with ordinal numerals with the noun time; the combinations with numeral substitutes with times; repetition; the combinations “used to/would + infinitive”); c) property-quantity (word combinations with intensifying/diminishing adverbs; word combinations with the adjectives denoting the shades of colour with the nouns denoting colour; special phraseological units; repetition).

The functional-semantic field is a system of linguistic means of a linguistic category representation that belong to different levels of the language. Thus, the functional-semantic field of quantity is a system of means of the category of quantity representation. It is closely connected to the functional-semantic field of quality. These functional-semantic fields have no clearly cut boundaries and, thus, they often interfere. This is caused by their polycentric structures and the interdependence of the linguistic and ontological categories. This interdependence is based on the fact that linguistic categories are used for representation of the ontological ones. The latter has a reverse influence because the language influences cognitive processes of a person.

In every language there is a definite set of lexical and grammatical units that are peculiar to a definite style. The distinctive feature of the study of functional-semantic field in author’s discourse lies in the influence of author’s world outlook (the reality created by the interaction of three dimensions of the author’s personality: I-reality, I-possible realities and I-The Other) on the choice of the types of means that the author uses to represent this or that category.

These facts have been taken into consideration in the process of our investigation and helped us to outline the major ways of the quantity representation in Modern English. This, in its turn, has given us the opportunity to find the specific means of the category of quantity representation in the novel “The Collector” by John Fowles. The investigation has shown that the most frequently means used by the
The syntactic means of quantity representation express mainly property-quantity (49.3%) and substance-quantity (34.4%); the lexical means – also property-quantity (67%). The predominance of the process-quantity representation is peculiar to the morphemic level. The latter comprises only 1.8% of all the means of quantity representation used in the novel.

The comparison of the general structure of the functional-semantic field of quantity and the structure of the functional-semantic field of quantity in the novel “The Collector” by John Fowles has shown that there is no substantial difference between these two structures. The substance quantity is represented by the same means except for the morpheme -ie, pronoun one another and the nouns denoting calculation. Some of the means of the process-quantity representation, namely the verbs that realize the seme of concrete number; the adverbs repeatedly, rhythmically; postpositional combination to-be; morphemes -fold and ex- are not used in the novel. As to the property-quantity, in “The Collector” the author uses all possible means of this type of quantity representation. The resemblance of the general structure of the functional-semantic field of quantity in Modern English and the functional-semantic field of quantity in the novel “The Collector” (graphically represented in Supplements 23-25) proves the idea that the functional-semantic field of quantity being peculiar to the discourse of John Fowles is a typical example of the category of quantity representation in Modern English author’s discourse.

The problem of the functional-semantic field of quantity in the author’s discourse is still open for discussions and investigations as in every particular case the structure of functional-semantic field and the ratio of the means that belong to different levels of the language is dependent on the personality of the author, the topic of his discourse and the historical epoch.
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Supplement 1
Glossary

Category of quantity – 1) an ontological category that is the result of the “mirroring” of the quantative determinacy peculiar to all the objects existing in objective reality; 2) a linguistic category: the unity of morphemes, words and word combinations used to realize the meaning of quantity.

Componential analysis – the analysis of vocabulary into a series of basic identifying features or ‘components’ of meaning.

Discourse – 1) philosophy: the process of getting new knowledge on the basis of philosophically and scientifically independent judgements presented in a linguistic form; 2) linguistics: a text or its fragment the peculiarity of which is the logical integration and interaction of linguistic forms on different levels of the language that are characterized by the existence of correlative relations of linguistic and extralinguistic type, the richness of content and logicality of the structure; speech, process of linguistic activity; a halting text; a spoken form of a text; a dialogue; oral or written speech, etc.

Functional grammar – a kind of grammar that studies the linguistic units that belong to different levels of the language and are united on the basis of the unity of their semantic functions.

Functional-semantic field – a double-sided (semantico-formal) unity that is formed by grammatical (morphological and syntactic) means of a given language together with the interactive lexical, lexico-grammatical and word-building elements that belong to the same semantic zone.
**Hyponym** – the name for the notion of the genus as distinguished from the names of the species.

**Language level** – certain “areas” of language, the subsystems of the language that are characterized by combination of relatively similar units and the set of rules that regulate their usage and grouping into different classes and subclasses.

**Language structure** – the way of language system organisation; inner construction of the language that consists of four levels: phonological, morphological, lexico-semantic and syntactic.

**Language system** – the system of firmly interconnected elements of the language that make up internally organized unity.

**Lexico-semantic field** – a group of lexemes that build up a “thematic group” that deals with a definite part of a physical or mental activity, which is allocated by means of our consciousness.

