

DOI <https://doi.org/10.51647/kelm.2024.1.10>

PROTOTYPOWE KADRY POWIEŚCI JOHNNA FOWLESA „KOLEKCJONER”

Mariya Matkovska

*starszy nauczyciel Katedry Języka Angielskiego
Narodowy Uniwersytet w Kamieńcu Podolskim imienia Iwana Ohienki
(Kaminiec Podolski, Ukraina)
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-1047-7027
matkovska.mariya@kpnu.edu.ua*

Adnotacja. Artykuł poświęcony jest analizie cech językowych i poznawczych tekstu literackiego, poznaniu mechanizmów korelacji kategorii: autor – postać – czytelnik (odbiorca) – interpretator. Korelacja takiego planu w strukturze tekstu opiera się na świadomości psycholingwistycznych środków „czynienia zła” w aspekcie autorskiej wizji i rozumienia tekstu oraz indywidualnego sposobu jego postrzegania przez odbiorcę, odbiorcę. poziom adekwatności tego postrzegania.

W wyniku analizy stwierdzono, że archetypy życia i śmierci, które werbalnie zawarte są w tekście, powstały na podstawie interpretacji struktur pojęciowych reprezentowanych przez zbiorowe doświadczenie kulturowe, a prototypami są baśnie. „Sinobrody”, „Piękna i Bestia”, poemat filozoficzny Williama Szekspira „Burza” stanowią podstawę konstrukcji i interpretacji wewnętrznej struktury „Kolekcjonera” w oparciu o aluzje, rozwinięcia metaforyczne i metonimiczne znaczenia itp.

Postuluje się, że kategorie spójności i koherencji są cechami definiującymi właściwy odbiór tekstu przez czytelnika. Spójność rozumiana jest jako sposób łączenia zdań w tekście, który osiąga się poprzez powtarzanie. Spójność ukazana jest jako zespół procedur zapewniających potencjał poznawczy tekstu poprzez ustanowienie logicznych relacji konsekwencji i przyczynowości.

Słowa kluczowe: archetyp, lingwistyka kognitywna, semantyka, pragmatyka, studia językoznawcze i kulturowe, zachowania komunikacyjne, pojęcie, rama.

THE PROTOTYPAL FRAMEWORK OF FOWLES'S NOVEL “THE COLLECTOR”

Mariya Matkovska

*Senior Lecturer of the English language department,
Kamyanets-Podilskiy Ivan Ohiyenko National University
(Kamyanets-Podilskiy, Ukraine)
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-1047-7027
matkovska.mariya@kpnu.edu.ua*

Abstract. This paper is devoted to the linguistic and cognitive peculiarities of the text, perception of correlation mechanisms – the author – the character – the reader – the interpreter. Some correlations of such a structure are based on the awareness of psycho-linguistic means of ‘causing evil’ in author’s intention and in an adequate reader's orientation. The author examines the linguistic features of archetypes *life* and *death* on the basis of the conceptual prototypes of fairy tales “Bluebeard”, “Beauty and the Beast”, “The Tempest”, representing the inner structure of “The Collector” on the basis of collective cultural experience. John Fowles uses such linguistic means as allusions, metaphorical and metonymic extensions of senses, entrenched meanings to coincide his characters with the conceptual prototypes of fairy tales deeply rooted in the language.

It is postulated the idea that the conceptual analysis of the text includes the structural characteristics of natural language categorization cohesion and coherence and the relationship between language and thought. Cohesion refers to the specific features that link different parts of the discourse, i.e. a condition in which people or things are closely united. Coherence refers to the underlying functional connectedness of a piece of language that is components are combined in a logical, effective and well-organized, clear way that can be easily understood.

Key words: archetype, cognitive linguistics, semantics, pragmatics, linguistic culturology, communicative behavior, concept, frame, prototype.

