"READING" VAGUE QUANTIFIERS

Mykhaylenko V. V.

Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor,
Head of the Department of Translation and Philology
King Danylo University
Konovaltsia str., 35, Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine
orcid.org/0000-0003-3263-71-56
valerymykhaylenko@i.ua

The present paper is focuced on non-numerical nominations represented by the Q-adjectives of the "little" / "small" type in the dictionary entries and discourse continuum. The research is based on an analysis of the linguistic data retrieved from the British National Corpus, it is proposed that the conceptualisations of a small value in the Modern English discourse can be traced back to the language community tradition to assess the environment in terms "little: much / many". The indefinite numeral adjectives give a non-identified information about a noun. We have retrieved all the instances of value use which sharing the common component of number from the thesaurus to compile our own corpus of small/little values which is in the focus of our exploration. Gliozzo (2004) considers a semantic domain to be associated to a particular domain of specific terms belonging to it, which is characterized by a set of domain words whose main property is to co-occur in texts. The matter is that the given two units in specific contexts can actualize various grades of their littleness / smallness. Koczy (2017) points out that the given units – used in the contexts – are able to transmit some cultural features of the English interlocutors. In fact, a word meaning is established only by the network of relations among the terms of its field. Accordingly, the contexts may reveal some periphery or implicit components and cause some shifts in the word semantic structure. Miller and Leacock (2000) define two types of context: (i) the local context which we would refer to the area of the lexical-grammatical distribution and (ii) the topical context which we would refer to the area of the semantic cohesionof discourse. A major aim of the corpus-linguistic approach is to identify association patterns in corpora. Alternatively, it might be argued that the large individual differences emerged because each person developed his or her own strategy for coping with the unnatural task of using nonnumerical value in a situation involving precise nomonations.

ЗЧИТУВАННЯ НЕВИЗНАЧЕНИХ КВАТИФІКАТОРІВ

Михайленко В. В.

доктор філологічних наук, професор,
завідувач кафедри перекладу та філології
Університет Короля Данила
вул. Коновальця, 35, Івано-Франківськ, Україна
orcid.org/0000-0003-3263-7156
valerymykhaylenko@i.ua

Ключові слова: прикметник, лексична семантика, контекстна семантика, регістр дискурсу, дистрибуція, функція, пересув, лінгвокультурологія.

У фокусі пропонованої статті перебувають невизначені номінації, представлені Q-прикметниками типу "little" / "small" у лексичній та контекстуальній семантиці. Дослідження ґрунтується на аналізі лінгвістичних даних, отриманих із Британського національного корпусу. Запропоновано інтерпретувати невизначені низькі величини в межах концептуального поля value, водночас його конституенти проявляють задане лексичне значення та контекстуальне значення, актуалізоване в дискурсі. Невизначені величини, як низькі, так і великі, у сучасному англійському дискурсі зберігають культурогему мовного соціуму. Прикметники невизначеного числа не надають імпліцитної кількісної інформації про об'єкт, проте співрозмовники зчитують відносно точну інформацію про розмір, об'єм, зріст, вік та інші характеристики. Фактологічний матеріал для аналізу отримано із Британського національного корпусу, отже, кількісні результати слугують надійним підтвердженням семантичного, дистрибутивного та концептуального дослідження, що також уможливило моделювання семантичної системи value та її двох підсистем little та small. Об'єктивно значення слова, яке функціонує в дискурсі, визначається, по-перше, мережею відносин між складовими його поля; по-друге, мовно-культурологічною практикою. Отже, контексти (горизонтальні та вертикальні) актуалізують певні компоненти значення слова, запрограмовані автором, що спричиняють певні пересуви в семантичній структурі слова. Міллер і Лікок (2000 рік) визначають два типи контексту: (i) локальний контекст, який ми відносимо до області лексико-граматичної, та (ii) тематичний, який ми відносимо до області семантичної єдності дискурсу. Можна також стверджувати, що індивідуальні відмінності "little" та "small" виникають через те, що на загальному культурно-мовному тлі кожен мовець розробляє свою власну стратегію кодування та зчитування домінантних компонентів значення під впливом інтенції мовця, концептуального поля, регістру дискурсу, горизонтальної та вертикальної дистрибуції.