**Stylistic coinages (neologisms)** are the words which appeared because their creators sought expressive utterance.

**Taxonomy** – the practice and science of classification.

**Text** – 1) the main printed part of a book or magazine (not the notes, pictures);
2) any form of written material;
3) the written form of speech, a play, an article, etc.;
4) a book, play, etc., especially one studied for an exam.
Supplement 2

**morpheme -let:**
- Do you know I’ve given up hours and hours of my time to distribute leaflets and address envelopes and argue with miserable people like you who don’t believe anything?

**suffix -ish:**
- But I see it as something very special, all black, umber, dark, dark grey, mysterious angular forms in shadow leading to the distant soft honey-whitish square of the light-filled door.
- I can see you’re a draughtsman, you’ve a fairish sense of colour and what-not, sensitive.
- She didn’t say anything, the cold air had made her cough and bring up, her face was the funny purplish colour, too.

**compound adjectives:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>verb</th>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>half +</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- She’s half-turned away, hanging up or taking down a dress from a hook.
- I’m restless. I can’t write here. I feel half-escaped already.
- The one that was so good only looked half-finished to me, you could hardly tell what the fruit were and it was all lop-sided. He wanted to run away, but he couldn’t, so he stood by his desk, half turned, while I knelt half-naked by the fire and let my hair down, just to make it quite obvious.

**prefix -re:**
- So he gets up, goes out, undoes the padlock holding the door open, locks the door, gets the sauce in the outer cellar, unlocks the door, re-padlocks it, comes back.
What this is all leading to is I got a bit drunk once or twice when I was in the Pay Corps, especially in Germany, but I never had anything to do with women.

Once or twice I saw tradesmen looking through, but people soon seemed to get the point.

Twice she struggled to get out of bed again, it was no good, she hadn’t the strength of a flea.

Table 2.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>twice represents:</th>
<th>amount</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>process-quantity</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>88,9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>property-quantity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process-quantity</th>
<th>Property-quantity</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>at the beginning</td>
<td>at the end of the</td>
<td>in the middle of the</td>
<td>in the middle of the</td>
<td>amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of the sentence</td>
<td>sentence or a</td>
<td>sentence</td>
<td>sentence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or a clause of a</td>
<td>clause of a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>compound sentence</td>
<td>compound sentence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>at the direct</td>
<td>after the</td>
<td>after the</td>
<td>after the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>object</td>
<td>indirect object</td>
<td>verb-predicate</td>
<td>verb-predicate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definite quantity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indefinite</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quantity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total amount</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>33,3%</td>
<td>16,7%</td>
<td>5,6%</td>
<td>22,2%</td>
<td>11,1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Derived from</th>
<th>amount</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cardinal numerals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>four</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>six</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ten</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thirty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ordinal numerals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- She was like all women, she had a **one-track** mind.
- It was **two-inch** seasoned wood with sheet metal on the inside so she couldn’t
- **Four-letter** words.
- Every week I did the same **five-bob** perm.
- To show how I was, I put five **five-pound** notes I had on me in an envelope and addressed it to Miss Miranda Grey, the Slade School of Art... only of course I didn’t post it.
- It was an old **six-inch** nail, I don’t know how she’d got hold of it. He said, you’re like a kid trying to see over a **six-foot** wall.
- I fixed **ten-inch** bolts outside.
- She went up to the fireplace where the wild duck were, there were three hung up, **thirty-bob** each and before you could say Jack Knife she had them off the hook and bang crash on the hearth.
- She is one of our most promising **second-year** students.
- I watched him go out, his hands in his pockets. I was red. Caroline was furious, trying to slide out of it. (“He’s always like that, he does it deliberately.”) Sneering at his painting all the way home (“**second-rate** Paul Nash”—ridiculously unfair).
Table 4.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substance</th>
<th>Substance-quantity</th>
<th>Process-quantity</th>
<th>Total amount</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>80,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundredth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total amount</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Substance-quantity:

- She was sitting in a second loom at the back. It was another large cellar, four big steps down from the first one, but this time with a lower roof and a bit arched, like the rooms you see underneath churches sometimes.
- What I did in the first cellar was I put in a small cooker and all the other facilities.
- Perhaps she didn’t always use the tube to go home, I didn’t see her for two days, but then the third day I saw her cross the road and go into the station.
• The Invention I like best is the one after the one he loves best—he loves the fifth, and I the sixth.