ФРЕЙМИ-ПРОТОТИПИ РОМАНУ ДЖОНА ФАУЛЗА «КОЛЕКЦІОНЕР»

Марія Матковська

старший викладач кафедри англійської мови

Кам'янець-Подільського національного університету імені Івана Огієнка

(Кам'янець-Подільський, Україна)

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-1047-7027

matkovska.mariya@kpnpu.edu.ua

Анотація. Стаття присвячена аналізу лінгво-когнітивних особливостей художнього тексту, пізнання механізмів кореляції категорій: автор – персонаж – читач (реципієнт) – інтерпретатор. Кореляція такого плану в структурі тексту базується на усвідомленні психо-лінгвістичних засобах «чинення зла» в аспекті авторського бачення й розуміння тексту та індивідуальному способі сприйняття його реципієнтом, рівень адекватності цього сприйняття.

В результаті аналізу виявлено, що архетипи *життя* і *смерть*, які вербально втілені в тексті, утворено на основі інтерпретації концептуальних структур, репрезентованих колективним культурним досвідом, а прототипи – казки «Синя борода», «Красуня і Чудовисько», філософської поеми Вільяма Шекспіра «Буря» являються основою побудови та інтерпретації внутрішньої структури «Колекціонеру» на основі алюзій, метафоричних та метонімічних розширень значень тощо.

Постулюється ідея, що визначальними ознаками для адекватного сприйняття тексту читачем є категорії когезії та когерентності. Когезія розглядається як спосіб з'єднання речень у тексті, що досягається повторами. Когерентність представляється як комплекс процедур, що забезпечують когнітивний потенціал тексту через встановлення логічних відношень наслідку та причинності.

Ключові слова: архетип, когнітивна лінгвістика, семантика, прагматика, лінгвокультурологія, комунікативна поведінка, концепт, фрейм.

Introduction. The theoretical foundations of cognitive language analysis and the relation of language to human cognition are explored in (Edwards, 1997), (Fauconnier, Turner, 2002), (Fillmore, 1982), (Lakoff, Johnson, 1980, 1996). Studies of the language change and optimality are offered in (Keller, 1994, McMahon, 2000). The psychological basis of prototypical categories is explored in (Dijk, Kintsch, 1983), (Kintsch, 1985). Recent studies on the pragmatic analysis of assertive speech-acts are offered in (Nisa, Manaf, 2021), (Rohmah, 2020).

Cognitive linguistics studies the models of consciousness associated with the processes of cognition, the acquisition, production, use, storage, transmission of knowledge (Dijk, Kintsch, 1983: 177).

Recent research and publications. The elaborated theories on conceptual metaphor and conceptual metonymy were developed by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson (Lakoff, Johnson, 1980: 19–21). They believe that the conceptual system within which a person thinks and acts metaphorical in nature and plays a major role in determining reality. The theory of semantic prototypes stood out as a branch of cognitive linguistics in the 70s of the twentieth century thanks to the works of A. Wierzbicka and her associates. According to this theory, some elements the internal structure of the concept are prototypes (Wierzbicka, 1997: 98–101; Wierzbicka, 2003: 305).

Teun a van Dijk and W. Kintsch distinguish several major components of text processing, not all of which are treated in equal detail. These components can be considered stages of processing: first comes the linguistic parsing of the text, followed by the construction of atomic propositions that represents its meaning elements; next, these meaning elements are organized into a coherent text base, which represents the full meaning of the text; from this text base, the macrostructure of the text is derived, representing its essence or gist (Dijk, Kintsch, 1983: 77–79; Kintsch, 1985: 235–236). At all of these levels, we are dealing with representations of text proper. In addition, however, text comprehension results in the construction of a situational model, which is not a representation of the text itself but of the situation referred to by the text. The model describes these various construction processes in real time, subject to known human processing limitations, mainly with respect to short-term memory (Dijk, Kintsch, 1983: 177). One of the components that is not developed in the van Dijk and Kintsch model is linguistic parsing. The model bypasses this stage and starts out not with a text proper, but with text-plus-annotations. These annotations provide the model with the kind of information it needs for its further processing, for example, the formation of propositions. There is, however, no explicit rule system that would compute these annotations from the textual input (Copeland, 1984: 67; Dijk, Kintsch, 1983: 181; Rohmah, 2020: 25).