Preliminaries: points under discussion. The research is based on an analysis of the linguistic data retrieved from the British National Corpus, it is proposed that the conceptualisations of a small value in the Modern English discourse can be traced back to the language community tradition to assess the environment in terms "little: much: many". The indefinite numeral adjectivesgive a non-identified information about a noun. Zimmer (1983) admits that people generally handle uncertainty by means of verbal expressions and their associated rules of conversation, rather than by means of numbers. The lack of sharp boundary for vague predicates is related to a further feature, which concerns what we may call the relative plasticity in the use of these predicates. Vague predicates are often described as tolerant [25]: if someone is counted as young, for instance, it seems that anyone only slightly older (by a small increment of just a few days, or months) should count as young too [8, p. 1–2]. Accordingly, these Q-adjectives –*little* and *small* – pose certain challenges to the reader's or hearer's ability to interpret them in discourse continuum. Our main thesis is that semantics is compositional and to understand the complexity

of the lexical meaning we have to decompose it [19, p. 76–77]. Dekker kept on interpreting Stalnaker's attempt to suggest the formal system of interpretation [which would also characterize "update of information" based on "reading" the values of variables of one and the same unit [5]. The fact is that interlocutors in a discourse distinguish between the relative states of the world which they conceive possible or desirable and seek to deminish to the one which the actual word could or should be [5, p. 50]. Accordingly, the interlocutors – to understand each other – have to choose the component of the word meaning, first, from its semantic domain, distribution, and the author's intentional meaning. And their discourse will be felicitous in case they manage to correlate all the variables of the given unit. The adjectives of quantity (Q-adjectives) *many, few, much little small,* etc. represent quantity nominations due to their syntactical functions, their disctribution, and semantic variation; quantificational predicative, attributive), differential, and modifying [22, p. 6–7]. Quantifiers are used to indicate the amount or quantity of something referred to by a noun. They are different from numbers because they indicate an approximate number ir value Most people, including expert forecasters, generally prefer communicating their uncertain opinions with nonnumerical terms such as doubtful, probable, slight chance, very likely, and so forth, rather than with numerical probabilities [26, p. 148; 2]. In every culture there exist specific language means of expressing indefinite values [1, p. 182; 17, p. 51; 20, p. 27].

Boas suggests that linguistics is one of the instruments for the cultural or historical analysis [3]. Cultural linguistics is a multidisciplinary area of research that explores the relationship between language and cultural conceptualisations. It can produce in-depth and insightful investigations into the cultural grounding of language in several domains and discourse registers [11; 24]. Zimmer (1983) admits that people generally handle uncertainty by means of verbal expressions and their associated rules of conversation, rather than by means of numbers [26; 8]. The lack of sharp boundary for vague predicates is related to a further feature, which concerns what we may call the relative plasticity in the use of these predicates. Vague predicates are often described as tolerant [25]: if someone is counted as young, for instance, it seems that anyone only slightly older (by a small increment of just a few days, or months) should count as young too [8, p. 1–2]. Accordingly, these Q-adjectives – *little* and *small* – pose certain challenges to the reader's or hearer's ability to interpret them in discourse continuum.

Theoretical grounding. A key issue that linguistic anthropology tries to address is whether and how language, and ultimately, cultural differences impact

the way language users perceive and understand the world. Hence it investigates the way of language determining the modes of communication and modes of thought, forms of social identity, common cultural ideology and representations of natural and social phenomena. Cultural cognition is, to a great extent, transmitted through language and, consequently, reflected and replicated in language use. It may be instantiated in various patterns of language use, such as the discourse behaviour of constructions [6, p. 323; 11, p. 477–505]. We have retrieved all the instances of *value* use which sharing the common component *of number* from the thesaurus to compile our own corpus of *small / little* values which is in the focus of our exploration. Gliozzo considers a semantic domain to be associated to a particular domain of specific terms belonging to it, which is characterized by a set of domain words whose main property is to co-occur in texts [9, p. 275–276]. The matter is that the given two units in specific contexts can actualize various grades of their littleness / smallness. The given units – used in the contexts – are able to transmit some cultural features of the English interlocutors. In fact, a word meaning is established only by the network of relations among the terms of its field [14, p. 223]. Accordingly, the contexts may reveal some periphery or implicit components and cause some shifts in the word semantic structure. Miller and Leacock (2000) define two types of context: (i) the local context which we would refer to the area of the lexical-grammatical distribution and (ii) the topical context which we would refer to the area of the semantic cohesion of discourse [18, p. 151–152]. Dash argues to specify four types of context which do not differ from our given specified two types: local context; (b) sentential context; (c) topical context; (d) global context [4, p. 159–169]. In our opinion these classification does not mirror the types of the contexts but the levels of the word combinability: word (lexical-grammatical → phrase (lexical-syntactical) →sentence (horizontal) →discourse (vertical).