Process-quantity:
• And a third time, and each time I said don’t talk about it, but she didn’t seem to hear.
• It must have been about the fourth or fifth time I went round to see him.
• Frances told me about their life in Cornwall and I felt for the first time in my life that I was among people of an older generation that I understood, real people.
• She tried to eat something at supper, but she couldn’t manage it, she was sick, she did look off-colour then, and I can say that for the first time I had reason to believe there might be something in it all.
amount  |  %  
---|---
adjectives denoting calculation  |  2  |  1.2%  
adjectives denoting measure  |  164  |  98.8%  
Total  |  166  |  100%  

adjectives denoting calculation:

- *In the end I got her to take a double dose of the pills, it said on the packet not to exceed the stated dose, but I heard once you ought to take twice what they said, they were scared to make it too strong for legal reasons.*

adjectives denoting measure:

- *The best were when she stood in her high heels, from the back.*
- *The doctor came out just then to call in the next patient, he was a tall man with a moustache, and he said, “Next” as if he was sick of seeing all these people.*
- *I couldn’t pretend I was ill. I’d put shoes on. He had something (a hammer?) in his hand, peculiar wide eyes, I’m sure he was going to attack me.*
- *It was another large cellar, four big steps down from the first one, but this time with a lower roof and a bit arched, like the rooms you see underneath churches sometimes.*
- *I had the cords in my pocket and after a bit of a struggle I got them on her and then the gag, it was her own fault if they were tight, I got her on a short rope tied to the bed and then I went and fetched the camera and flash equipment.*
- *However I was very lucky, the axe wasn’t all that sharp and it glanced off my head, it looked a horrible jagged wound but it wasn’t deep.*
- *A thick round wall of glass.*
- *She was wearing a narrow blue skirt I bought her and a big black jumper and a white blouse, the colours really suited her.*
- *What I did in the first cellar was I put in a small cooker and all the other facilities.*
- He is going bald and he has a nose like a Jew’s, though he isn’t (not that I’d mind if he was). And the face is too broad.

- I fixed up a screen in one corner and behind it a wash-table and a camper’s lavatory and all the etceteras—it was like a separate little room almost.

Table 5.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>amount</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* big</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tall</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thick</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deep</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>broad</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wide</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* little</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>43,9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>short</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>narrow</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Derivatives:

- Short and broad and broad-faced with a hook-nose; even a bit Turkish. Not really English-looking at all.

- It wasn’t just that. It was frightened in a funny little-boy way, too.

- Very short-fingered, sure hands.
### Table 6.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superlative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Adjectives denoting age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Comparative</th>
<th>Superlative</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>young</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>old</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14,7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Adjectives denoting measurement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Comparative</th>
<th>Superlative</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>big</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teensy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deep</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Adjectives denoting distance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Comparative</th>
<th>Superlative</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>close</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>near</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12,3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Adjectives denoting emotions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Comparative</th>
<th>Superlative</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>happy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>serious</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calm</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>embarrassed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>angry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ashamed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Adjectives denoting features of character**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Comparative</th>
<th>Superlative</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sensible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dignified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>virtuous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smug</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shallow</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Adjectives denoting mental characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Comparative</th>
<th>Superlative</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>clever</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stupid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Adjectives denoting positive treatment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Comparative</th>
<th>Superlative</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nice</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wonderful</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lovely</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beautiful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attractive</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perfect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brilliant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>55,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tremendous</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* "+" – positive.
* "-" – negative.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjectives denoting negative treatment</th>
<th>pure</th>
<th>promising</th>
<th>hopeful</th>
<th>liveable</th>
<th>Total amount</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>5.3%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>disgusting</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foul</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nasty</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vile</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>despicable</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terrible</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cheap</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slick</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excruciating</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives denoting physical state</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ well</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>easy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strong</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>clean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strange</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>obvious</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dark</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ghastly</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>slight</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>proud</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>faint</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>far</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>noisy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lame</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>intimate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>expert</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>real</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>popular</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>important</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>appropriate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unwolflike</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wild</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>peculiar</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>safe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total amount</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
adjectives denoting age:

- *She* and her *younger* sister used to go in and out a lot, often with young men, which of course I didn’t like.
- *Aunt Annie* was my father’s *elder* sister.

adjectives denoting measurement:

- *First, the outside air*, being in a space *bigger* than ten by ten by twenty (I’ve measured it out), being under the stars, and breathing in wonderful wonderful, even though it was damp and misty, wonderful air.

adjectives denoting distance:

- *There is a farmhouse about three-quarters of a mile away down the hill*, the *nearest house*.

adjectives denoting emotions:

- *But it makes me feel* *calmer*.

adjectives denoting features of character:

- *I went in and it was three hundred pounds and I nearly walked right out again, but then my* *more generous* nature triumphed.

adjectives denoting mental characteristics:

- *Being* *cleverer* (as I thought) than most men, and *cleverer* than all the girls I knew. *I always thought I knew more, felt more, understood more.*
adjectives denoting positive treatment:
  • I never saw more beautiful hair.

adjectives denoting negative treatment:
  • And I think the most disgusting thing of all is that Alan Sillitoe doesn’t show that he’s disgusted by his young man.

adjectives denoting physical state:
  • It was not my fault. How was I to know she was iller than she looked.