The process of constructing propositions, on the other hand, is fully specified, given the annotated text as input. In essence, the model reads the text word by word (more precisely, in terms of small word groups called 'text expressions', as is explained below), building prepositional frames for each term as it is encountered, with dummy arguments in those cases where the required information has not yet been received (Austin, 1962: 77; Beaugrande, Dressier, 1981: 174–175). When the missing word is read, a second process fills in the corresponding argument, which now replaces the provisional dummy variable. The model knows what sort of propositions to build, because along with the text it is also provided with the necessary knowledge about the meaning of the words in the text (Beaugrande, Dressier, 1981: 182–183).

What needs to be specified is the form of the prepositional frame that is to be constructed, some semantic relations (such as subordination), and some meaning postulates specifying implications that are crucial for understanding the text. A formal theory of knowledge structures and inference from which the required knowledge sources could

be derived for a text is, however, not a part of the model, and the knowledge sources, just as the syntactic annotations, must be constructed for each text ad hoc (Edwards, 1997: 111–112). The central component of the model is the next stage, in which the atomic propositions just constructed are organized into a coherent text base, called the microstructure of the text. In an earlier version of the model, this was done in an oversimplified way. The only coherence relation considered was the repetition of prepositional arguments (Dijk, Kintsch, 1983: 122).

Van Dijk and Kintsch describe a much richer set of strategies by means of which coherent text bases are constructed (Dijk, Kintsch, 1983: 97–99; Kintsch, 1985: 240). Normally, the prepositional organization closely mirrors the syntactic structure of the sentence from which the propositions have been derived. This is achieved by the use of a prepositional schema, with the main verb of the sentence as the focal concept. The prepositional schema consists of a predicate-argument structure, with optional modifiers, and a circumstance category (specifying time, place, modals, consequences, etc.) (Fauconnier, Turner, 2002: 165–167; Fillmore, 1982: 115).

The **aim** of the paper is to identify the semantic and functional peculiarities of the concept ‘*causing evil*’ linked with the writer's intention and the reader's orientation in John Fowles's novel “The Collector” on the basis of collective cultural experience. The **tasks** of our investigation may be the following ones: to find out which means serve to maintain cohesion and coherence in dispensable for text understanding; to designate all the metaphors which serve as a backbone of cohesion and coherence in the given text; to designate some psycholinguistic peculiarities of the concept ‘*causing evil*’.

For identification the conceptual model ‘*causing evil*’ the **methodology** of framing modeling has been used. The method of conceptual analysis was taken for identifying the constituents of the concept ‘*causing evil*’ and the reconstruction of the English linguistic picture of the world on the basis of collective cultural experience.

Presentation of the main material. “The Collector” has deep roots in two fairy tales that function as prototypes, “Bluebeard” and “Beauty and the Beast”. In addition, Shakespeare's “The Tempest” functions both as literary allusions and prototypes. The basic plot of “The Collector” is a modern retelling and admixture of the two fairy tales. A young man, Frederick Clegg, becomes obsessed with a beautiful young art student, Miranda Grey. Smitten by love-at-first-sight, he worships her quietly from afar, for she is the ideal, the unattainable. Miranda and Lepidoptera soon become his life's two great passions. Miranda is the moonlight that fills his dreams with magic and that makes bearable the darkness of his mundane existence as a petty Town Hall clerk (Fowles, 1986: 9).

Thus for Miranda, Clegg-Bluebeard represents the dark, male side of her personality that she must learn to control and use creatively. If she does not channel the darker, negative aspects of her animus to positive use, they will destroy her. To control the dark, irrational forces of her personality – represented by Clegg-Bluebeard – Miranda must achieve individuation, which she does. But before she can affect an escape from Clegg's prison, she contracts pneumonia and dies – a victim of Clegg's will to power, his selfishness, and his manifest indifference to the sanctity of human life. According to Brown P. and Levinson St., the moral of “Bluebeard” is an admonition to us that “*knowledge, though dangerous, is necessary and good, while secrecy and crime must be challenged, revealed, and punished*” (Brown, Levinson, 1987: 147). Miranda learns that Clegg's diabolism must be exposed to the light, for it is a sickness, like the pneumonia that destroys her. Clegg's spiritual and psychological darkness – and the darkness of those like him – must be exorcized.