Corpora analysis and discussion. The tools of cognitive linguistic approach will help us to present a coherent description of the impact of the context on the lexical semantics (see Bartmiński, 2009). Between a computer and human intelligence there is still a substantial gap. The human mind is often very skilled in handling problems with vague input and output, for instance, in the situation of bargaining a used car the seller and the buyer usually employ the following phrases*: a small sum*, *a little higher speed*, *a car small engine capacity*, *the land rover tyre width is alittle narrower,* etc. The computer requres definite numerical nominations like: *the car price is 25 000 dollars; the speed is 270 mph, the car engine capacity is 1,9 litre; the tyre width of the land rover must be 29 inches, etc.* Computers on the other hand are perfect

tools in solving problems if the starting data and solutions are expressed in precise numbers [15, p. 27]. Computers demand data of a high precision-level: therefore they can only solve problems with a very limited complexity/ The classical representation of data by numeric quantities lacks vagueness which is usually has a culturally marked feature.

3.0. A comprehensive description of the lexemes *value*, *little* and *small*

We shall start with the definition analysis of the lexical meaning as a tool of lexical semantics. Lexical meaning of the word is defined as the study of language organization and expressing meaning registered in the dictionary entries.

1. Definition of the lexemes *value little* and *small*

1.1. The definition of the dictionary entry of *value* quality (Cambridge, Collins, Longman, Macmillan, Merriam Webster, Oxford): the monetary worth of something; ii. a fair return or equivalent in goods, services, or money for something exchanged; iii. relative worth, utility, or importance; iv. something (such as a principle or quality); intrinsically valuable or desirable; vi. a numerical quantity that is assigned or is determined by calculation or measurement; vii. relative duration of a musical note; vii. luminosity. Thus the definitional analysis of *value* can refer it to the conceptual system of mathematics, economy, monetary, quantity, quality, music, arts, social practice, linguistics (Cambridge, Collins, Longman, Macmillan, Merriam Webster, Oxford).

1.2. Definitional analysis of *little*: small in size, amount, duration, or degree, expressing diminutive or an affectionate, or condescending attitude, small in condition, distinction, age, or scope [Cambridge, Collins, Longman, Macmillan, Merriam Webster, Oxford]: c.f.

1.3. Definitional analysis of the adjective *small*: little size or slight dimensions, minor in influence, power, or rank, lacking in strength, little in quantity, few in number, trivial, humble, limited in degree [Cambridge, Collins, Longman, Macmillan, Merriam Webster, Oxford].

2. Componential structure of the lexemes *value* (noun), *little* and *small* (adjectives)

Our main thesis is that semantics is compositional and to understand the complexity of the lexical meaning we have to decompose it [19, p. 76–77]. Dekker kept on interpreting Stalnaker's attempt to suggest the formal system of interpretation (which would also characterize "update of information" based on "reading" the values of variables of one and the same unit [5]). The fact is that interlocutors in a discourse distinguish between the relative states of the world which they conceive possible or desirable and seek to deminish to the one which the actual word could or should be [5, p. 50]. Accordingly, the interlocutors – to understand each other – have

to choose the component of the word meaning, first, from its semantic domain, distribution, and the author's intentional meaning. And their discourse will be felicitous in case they manage to correlate all the variables of the given unit.

2.1. Componential structure of the lexical meaning of the noun *value* based on the defintin an analysis: *amount, volume, size, degree, mathematical sign, price, worth, social relations, music, linguistics.*

2.2. Componential analysis of the lexical meaning of the adjective *little*: size or extent, amount, degree, few in number, scope, short in duration, small in importance.