other:
  • These last few days I’ve felt Godless. I’ve felt cleaner, less muddled, less blind. I still believe in a God.
  • The bathroom window was over the porch round the cellar door. Out the back, which was safer.
  • I’ve got lots of friends. Do you know why? Because I’m never ashamed of them. All sorts of people. You aren’t the strangest by a long way.
**Table 7.1.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Total amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comparative</td>
<td>superlative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soon</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>far</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bright</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>near</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>early</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faster</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total amount</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>91,7%</td>
<td>8,3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- You always squirm one step lower than I can go.
- But I’m not prepared to stay any longer down here.
- I make it sound brighter so much brighter than it is.
- I knew her lark, no sooner she was up out of the room she was as good as gone.
- And I asked him earlier today why he collected butterflies.
- He doesn’t realize it fully yet, because he’s trying to be nice to me at the moment. But he’s much nearer than he was.
- I’ll swear all the clocks in the world have gone centuries slower since I came here.
- Time passed, it must have been midnight or more and I went up to see how she was, to see if she’d drink a cup of tea, and I couldn’t get her to answer me, she was breathing faster than ever, it was terrifying the way she panted, she seemed to catch at the air as if she could never get it fast enough.
- I’m making him cook better.
- As I think he might not let me have my half-hour in midmorning if he let me go out earlier, I don’t insist.
Supplement 8

Table 8.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Adverbs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>often</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the beginning of the sentence</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the beginning of a clause of a complex sentence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the end of the sentence</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the end of a clause of a complex sentence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the middle of the sentence</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In parenthetical phrases</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total amount</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Beginning:**

- *Often* I had an itch to touch it.

- *Sometimes* when I looked at the books before she came, it was what I thought, or I didn’t know.

**Middle:**

- I kept on thinking of nice things, how *sometimes* we got on well and all the things she meant to me back home when I had nothing else.

- She *often* went on about how she hated class distinction, but she never took me in.

**End:**

- I must have a bath *sometimes*.

- I’m like that, I act on impulse *sometimes*, taking risks others wouldn’t.

- A toy I’ve I have a strange illusion *quite often*.

- A toy I’ve played with *too often*.

**Parenthesis:**

- She and her younger sister used to go in and out a lot, *often* with young men, which of course I didn’t like.

- Well, every day it was the same: I went down between eight and nine, I got her breakfast, emptied the buckets, *sometimes* we talked a bit, she gave me any
shopping she wanted done (sometimes I stayed home but I went out most days on account of the fresh vegetables and milk she liked), most mornings I cleaned up the house after I got back from Lewes, then her lunch, then usually we sat and talked for a bit or she played the records I brought back or I sat and watched her draw; she got her own tea, I don’t know why, we sort of came to an agreement not to be together then.

- She was cold all over, she began to shiver terribly, and then to sweat more and she was delirious, she kept on saying, get the doctor, get the doctor, please get the doctor (sometimes it was general practitioner—G.P., G.P. she kept on, over and over again, like a rhyme), it wasn’t her ordinary voice but what they call sing-song, and she didn’t seem to be able to fix her eyes on me
### Table 9.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>amount</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>inch (inches)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38,9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mile (miles)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foot (feet)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- I just draw a line an **inch** from the bottom.
- He’s six **feet**. **Eight or nine inches** more than me.
- I don’t trust you **half an inch**, I said.
- He said, an ash tree a **foot** high is still an ash tree. But I did say perhaps.
- I could dig a tunnel round the door. I could dig a tunnel right out. But it would have to be at least **twenty feet** long.
- There is a farmhouse about **three-quarters of a mile** away down the hill, the nearest house.
- Old cottage, charming secluded situation, large garden, 1 hr. by car London, **two miles** from nearest village...
- I said (later, of course I was gagged outside), are we near the sea? And he said, **ten miles**.
Table 10.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>amount</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>both</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>each other</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- It seemed like we became more intimate, although of course we still did not know each other in the ordinary way.
- We just stood staring at each other.
- In my dreams it was always we looked into each other’s eyes one day and then we kissed and nothing was said until after.
- To try to show you that sex—sex is just an activity, like anything else. It’s not dirty, it’s just two people playing with each other’s bodies.
- We’re both terrible lookers-through.
- He was terrible. Both ways. He was terrible, because he had started it all, he had determined to behave in that way.
- Two people in a desert, trying to find both themselves and an oasis where they can live together.
- And they both lived happily ever afterwards.
## Supplement 11

### Table 11.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numeral</th>
<th>Substance-quantity</th>
<th>Process-quantity</th>
<th>Property-quantity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ noun</td>
<td>noun is omitted</td>
<td>+ adverb o'clock</td>
<td>duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>four</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>six</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seven</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eight</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ten</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eleven</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>twelve</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fourteen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>twenty</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>twenty-one</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>twenty-eight</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thirty</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thirty-five</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forty</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forty-three</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fifty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sixty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seventy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ninety</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ninety-nine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hundred</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thousand</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total amount</strong></td>
<td>145</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>54,3%</td>
<td>8,2%</td>
<td>18,7%</td>
<td>1,1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Substance-quantity:

- He said, I don’t know how two such bad parents can have produced two such good daughters.
- Being stuck to one place and one job.
- I must be sure he is away for at least six hours. Three for the tunnel, two to break through the outer door.
- It’s eleven o’clock in the morning.
- It came to two o’clock.
- Two skeletons copulating on a tin roof?
- “You’ve gone to a lot of trouble. All those clothes in there, all these art books. I added up their cost this afternoon. Forty-three pounds.”
- Three Indian mats and a beautiful deep purple, rose-orange and sepia white-fringed Turkish carpet (he said it was the only one “they” had, so no credit to his taste).
- It was partly that she had to borrow cigarettes because she had no money and I had sixty thousand pounds (I gave Aunt Annie ten) ready to lay at her feet—because that is how I felt.
To show how I was, I put five five-pound notes I had on me in an envelope and addressed it to Miss Miranda Grey, the Slade School of Art... only of course I didn’t post it. I would have if I could have seen her face when she opened it.

I had to give five hundred more than they asked in the advert, others were after it, everyone fleeced me.

I don’t think she believed me in the store, but it was a good sale—I paid out nearly ninety pounds that morning.

She’d come up and round without me seeing, only twenty yards away, walking quickly.

Why didn’t you pay back the money then? What was it—seventy thousand pounds?

Minny, going upstairs with him yesterday. First, the outside air, being in a space bigger than ten by ten by twenty (I’ve measured it out), being under the stars, and breathing in wonderful wonderful, even though it was damp and misty, wonderful air.

He came in this morning with fourteen different bottles. He says now he will release me in another four weeks.

If fifty people came to me, real honest respectable people, and swore blind you wouldn’t escape, I wouldn’t trust them. I wouldn’t trust the whole world.

**Process-quantity:**

- When she had gone in, I went and saw how long the programme lasted. It was two hours.
- I’d planned everything, I knocked on her door and shouted please get up, and waited ten minutes and then drew the bolts and went in.
- She made me wait about ten minutes and then she came out.
- One day I spent nearly two hours there pretending to read a book, but she didn’t come.
- It was all over in five seconds, she was back with the young man, but hearing her voice turned her from a sort of dream person to a real one.
• After that for two or three days we were neither one thing nor the other.
• I took her arm tight and let her stand there for five minutes.
• Then I treated him for three days with a view of my back and my sulky face.
• I shall put what she wrote and her hair up in the loft in the deed-box which will not be opened till my death, so I don’t expect for forty or fifty years.
• Fine Sundays there were cars passing every five minutes.
• I must have gone down four or five times that morning, I was that worried
• Two or three more times she went up and down.

Property-quantity:
• Robert’s only four years younger than you are now, he said. Don’t drink it yet. Let the grounds settle.
• He’s twenty-one years older than I am. Nine years younger than D.
• If I had a fairy godmother—please, make G.P. twenty years younger.
• Do you know I’ve read it twice and I’m five years younger than you are?
• What will happen to me, how I’ll develop, what I’ll be in five years’ time, in ten, in thirty.
• I helped her behind the screen, she was so weak I knew she couldn’t run away, so what I decided was I would go up and try and get two hours’ sleep and then I’d carry her upstairs and I’d go down to Lewes and get another doctor out.
• The collection of books on art. Nearly fifty pounds’ worth, I’ve added them up.
• He’d ransacked all the chemists’ shops. It’s mad. Forty pounds’ worth.

Saying:
• Two birds with one stone.
**Supplement 12**

**Table 12.1.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process-quantity</th>
<th>Numeral + &quot;times&quot;</th>
<th>Other words + &quot;times&quot;</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>at the beginning of the sentence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at the end of a simple sentence</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at the end of a clause of a compound sentence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the middle of the sentence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in parenthesis</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property-quantity</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in the middle of the sentence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| amount                           | 11                | 11                    | 22    |
| %                                | 50%               | 50%                   | 100%  |

**Fig. 12.2.**

**The ratio of process- and property-quantity realization**

- **Process-quantity:**
  - *Several times* I saw him look to see how many pages more he had to read.
  - *Several times* he’s tried to speak, but I’ve shut him up.
  - *Two or three more times* she went up and down.
• Of course it wasn’t all peace and light, **several times** she tried to escape, which just showed. Luckily I was always on the look-out.

• I made him take me round and round, **ten or twelve times**.

• She walked to and fro **four or five times more**.

• Then suddenly she was kneeling in front of me, with her hands up high, touching the top of her head, being all oriental. She did it **three times**.

• I felt sulky so I was sulky. I asked him to go away after lunch and I asked him to go away after supper, and he went away **both times**.

• I saw him **a few times more**, but never alone, I wrote him two letters when I was in Spain, and he sent a postcard back.