In psychological terms, Clegg – like Bluebeard – suffers from a repressed sexuality that leads to his decidedly puritanical attitudes and also his sexual perversion – he is an impotent voyeur who believes the sexual act itself is something dirty. It is partly Clegg's idealized and immature outlook on sexuality that brings about the tragedy that befalls Miranda. Clegg cannot accept the true nature of men and women's sexual relations. He veils his own sexual inadequacy in a web of dark and somber anger at what he mistakenly believes is the truth about sexuality. For Clegg sexuality is something to be forever repressed and locked away in a darkened room of the mind, to be rounded up periodically for purely prurient reasons, when the flesh is weakest. Thus forever repressed, forever fragmented from his being, sexuality for Clegg comes to mean the pornographic (Fowles, 1986: 10).

In his bedroom, alone and quiet, Clegg can compensate himself for his failure to achieve a meaningful relationship with a woman. Alone with his photographs of Miranda, Clegg achieves there what little and sordid sexual release he can allow himself. Bluebeard, bent on having his will and possessing his partner, cannot love anybody, but neither can anyone love him (Brown, Levinson, 1987: 203; Lakoff, 1996: 189).

In “The Collector” one of Fowles's favorite literary sources and inspirations is Shakespeare's “The Tempest”. In “The Collector” Fowles provides several allusions – sustained throughout the novel – that draw the reader's attention to Shakespeare's play. As P. Brown has noted, “The Tempest” analogues function as a metaphor for the action of the novel: “*The Tempest*” represents a very significant metaphorical strand woven into the total design of the book” (Brown, Levinson, 1987: 247; Grice, 1975: 48). “The Tempest” thus provides a rich source – an extended commentary, from which to approach Fowles's novel and to gain a deepened awareness of the author's purpose and intent. Yet “The Tempest” is much more, for it functions on the level of a myth.

The numerous allusions to “The Tempest” also serve to intensify the drama of Miranda's plight. Essentially one sees a dramatic contrast between the figuratively impotent Caliban of Shakespeare's play and the wealthy and powerful Clegg of the novel. Basically Clegg desires to act the role of lover, of Ferdinand, Miranda's lover in the play. But since Clegg cannot act and cannot truly love, he cannot become Ferdinand, even momentarily. Fowles poses the question: “*Does Clegg, have the emotional strength, the psychological potential, to become an authentic human being, to become metamorphosed from the beast Caliban into the noble Ferdinand, through the process of individuation?*” (Fowles, 1986: 24). Although the ultimate answer must be a resounding no, Fowles still provides the reader with a cautionary tale and important lessons to consider.

Symbolically Clegg is unrequited need; a beast that lies hidden in some murky cranny of the mind, whose fierceness and savagery is a necessary psychic element only when the need for self-preservation is invoked by urgent necessity or danger. Otherwise, if he comes unbidden into the light of day, it is with the force of chaos and the name of Death.

Shakespeare's "The Tempest", on at least one level, concerns the usurpation of power the misuse of wealth by those too immature to assume responsibility. In "The Collector" this same theme is evident. In "The Tempest" Prospero, the rightful Duke of Milan, trusting implicitly in his brother's loyalty and ability to govern Milan, gives himself over temporarily to a pursuit of knowledge. Leaving Antonio to steer the ship of state, Prospero, blinded by the intensity of his Faust-like quest, *'being transported and rapt in secret studies'* (Goffman, 1967: 76–77; Halliday, 1976: 278; Nisa, Manaf, 2021: 65).

The two major sub-plots of "The Tempest" – Ferdinand and Miranda's love and Sebastian and Antonio's scheme to murder Alonso and usurp the throne of Naples – are skillfully balanced within the larger framework of the play's themes which, if simplified, may be perceived as a series of binary oppositions: art versus nature, reality versus illusion, the spiritual versus the material, and the powers of life (freedom) versus the powers of death (hatred and repression). In "The Collector" Fowles has structured his novel on much the same principles that operate in Shakespeare's play. Several of Fowles's themes, initiated in "The Collector", are repeated and amplified in later works.