2.3. Componential analysis of the lexical meaning *small* reveals the following components: size or dimention, minor (in influence, power, or rank), lacking (in strength), measering, humble, limited in degree: (i) Common components in the lexical meaning of *little* and *small*: to describe size, either small or little could be used, although *small* is more fequent; (ii) Distinctive components in the lexical meaning of *little* and *small*. *Little* is also used to mean young concerning children; *Small* could be used to describe the height of the child. *Little* can also be used to show that something is not very significant. This component is not registered in the lexical meaning of *small*. *Small* is also used in comparative sentences. Nickels, dimes, and quarters are *small* change. "Little change" is not registered.

3. Distribution of the lexemes *value* (noun), *little* and *small* (adjectives)

Different components of the word meaning are actualized due to the word combinability / valence / distribution of the word with other constituents of the phrase or sentence. The components of the semantic structure of the lexeme *value* undergo shifts due to its lexical, grammatical (morphological and syntactical) correlation with other constituents of the collocation and broader of the sentence and discourse.

3.1. Distributional analysis of value (noun): i. NP →Adj + N [value]: Current value, actual value, investment value, market value; ii. NP →Neg [no] + Adj + N [value]: no clinical value; iii. NP →N + N [value]: credit assessment value.

3.2. Distributional analysis of *little* (adjective). It is used as a determiner, intensifier, quantifier, or approximator in the sentence pattern. It cooccurs with the following constituents in the sentence [13, p. 60]: (i) NP →Adj [little] + N.

Little empires, little wadding, little sledges, little delegation, little villages, little boat, littlE girk; (ii) NP →Ipos + Adj [little] + N; (iii) NP →Adj [little] + Adj + N.

Little white pots; (iv) NP →Adj + Adj [little] + N: Provocative little minx, nasty little book, solid little cottage; (v) NP →D (determiner) + Adj + N: These little divinities. (vi) NP →D (determiner) + Adj + Adj [little] + N: That ugly little statue.

3.3. Distributional analysis of the adjective *small*: (i) NP →ADJ (small) + N: small house, small stones, small area, small group, small tanker, small teams, small signs, small place, small packet, small congregation; (ii) PrepNP →prep[in] + ADJ (small) + N: in (a) small house; (iii) PrepNP →Prep[in] +Emphasizer [too]: in too small room; (iv)NP →ADJ (small) + Adj + N: small rural churches, small retail businesses, small, wax candle; (v) Prep +[the] + NP→ADJ (small) + ADJ +N: beneath the small round cap; (vi) NP *****ADJ (small) + N+ Of +N: small pieces of paper; (vii) Prep + NP →ADJ (small) + N + Adj: with small stones stained.

4. Corpus analysis of the lexemes *value* (noun), *little* and *small* (adjectives)

Corpus linguistics is concerned with whether something (an individual element or the co-occurrence of more than one individual element) is attested in corpora; i.e. whether the observed frequency (of occurrence or co-occurrence) is 0 or larger; something is attested in corpora more often than something else; i.e. whether an observed frequency is larger than the observed frequency of something else; something is observed more or less often than you would expect by chance – this is a more profound issue than it may seem at first sight and needs a more detailed evidence.

4.1. The corpus analysis of the noun lexeme *value* is based on 17 482 cases of its usage in the British National Corpus: (i) He lived in *a small house* there with his brothers and sisters; (ii) *The actual value* of that part; (iii) You'll see that it has *an investment value* in the region of eight million pound; (iv) The Chevron doesn't look *bad value* after all; (v) Les villas a Bordighera' from going abroad had seriously affected its market value; (vi) Blakemore's research was' cruel, barbaric and of no clinical value; (vii) As I have already said, our first priority will be to maintain the external value of the currency; (viii) It may for example have had a social value or a "credit" assessment value.