• She drew them **about ten times**, and then she pinned them all up on the screen and asked me to pick the best.

• I’ve called him Ferdinand (not Caliban) **three times**, and complimented him on a horrid new tie.

• *She saw me a few times in the town, I suppose, perhaps she saw me out of the windows of their house sometimes, I hadn’t thought of that, my mind was all in a whirl.*

• I saw him **several times** in there when I was, and talking with Mr. Singleton.

• The silly thing was I told myself a **dozen times** before I mustn’t tell her I loved her, but let it come naturally on both sides.

• I must have gone down **four or five times** that morning, I was that worried.

• I must have heard Aunt Annie say that a **hundred times**.

**Property-quantity:**

• I remember being one of the most disgusted when Susan Grillet married a Beastly Baronet nearly **three times** her age.

• I stood there, I couldn’t say anything, he made me furious, they made me furious and anyhow I was **ten times more embarrassed** than furious.
Table 13.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nouns denote:</th>
<th>amount</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vessels (containers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stable meaning</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stylistic coinages</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>portion of medicine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a group of objects</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quantitative segmentation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general amount</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

container:

- *I threw a bottle of ink at him.*
- *I handed her a cup of coffee, which she took.*
- *And it was so lovely to see a bathful of hot water and a proper place that I almost didn’t care.*
- *He thinks of everything. He padlocks the door open. It was worth it. One keyholeful of light in seven days.*

portion of medicine:

- *In the end I got her to take a double dose of the pills, it said on the packet not to exceed the stated dose, but I heard once you ought to take twice what they said, they were scared to make it too strong for legal reasons.*

a group of objects:

- *I’ve come to a series of decisions. Thoughts.*
- *You can’t talk about it with him because the word “art” starts off a whole series of shocked, guilty ideas in him.*
quantitative segmentation:

- *A chap in Public Analysis let me have it. It doesn’t go weak but just to make sure I decided to mix in a bit of carbon tetrachloride, what they call CTC and you can buy anywhere.*

- *I laid a torch where it gave a bit of light and I could see.*

genral amount:

- *It’s typical of the states I get in here—I suddenly told myself that the digging would have to be done over a number of days, the only stupid thing was to expect to do it all in one.*

- *It’s as if somewhere in me a certain amount of good-will and kindness is manufactured every day; and it must come out.*
Supplement 14

Table 14.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Substance-quantity</th>
<th>Process-quantity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in combination with</td>
<td>in combinations like</td>
<td>with the word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nouns or their</td>
<td>dozens + of + noun</td>
<td>times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amount</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The usage of the combinations with noun dozen for the representation of process- and substance-quantity

- I want to see dozens and dozens of strange faces.
- What difference would a dozen specimens make to a species?
- He said, I’ve met dozens of women and girls like you.
- The silly thing was I told myself a dozen times before I mustn’t tell her I loved her, but let it come naturally on both sides.
- Then I think of nothing but the sky. June sky, December, August, spring-rain, thunder, dawn, dusk. I’ve done dozens of skies.
- It’s not worth dozens of things he’s done since.
- In dozens of books.
- One dozen pants and three slips and vests and bras.
- And there’re a dozen others—Peter. Bill McDonald. Stefan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;intensifiers&quot;</th>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>adverb</th>
<th>word combinations with numerals</th>
<th>Total amount</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>55,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quite</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>absolutely</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>utterly</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perfectly</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>much</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the adverb of excessive degree</td>
<td>too</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the adverb of moderate degree</td>
<td>rather</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the adverb of low degree</td>
<td>slightly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the adverbs of approximate degree</td>
<td>almost</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>just</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nearly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the adverb of optimal degree</td>
<td>enough</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the adverb of inadequate degree</td>
<td>intolerably</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the adverb of under-degree</td>
<td>hardly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total amount</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>403</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| %                      | 77,7% | 20,3% | 2% | 100% |

adjectives:

- *It’s too dangerous.*
- *We are sure that there is some quite harmless explanation for her disappearance.*
- *It was very pale, silky, like Burnet cocoons.*
- *I’m interested, I said. Very interested.*
• It’s so **utterly** impossible—even if I could overcome the physical thing, how could I ever look in any way but down on him?

• **He seemed so absolutely** serious and clinical.

• **Piers Broughton**, a fellow-student and close friend of **Miranda**, told me in the coffee-bar he often took Miranda to, that she seemed **perfectly** happy the day of her disappearance and had arranged to go to an exhibition with him only today.

• **The devil wouldn’t be devilish and rather** attractive, but like him. There’s something **slightly** unbalanced about the whole composition, as if there’s a tiny bit missing somewhere.

• So we slip into teasing states that are **almost** friendly.

• Do shut up. You’re ugly **enough** without starting to whine.

• Today. **Intolerably** long.