Another important theme is introduced in "The Collector" when Miranda attacks the 'Caliban' of modern British society (Keller, 1994: 162; McMahon, 2000: 125). Here Fowles satirizes man's greed for power over others; and the evil resulting from the usurpation of power is essentially what Antonio represents in "The Tempest" – even Prospero's desire to achieve mastery over the forces of Nature nearly results in irrevocable evil.

Certainly in "The Collector" Fowles equates wealth with power because it can buy Clegg anything but the love of Miranda – the one thing he must earn if he is to mature emotionally and psychologically. Certainly, too, Clegg is equated with Caliban – a Caliban who would not know how to use his freedom if Prospero granted it to him. Clegg is repressive and life-denying and embodies the terrible thirst of a ruthless man for power. And yet how do we interpret Miranda? If she represents the antithesis of Clegg – freedom, creativity, and life-affirming exuberance – then how do we associate her with her namesake in Shakespeare's play?

Although Miranda is by no means the major figure in "The Tempest" that she is in "The Collector", there are many similarities between her and Miranda Grey. In her idealism, for example, Fowles's heroine does resemble her namesake. Shakespeare's Miranda, though she is innocent of the world, unsophisticated and naive, is her father's daughter. She represents her father's idealistic impulses – and by extension those of mankind – when not checked and thwarted by their encounter with evil. She is compassionate, though she is imperious in her relations with Caliban. She sees in Caliban's gross countenance (as does Fowles's heroine in Clegg's) man's capacity for evil – his propensity to repay pity and kindness with acts of cruelty and hatred. Both Mirandas eventually tire of Caliban/Clegg's brute side and revile him for the monster he will ultimately remain. What Miranda says of Caliban in "The Tempest" is also true of Clegg in "The Collector" – both women sound remarkably alike in their rejection of "Caliban" (Fowles, 1986: 35).

Miranda's speech echoes many that one finds in "The Collector", and in one place in particular, Fowles provides a context for the Shakespearean allusion:

[Miranda:] *I know what you are. You're the Old Man of the Sea.*

[Clegg:] *Who's he?*

[Miranda:] *The horrid old man Sinbad had to carry on his back. That's what you are. You get on the back of everything vital, everything trying to be honest and free, and you bear it down* (Fowles, 1986: 206).

Fowles portrays the Clegg-Miranda relationship as almost an inversion, a parody, of the way the story should end, indeed would end, if it were a fairy tale. In his commentary on the myth of Amor (Eros) and Psyche, C. Kramersch shows how the sacrifice of a beautiful young girl leads to the regeneration of the hero: *"Through Psyche's sacrifice and death the divine lover [Eros] is changed from a wounded boy to a man and savior, because in Psyche he finds something that exists only in the earthly human middle zone between heaven and underworld: the feminine mystery of rebirth through love"* (Kramersch, 1998: 68). Of course, Miranda, unlike Psyche, can never give herself completely to Clegg, and Clegg is certainly no Eros. Clegg is both unable and unwilling to give himself completely to anything that is outside himself or beyond the narrow limits of his own experience.

Miranda does, however, come very close to self-sacrifice (in the manner of Psyche) so that Clegg can attain authenticity – can become psychologically and spiritually whole. But her conscience, her honesty, and her sincerity all dictate that she not become, in Kramersch's phrase, *"The natural naive beauty and perfection of the maiden who dies in the marriage of death with the male [and who] become [s] the knowing, psychic-spiritual beauty of a Psyche who dies for Eros and voluntarily sacrifices her whole being for him"* (Kramersch, 1998: 67–68). Miranda's existential awareness and her curse of honesty deny her easy escape and reprieve in this fashion. Miranda cannot become for Clegg what he needs because she is unable (and unwilling) to become a slave for any man. And perhaps the goddess Aphrodite herself would applaud Miranda for her refusal to submit to the male ego – for the goddess too has often resisted the iron will of all-powerful Zeus, prototypical male.