4.2. Corpus analysis of the adjective lexeme *little* is based on 61 932 text fragments which are retrieved from the British National Corpus reflecting various discourse registers like economy, quantity, quality, science, arts, social practice, everyday life: (i) Please. Do you want marmalade? Yes I do, a little bit; (ii) Oh he's got another little tractor (size); (iii) Happy New Year, little brotherI know you're thirty-four years old (age); (iv) Yeah, cos there's a little coffee table sort of thing that I put my script on; (v) And there you are, blithely hiring one of these little divinities as an assassin; (vi) She asked her aunt for a little money, for the first time (monatery; (vii) She cast a quick, cautious glance at the little girl (age); (viii) Diana in private is a nasty little book (volume); (ix) There was little delegation of authority (quantity).

4.3. Corpus analysis of *small* (adjective) reveals 42 738 cases in the BNC.

The formulaic language demonstrates very well how language, culture, and context are intertwined in discourse [10, p. 1–2]: (i) For the faithful witness of our *small rural churches* (size); (ii) With a voluntary sector that is erm constantly needing small amounts of resource (amount); (iii) In many cases *those very small primary schools* are receiving (size); (iv) Ludens also noticed her small feet, clad in expensive discreetly elegant shoes; (v) which would be adequate for the *small congregation* expected at that morning's early Mass (few in quantity). The lexemes *little* and *small* are used in the text fragments as *determiners, emphasizers, approximators, intensifiers* and *quantifiers*,

5. Semantic Domains of the lexemes *value* (noun), *little* and *small* (adjectives)

After all, "every", "some", "most", "bit", "little", "many", "much", etc., make up a tiny category of high-frequency words, and it would be quite remarkable if they were all alike. Indeed, it has been known for some time that, e.g., the meanings of "few" and "many" [16]; and "any" [12] appear to escape a straightforward analysis along the standard lines, and the same may hold for the differences between "all", "every", and "each". Trier 1931 a specialist in medieval German literature, analysed the vocabulary of the domain of knowledge as it changed through time, arguing that lexical sets form structured wholes in which each term sets semantic limits to the others: this is the idea of a semantic field, or Wortfeld, introduced [6, p. 57].

5.1. Semantic domain of *value* (noun) includes over 40 constituents: *merit, worth, usefulness, use, utility, practicality, advantage, desirability, benefit, gain, profit, and the like*. The constituents of the domain share the common semantic component enabling them to be interchangeable in certain contexts.

5.2. Semantic domain of *little* (adjective): small, little, diminutive, minute, tiny, miniature mean noticeably below average in size. *Small* and *little* are often interchangeable, but *small* applies more to relative size determined by capacity, value, number. a relatively small backyard. Little is more absolute in implication often carrying the idea of petiteness, pettiness, insignificance, immaturity. Diminutive implies abnormal smallness. diminutive bonsai plants.

5.3. The semantic domain of *small* (adjective): includes over fifty constituents diminutive, dinky (informal) exiguous (formal), infinitesimal (formal) and the like.

Jensen discusses how cultural linguistics can benefit from adding corpus-linguistic techniques to its list of research methods. A major aim of the corpus-linguistic approach is to identify association patterns in corpora [11, p. 478]. Alternatively, it might be argued that the large individual differences emerged because each person developed his or her own strategy for coping with the unnatural task of

using nonnumerical value in a situation involving precise nominations [23, p. 383]. A conceptual system of *value* as a "knowledge structure" is composed of information and knowledge of elements like definite and indefinite values They are related to each other but do not interact with each other. The meaning of the conceptual system is based on the meaning and relationship of its cinstituents in the horozontal and vertical contexts sharing the common component.