• I said he was so square he was **hardly** credible.

**numerals:**

• The collection of books on art. **Nearly fifty pounds’** worth, I’ve added them up.

• I didn’t sleep much that night, because I was shocked the way things had gone, my telling her so much the **very first day** and how she made me seem a fool.

**adverbs:**

• Tried not to plagiarize **too flagrantly**.

• I’ve given up **too soon** with Caliban.

• I lifted her, she was not so heavy as I thought; I got her down **quite easily**; we did have a bit of a struggle at the door of her room, but there wasn’t much she could do then.

• They came out **quite well**.

• That is **very true**, in my humble opinion.

• “Please,” she said. **Very gently** and **nicely**. It was difficult to resist.

• A sort of chess-game with death I’d **rather** unexpectedly won.
• There’s no word to say how he said it. Sadly, **almost** unwillingly.
• They ought to find the house easily **enough**.
• A **much** more than nice woman.

*Fig. 15.2.*

The ratio of the adverbs performing diminutive/intensifying function

![Diagram](image-url)
Supplement 16

Table 16.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>amount</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dark colours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dark</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light colours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pale</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bright</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Three Indian mats and a beautiful **deep purple**, rose-orange and sepia white-fringed Turkish carpet (he said it was the only one “they” had, so no credit to his taste).
- And suddenly we saw swallows flying low over the corn. I could see their backs gleaming, like **dark blue** silk.
- She’d taken to wearing her hair long, tied up with a **dark blue** ribbon that was one of the things she wrote down for me to buy.
- She took off the paper and there was this **dark blue** leather case and she pressed the button and she just didn’t say anything.
- She’d taken her blue jumper off, she stood there in a **dark green** tartan dress, like a schoolgirl tunic, with a white blouse open at the throat.
- She all pretty with her **pale blonde** hair and grey eyes and of course the other men all green round the gills.
- Today I asked him to bind me and gag me and let me sit at the foot of the cellar steps with the door out open. In the end he agreed. So I could look up and see the sky. A **pale grey** sky.
- I put several layers of insulating felt and then a nice **bright orange** carpet (cheerful) fitting the walls (which were whitewashed).
- It sounds silly in words. But I see it as something very special, all black, umber, **dark, dark grey**, mysterious angular forms in shadow leading to the distant soft honey-whitish square of the light-filled door.
I know most men would only have thought of taking an unfair advantage and there were plenty of opportunities.

There’s plenty of air, I said.

If you are on the grab and immoral like most nowadays, I suppose you can have a good time with a lot of money when it comes to you.

Aunt Annie let me smoke cigarettes after a lot of rows when I came out of the army, but she never liked it.

There were a lot of species I wanted—the Swallowtail for instance, the Black Hairstreak and the Large Blue, rare Fritillaries like the Heath and the Glanville.

She came out with a lot of other students, mostly young men.

Another thing I did, I bought a lot of clothes for her at a store in London.

I waited for her to come out the next day and she did and I followed her about ten minutes through a lot of little streets to where she lived.

“You won a lot of money, didn’t you?”

Then she wrote down food to buy, she had to have fresh coffee, and a lot of fruit and vegetables and greens—she was very particular about that.

I wouldn’t have it. I said I got a lot of requests.
So there are two possibilities: you’re holding me to ransom, you’re in a gang or something.

Belonging’s two things. One who gives and one who accepts what’s given.

You are sensitive, you are eager, you try to be honest, you manage to be both your age and natural and a little priggish and old-fashioned at the same time.

I mean, both the filthy way she behaved and in looks.

I want to make him relax, both for his own good and so that one day he may make a mistake.

Two people in a desert, trying to find both themselves and an oasis where they can live together.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>amount</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>both</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two + noun</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supplement 19

Table 19.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>amount</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property-quantity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all of a sudden</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>out of the blue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance-quantity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seas and oceans of...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Just as it came up to the house, she reached with her foot like to warm it, but all of a sudden she kicked a burning log out of the hearth on to the carpet, at the same moment screamed and ran for the window, then seeing they were padlocked, for the door.
- I asked her if she wanted any tea, she didn’t answer, all of a sudden I realized she was crying.
- And then all of a sudden she was kissing me again, I even felt her tongue.
- Sometimes she’d come out of the blue with funny questions.
- Like lying on one’s back as we did in Spain when we slept out looking up between the fig-branches into the star-corridors, the great seas and oceans of stars.
What irritates me most about him is his way of speaking. *Cliche after cliche after cliche*, and all so old-fashioned, as if he’s spent all his life with people over fifty.