He can never admit the fact that this is love and only love that can change Miranda. But why would he want a butterfly that flies freely over flowery meadows, basking its wings in the sun? It arouses him only when it is pinned down in a glass box. He wants to feel power over it. Which of these beautiful creatures so endowed by nature would ever look at the collector? He is aware that probably none of them. Only on the collecting he sees a chance

for healing his paranoia, which he treats as something lofty and foreign to other mortals. *“Look, Ferdinand, I don't know what you see in me. I don't know why you are in love with me. Perhaps I could fall in love with you somewhere else. I... ’ she didn't seem to know what to say, which was unusual ‘... I do like gentle kind men. But I couldn't possibly fall in love with you in this room; I couldn't fall in love with anyone here. Ever”* (Fowles, 1986: 139).

In the game for his egoistic happiness, Clegg bets everything on a single hand. When the time for Miranda's release approaches, he makes arrangements for a farewell supper. He carefully prepares *“flowers, (...) bottles on the side-table, (...) everything really grand hotel”* (Fowles, 1986: 79). He does not forget to take some precautions: *“I would take the risk but watch her like a knife and ... Say someone knocked at the door, I could use the pad and have her bound and gagged in the kitchen in a very short time, and then open up”* (Fowles, 1986: 80).

While doing his preparations, he comes up with an ingenious idea of proposing to her during the supper. He buys a valuable necklace and an engagement ring. He knows very well that she will refuse his marriage proposal but simultaneously this will be a wonderful pretext for keeping her longer. Miranda refuses his proposal, as predicted, being honest with her own feelings and not wanting this type of ‘freedom’:

“Then why can't it be me? ‘Because I can't marry a man to whom I don't feel I belong in all ways. ... One who gives and one who accepts what's given. You don't belong to me because I can't accept you” (Fowles, 1986: 85).

The beginning of the text indicates that people desire what they cannot have at the moment. If the object of one's desire is within reach, people do not appreciate it and very often do not even care about it. Even if men nurture their health, freedom, or other immaterial things, they realize the need for them only after they have lost them. Like a convict sitting on the death row, they think how much they could still accomplish if they were given a chance to live.

The relationship between the victim and the executioner changes several times during the captivity. The promise of freedom made by Clegg gives Miranda some hope for enduring this psychological ordeal. Living with a looming end of this nightmare, Miranda tries to survive in these terrible conditions (Fowles, 1986: 19).

Her vitality is apparent in her contact with her oppressor. She is afraid of him because she sees his insanity. Despite that she senses his social class complex and she tries to help him. In many walks of life with which Clegg can never come to grasp, she tries to sensitize his soul so she could see some change in him, while putting all her hatred aside. She does not want to have anything to do with him and wants to be on the opposite end from him, but still there is something that she finds fascinating about him. She cannot define this feeling, which brings to light a completely different side of her, which she has not known. For example, *“It's weird. Uncanny. But there is a mysterious fourth part I can't define. It can't be friendship”* (Fowles, 1986: 140).

The interest in her guard is no part of any noble feelings, but seems to be rather a specific experience in which Miranda unwillingly participates. She has come into possession of some information of his life because he was her only “companion” during her captivity, which causes her to feel some indescribable “closeness”. Even from this dark side of life she draws a valuable lesson: *“A strange thought: I would not want this not to have happened. Because if I escape I shall be completely different and I think better person”* (Fowles, 1986: 251).

Both willingness to fight for freedom and rebellion against the terror explode into an inner imperative for seeking radical means of regaining her freedom, such as escape, and not coming into agreement with the enemy. She begins to think about violent acts. At first, they make her “bend her knees”. In her determination to live, she changes her view on this problem. Parting with God who is not able or willing to help her, she concludes that one must fight for life only with more or less humane means in the name of happiness: *“I'm trying to explain why I'm breaking with my principles (about never committing violence). You have to act and fight for yourself”* (Fowles, 1986: 223).