Findings and perspective. In every day communication people exchange with non-definite information employing indefinite Q-adjectives of the *little / small*: *much / many* type. How eve, in case there is misunderstanding they use numerical specifiers. It proves the fact that a correlation of various discourse registers takes place. Linguistic ethnography focuses on the study of cultures using language tools and laying emphasis on personal and social identities, shared ideologies in the process of interactions between individuals and social groups. Undoubtedly, interlocutors understand vague phrases not only as representing amounts of uncertainty, but also as representing degrees of confidence in that uncertainty, expectation that the uncertainty may change with information, as well as other factors. We suppose that the diversity of the semantic components of the two quantifiers *little* and *small* primarily inherent in their lexical meaning and the context functioning as an actualizor.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Armstrong N. Culture and translation / ed. F. Sharifian. *The Routledge handbook of language and culture.* London : Routledge, 2015. P. 181–195.
2. Bartmiński Jerzy. Aspects of cognitive ethnolinguistics. Sheffield : Equinox, 2009. 256 p.
3. Boas F. Handbook of American Indian languages. Vol. I–II. Washinton, D.C. : Smithsonian Institution Bureau Bulletin, 1911. 1069 p. P. 40.
4. Dash Niladri Sekhar. Role of context in word sense disambiguation. *Indian Linguistics*. 2005. Vol. 66 (1–4). P. 159–175.
5. Dekker Paul J.E. Dynamic semantics. Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy. Berlin : Springer, 2012. 128 p.
6. Duranti A. Language as culture in US anthropology: Three paradigms. *Current Anthropology*. 2003. Vol. 44 (3). P. 323–347.
7. Eglin P. Language, culture, and interaction / ed. F. Sharifian. London : Routledge, 2015. P. 141–153.
8. Egre P., Klinedinst N. Vagueness and language Use. London : McMillan, 2011. 319 p.
9. Gliozzo A., Strapparava C., Dagan A. Unsupervised and supervised exploitation of semantic domains in lexical disambiguation. *Computer Speech and Language.* 2004. Vol. 18 (3). P. 275–299.
10. Gries Stefan Th. What is corpus linguistics? *Language and linguistics Compass*. 2009. Vol. 3.10.1111.1749–818. x.2009.00149.x. P. 1–17.
11. Jensen K. E. Corpora and cultural cognition: How corpus-linguistic methodology can contribute to cultural linguistics / ed. F. Sharifian. Singapore : Springer, 2017. P. 477–505.
12. Kadmon, Nirit, Landman, Fred. Polarity sensitive Any and Free Choice. *Linguistics and Philosophy.* 1993. Vol. 16 (4). P. 353–422.
13. Kerre E.E., Cock M.De. Linguistic modifiers: an overview. Fuzzy logic and soft computing. *ASIS*. 1999. Vol. 6. P. 69–85.
14. Kóczy Baranyiné J. Cultural conceptualisations of river in Hungarian folk songs / ed. F. Sharifian. Singapore : Springer Nature, 2017. P. 223–245.
15. Kuz'min V.B. A parametric approach to description of linguistic values of variables and hedges. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*. 1981. Vol. 6. Issue 1. P. 27–41.
16. Lappin Shalom. An intensional parametric semantics for vague quantifiers. *Linguistics and Philosophy.* 2000. Vol. 23 (6). P. 599–620.
17. Leavitt John. Ethnosemantics / ed. F. Sharifian. London : Routledge. 2015. P. 51–65.
18. Miller G.A., Leacock C. Lexical representations for sentence processing. / ed. Y. Ravin, C. Leacock. *Polysemy*: *Theoretical & computational approaches*. New York : OUP, 2000. P. 151–160.
19. Mykhaylenko Valery. Conceptual analysis: componental analysis. *Науковий вісник Чернівецького національного університету імені Юрія Федьковича. Германська філологія.* 2014. № 720. С. 77–86.
20. Risager K. Linguaculture : The language-culture nexus in transnational perspective / ed. F. Sharifian. London : Routledge. 2015. P. 87–99.
21. Sharifian Farzad. Cultural conceptualisations and language. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : Benjamins, 2017. 171 p.
22. Solt Stephanie. The semantics of adjectives of quantity: PhD. Dissertation. The City University of New York. 2009. 289 p.
23. Measuring the vague meanings of probability terms / Thomas S. Wallsten et al. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*. 1986. Vol. 115. № 4. P. 348–365.
24. Wierzbicka Anna. English: meaning and culture. Oxford : OUP, 2006. 363 p.

25. Wright C. On the coherence of vague predicates. Synthese. 1987. № 30. P. 325–366.
26. Zimmer A.C. Verbal vs. numerical processing of subjective probabilities / ed. R.W. Scholz. Amsterdam : North-Holland, 1983. P. 159–182.