*He spends pounds and pounds on me. It must be nearly two hundred already.*

**Substance-quantity:**

**Process-quantity:**

*I must must must escape.*

*I hit and hit and she laughed and then I jumped on her and smothered her and she lay still, and then when I took the cushion away she was lying there laughing, she’d only pretended to die.*

*Oh, I could learn and learn and learn and learn. I could cry, I want to learn so much.*

*I felt I was going mad last night, so I wrote and wrote and wrote myself into the other world.*

*I stayed on and on at the Cremorne.*

**Property-quantity:**

*It’s just that there’s so much time to get through. Endless endless endless time.*

*Standing there, with his faint, faint smile and eyes that understand things so quickly.*

*I suddenly realized that I was going mad too, that he was wickedly wickedly cunning.*
Table 21.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>amount</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>used to + infinitive</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>71,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would + infinitive</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>used to +</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>verbs denoting mental activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to think</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to dream</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to imagine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbs denoting feelings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to love</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to respect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to despise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbs denoting the process of speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ask</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to tell (to be told)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to say</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17,5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to talk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to call</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbs denoting senses of perception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to look</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to see</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to go</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to laugh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to smile</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to come (in the meaning “to begin”)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to do</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to sit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to spit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to have</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to get</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to write</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Aunt Annie and Mabel used to despise my butterflies when I was a boy, but Uncle Dick would always stick up for me. He always admired a good bit of setting. He felt the same as I did about a new imago and would sit and watch the wings stretch and dry out and the gentle way they try them, and he also let me have room in his shed for my caterpillar jars.
When she was home from her boarding-school I used to see her almost every day sometimes, because their house was right opposite the Town Hall Annexe. She and her younger sister used to go in and out a lot, often with young men, which of course I didn’t like. When I had a free moment from the files and ledgers I stood by the window and used to look down over the road over the frosting and sometimes I’d see her.

I used to have daydreams about her, I used to think of stories where I met her, did things she admired, married her and all that. Nothing nasty, that was never until what I’ll explain later.

I used to do odd jobs for Aunt Annie, Uncle Dick taught me. I wasn’t bad at carpentering and so on, and I fitted out the room very nicely, though I say it myself.

All this time I never thought it was serious. I know that must sound very strange, but it was so. I used to say, of course, I’ll never do it, this is only pretending.

I could go on all night about the precautions. I used to go and sit in her room and work out what she could do to escape.

“Fred’s looking tired—he’s been having a dirty week-end with a Cabbage White,” he used to say, and, “Who was that Painted Lady I saw you with last night?” Old Tom would snigger, and Jane, Crutch-ley’s girl from Sanitation, she was always in our office, would giggle.

She couldn’t sleep, I gave her as many sleeping tablets as I dared but they seemed to have no effect, she would doze off a little while and then she would be in a state again, trying to get out of bed (once she did before I could get to her and fell to the floor).
### Table 22.1.

The ratio of substance-, process- and property-quantity on the morphemic level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substance-</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process-</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property-</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 22.2.

The ratio of substance-, process- and property-quantity representation on the lexical level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substance-</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process-</td>
<td>13.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property-</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 22.3.

The ratio of substance-, process- and property-quantity representation on the syntactic level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substance-</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process-</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property-</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Substance-quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphemic level</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical level</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntactic level</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total amount</strong></td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>28,1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supplement 23

Fig. 23.1. The structure of the functional-semantic field of quantity in Modern English
Fig. 23.1. The structure of the functional-semantic field of quantity in the novel “The Collector” by John Fowles
### Table 25.1. Functional-semantic field of quantity in language system and discourse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Morphemic level</th>
<th>Functional-semantic field of quantity</th>
<th>in language system</th>
<th>in author’s discourse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Morphemes</strong></td>
<td>morphemes -let, -ie</td>
<td>only morpheme -let</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>morphemes -ce, -fold</td>
<td>only morpheme -ce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>morpheme re-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>suffix -ish that points to insufficient degree of property realization</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>compound words with the first component, which points to the part of a whole</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other compound words with the first element that has quantitative meaning</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>intensifying prefixes over-, out-, super-, hyper-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>diminishing prefix under-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prefix ex- and postpositional combination to-be</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lexical level</strong></td>
<td>ordinal numerals</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>derivatives from numerals</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nouns related to calculation and measurement</td>
<td>only nouns related to measurement</td>
<td>except for one another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pronouns that indicate mutuality: both, each other, one another</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adverbs that point to the recurrence of the action</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adjectives denoting measure and calculation</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adjectives and adverbs used in comparative and superlative degrees</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>verbs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Syntactic level</strong></td>
<td>repetition</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>syntactic structures with homogeneous members</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>word combinations with nouns denoting vessels, portions of medicine, group of objects, etc.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>word combinations like a lot of/plenty of + noun</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>word combinations with numerals</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>word combinations: cardinal numeral (substitute) + times; ordinal numeral + time</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>word combinations used to/would + infinitive</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>word combinations adverb numeral/adjective/adverb that perform diminishing or intensifying function</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>special phraseological units that are used for the indefinite quantity representation</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>