At the time of an extreme depression, Miranda goes as far as to try to kill her oppressor. Seeing that he does not watch her, she gets a hold of an axe. Her pacifist nature voices an everlasting dilemma, *“if I do not kill him, he will kill me”* (Fowles, 1986: 227). She stampedes her peacefulness and attacks. Her will to be free has won! To kill for freedom! A moment of hesitation is sufficient for her oppressor to be able to fend her barrage. Blood, struggle, and a painful defeat: *“I'm ashamed. I let myself down vilely. I've come to a series of decisions. Thoughts. Violence and force are wrong. If I use violence I descend to his level”* (Fowles, 1986: 228).

Conclusion. John Fowles's novel “The Collector” is like a scientific area of psychology, a study of a growing obsession so that the reader can flock to it like moths toward the light. In “The Collector” Fowles gives us two characters who represent a profound dichotomy of perspectives on life. Miranda quests for knowledge of the *self* and attempts to define herself through her relationships with men. This quest for *self* definition leads to an existential awareness for Miranda.

Clegg, on the other hand, through his blend of innocence and innate villainy, symbolizes the evil of all men. But Clegg is also a victim. Clegg shares a vision of life that is totally negative because it views all men as subject to greed, ambition, and the lust for power.

Thus, the existential elements in the novel balance with the prototypical ones. In “The Collector” we have all the elements of the fairy tale with the notable exception that the inner beauty of the Beast (Clegg) is never drawn out, and the Princess (Miranda) dies. Yet the failure here is not Miranda's – she is an exceptionally courageous and imaginative young woman who yet can do nothing to combat the fate that looms so menacingly over her. But her defeat is, in reality, Clegg's. His failure occurs because he, unlike Miranda, is not changed (except for the worse) by his experience. Ultimately, Miranda's triumph is that, had she lived, her spiritual beauty would have rivaled her physical perfection, and she would have continued to grow and mature intellectually and psychologically, ultimately perhaps achieving that state of mind whose essence is purity and harmony and which is indeed “mythic” in its perfection. As Fowles has said himself of Miranda: *“The girl in “The Collector” is an existentialist heroine although she doesn't know it* (Fowles, 1986: 7).

The first impression by “The Collector” is undoubtedly the depressive one. We consider the situation in the book as an evil one. The archetypal frameworks ‘*life and death*’, ‘*freedom and captivity*’ certify this idea. Our socio-cultural experience makes us believe that *captivity* and *death* are definitely evil. The use of the prototypes by the author, being analyzed in our paper, testifies coincidence between the prototypes and the situations in “The Collector”, stimulating in such a way positive or negative author’s intention and reader’s interpretation of the book.

Список використаних джерел:

1. Austin J.L. How to Do Things with Words. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1962, 168 p.
2. Beaugrande R., Dressier W. Introduction to Text Linguistics. London : Longman, 1981, 243 p.
3. Brown P., Levinson S. Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1987. 345 p.
4. Copeland J.E. New Directions in Linguistics and Semantics. Houston : Rice University Studies, 1984. 267 p.
5. Dijk T.A. van, Kintsch W. Strategies of Discourse Comprehension. New York : Academic Press, 1983. 289 p.
6. Edwards D. Discourse and cognition. London : SAGE Publications Ltd., 1997. 368 p.
7. Fauconnier G. and Turner M. The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind’s Hidden Complexities. New York : Basic Books, 2002. 382 p.
8. Fillmore Ch. Frame Semantics. In *Linguistics in the Morning Calm* (ed. by the Linguistic Society of Korea). Seoul : Hanshin, 1982. P. 111–137.
9. Fowles J. The Collector. London : Cavaye Place, 1986. 388 p.
10. Goffman E. Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior. New York : Anchor Books, 1967. 284 p.
11. Grice H.P. Logic and Conversation. In Cole, P., Morgan, J.L. *Syntax and Semantics*. Vol. 3: Speech acts. London : Academic Press 1975. P. 41–58.
12. Halliday M.A.K., and Hasan R. Cohesion in English. English Language Series, London : Longman, 1976. 374 p.
13. Keller R. On Language Change. London : Routledge, 1994. 182 p.
14. Kintsch W. Text Processing: A Psychological Model. In *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. London : Appleton Century Crofts, 1985. Vol. 2. P. 231–243.
15. Kramsch C. Cultural Stereotypes. Language and Culture. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1998. P. 67–69.
16. Lakoff George. Moral Politics: What Conservatives Know That Liberals Don't. Chicago and London : The University of Chicago Press, 1996. 512 p.
17. Lakoff G., Johnson, M. Metaphors we live by. Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 1980. 256 p.
18. McMahon A. Change, Chance, and Optimality. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2000. 212 p.
19. Nisa K., Manaf N. A. Analysis of Illocutionary Speech Acts on Student’s Social Media Post and Comments. *Seloka : Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia*, 2021. Vol. 10. №1. P. 62–67. DOI: 10.15294/SELOKA.V10I1.44409.
20. Rohmah E. An Analysis of Assertive Acts in *Letters to Juliet* Movie. *Journal of Humanities And Social Science*, 2020. Vol. 25 (4), P. 19–27. DOI: 10.9790/0837-250403192.
21. Wierzbicka A. Understanding cultures through their key words: English, Russian, Polish, German, and Japanese. New York, Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1997. 328 p.
22. Wierzbicka A. Cross-cultural Pragmatics: The Semantics of Human interaction. Berlin / NY : Walter de Gruyter, 2003. 502 p.