REFERENCES

1. Armstrong, N. (2015). Culture and translation. /Ed. F. Sharifian. *The Routledge handbook of language and culture.* London: Routledge. P. 181–195.
2. Bartmiński, Jerzy. (2009). *Aspects of cognitive ethnolinguistics.* Sheffield: Equinox. 256p.
3. Boas, F. (ed.). (1911). Handbook of American Indian languages. Vol. I–II. Washinton, D.C.: *Smithsonian Institution Bureau Bulletin.* 40. 1069p.
4. Dash, Niladri Sekhar (2005). Role of context in word sense disambiguation. *Indian Linguistics*. Vol. 66 (1–4). P. 159–175
5. Dekker, Paul J.E. (2012). *Dynamic semantics. Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy*. Berlin: Springer. viii, 128 p.
6. Duranti, A. (2003). Language as culture in US anthropology: Three paradigms. *Current Anthropology*. Vol. 44 (3). P. 323–347.
7. Eglin, P. (2015). *Language, culture, and interaction* / Ed. F. Sharifian. London: Routledge. P. 141–153.
8. Egre P. Klinedinst, N. (eds.). (2011). *Vagueness and language Use*. London: McMillan. 319 p.
9. Gliozzo, A., Strapparava, C., Dagan, A. (2004). Unsupervised and supervised exploitation of semantic domains in lexical disambiguation. *Computer Speech and Language.* Vol. 18 (3). P. 275–299.
10. Gries, Stefan Th. (2009). What is corpus linguistics? *Language and linguistics Compass*. Vol. 3.10.1111.1749–818. x.2009.00149.x. P. 1–17.
11. Jensen, K.E. (2017). *Corpora and cultural cognition: How corpus-linguistic methodology can contribute to cultural linguistics* / Ed. F. Sharifian. Singapore: Springer. P. 477–505.
12. Kadmon, Nirit, Landman, Fred. (1993). Polarity sensitive Any and Free Choice. *Linguistics and Philosophy.*Vol. 16 (4). P. 353–422.
13. Kerre, E.E., Cock M.De. (1999). Linguistic modifiers: an overview. Fuzzy logic and soft computing. *ASIS.* Vol. 6. P. 69–85.
14. Kóczy, Baranyiné J. (2017). Cultural conceptualisations of river in Hungarian folk songs. / Ed. F. Sharifian. Singapore: Springer Nature. P. 223–245.
15. Kuz'min, V.B. (1981). A parametric approach to description of linguistic values of variables and hedges. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*. Vol. 6. Issue 1. P. 27–41.
16. Lappin Shalom. (2000). An intensional parametric semantics for vague quantifiers. *Linguistics and Philosophy.* Vol. 23 (6). P. 599–620.
17. Leavitt John. (2015). *Ethnosemantics* / Ed. F. Sharifian. London: Routledge. P. 51–65.
18. Miller, G.A., Leacock, C. (2000). Lexical representations for sentence processing / Ed. Y. Ravin, C. Leacock. *Polysemy*: *Theoretical & computational approaches*. New York: OUP. P. 151–160.
19. Mykhaylenko, Valery. (2014). Conceptual analysis: componential analysis. Naukovyi visnyk Chernivetsogo universytetu. Germanska filologiya 20 Scientific Visnyk. Germanic Philology. № 720. P. 77–86.
20. Risager, K. (2015). Linguaculture: *The language-culture nexus in transnational perspective* / Ed. F. Sharifian. London: Routledge. P. 87–99.
21. Sharifian, Farzad. (2017). *Cultural conceptualisations and language*. Amsterdam. Philadelphia: Benjamins. xvii, 171 p.
22. Solt, Stephanie. The semantics of adjectives of quantity. (2009). *PhD. Dissertation*. The City University of New York. 289 p.
23. Wallsten, Thomas S. et al. (1986). Measuring the vague meanings of probability terms. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*. Vol. 115, № 4. P. 348–365.
24. Wierzbicka Anna. (2006). *English: meaning and culture*. Oxford: OUP. 363p.
25. Wright, C. (1987). On the coherence of vague predicates. Synthese 30: 325–66.
26. Zimmer, A.C. (1983). *Verbal vs. numerical processing of subjective probabilities* / Ed. R.W. Scholz. Amsterdam: North-Holland. P. 159–182.