References:

- Austin, J.L. (1962). How to Do Things with Words. Oxford : Oxford University Press.
1. Beaugrande, R., Dressier, W. (1981). Introduction to Text Linguistics. London : Longman.
 2. Brown, P., Levinson, S. (1987). Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
 3. Copeland, J.E. (1984). New Directions in Linguistics and Semantics. Houston : Rice University Studies.
 4. Dijk, T.A. van, Kintsch, W. (1983). Strategies of Discourse Comprehension. New York : Academic Press.
 5. Edwards, D. (1997). Discourse and cognition. London : SAGE Publications Ltd.
 6. Fauconnier, G. and Turner, M. (2002). The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind’s Hidden Complexities. New York : Basic Books.
 7. Fillmore, Ch. (1982). Frame Semantics. In *Linguistics in the Morning Calm* (ed. by the Linguistic Society of Korea). Seoul : Hanshin. P. 111–137.
 8. Fowles, J. (1986). The Collector. London : Cavaye Place.
 9. Goffman, E. (1967). Interaction Ritual : Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior. New York : Anchor Books.
 10. Grice, H.P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. In Cole, P., Morgan, J.L. *Syntax and Semantics*. Vol. 3: Speech acts. London : Academic Press.
 11. P. 41–58.
 12. Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). Cohesion in English. English Language Series, London : Longman.
 13. Keller, R. (1994). On Language Change. London : Routledge.
 14. Kintsch, W. (1985). Text Processing: A Psychological Model. In *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. London : Appleton Century Crofts. Vol. 2.
 15. P. 231–243.
 16. Kramsch, C. (1998). Cultural Stereotypes. Language and Culture. Oxford : Oxford University Press.
 17. Lakoff, George. (1996). Moral Politics: What Conservatives Know That Liberals Don't. Chicago and London : The University of Chicago Press.

18. Lakoff, G., Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago : University of Chicago Press.
19. McMahon, A. (2000). *Change, Chance, and Optimality*. Oxford : Oxford University Press.
20. Nisa, K., Manaf, N. A. (2021). Analysis of Illocutionary Speech Acts on Student's Social Media Post and Comments. *Seloka : Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia*, Vol. 10. №1. P. 62–67. DOI: 10.15294/SELOKA.V10I1.44409.
21. Rohmah, E. (2020). An Analysis of Assertive Acts in Letters to Juliet Movie. *Journal of Humanities And Social Science*, Vol. 25 (4), P. 19–27. DOI: 10.9790/0837-250403192.
22. Wierzbicka, A. (1997). *Understanding cultures through their key words: English, Russian, Polish, German, and Japanese*. New York, Oxford : Oxford University Press.
23. Wierzbicka, A. (2003). *Cross-cultural Pragmatics: The Semantics of Human interaction*. Berlin / NY : Walter de Gruyter.