

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18454/RULB.2021.25.1.10>**СЕМАНТИЧЕСКОЕ ПОЛЕ «ИДЕНТИФИКАЦИЯ В ПОЛИЦЕЙСКОМ РАССЛЕДОВАНИИ»: ОРГАНИЗАЦИЯ И СПЕЦИФИКА НОМИНАЦИИ**

Научная статья

**Шашкова В.Н. \***

ORCID: 0000-0003-0977-3061,

Орловский юридический институт МВД России имени В.В. Лукьянова, Орел, Россия

\* Корреспондирующий автор (valentina.shash[at]mail.ru)

**Аннотация**

Статья посвящена возможностям структурирования семантического поля “Identification in Police Investigation” с опорой на функционально-ролевой принцип, а также рассмотрению основных черт номинации единиц анализируемого поля и отдельных аспектов их семантики.

В результате анализа в качестве основных механизмов номинации выявлены уточнение сигнификативного значения номинативной единицы за счёт введения дополнительных лексических единиц, функциональный перенос, метонимия, а также конверсия.

Регулярным типом системных отношений среди единиц семантического поля “Identification in Police Investigation” выступают синонимические, а также гиперо-гипонимические отношения, притом со-гипонимы формируют синонимический ряд, составляющие которого отличаются по денотативному компоненту.

**Ключевые слова:** семантическое поле, номинативная единица, референтная область, гиперо-гипонимические отношения, уточнение сигнификативного значения, функциональный перенос, метонимия, конверсия.

**“IDENTIFICATION IN POLICE INVESTIGATION”: ORGANIZATION AND SPECIFICS OF NOMINATION**

Research article

**Shashkova V.N. \***

ORCID: 0000-0003-0977-3061,

Orel Law Institute of the Ministry of the Interior of Russia named after V.V. Lukyanov, Orel, Russia

\* Corresponding author (valentina.shash[at]mail.ru)

**Abstract**

The article elicits the possibilities of structuring the semantic field “Identification in Police Investigation” based on the functional-role principle, as well as to the consideration of the main features of the nomination in the analyzed field and certain aspects of semantics.

As a result of the analysis, specification of the significative meaning due to the introduction of additional lexemes, functional transfer, metonymy and conversion are elicited as the dominant nomination mechanisms.

The regular type of systemic relations among the units of the semantic field “Identification in Police Investigation” is represented by synonymic and hyper-hyponymic relations. Moreover, co-hyponyms form a synonymic row, the constituents of which differ in their denotative component.

**Keywords:** semantic field, nominative unit, reference zone, hyper-hyponymic relations, specification of the significative meaning, functional transfer, metonymy, conversion.

**Introduction**

The most important prerequisite for our research is the thesis that the lexical component of speech in any sphere of communication is the primary indicator of the reference zone, since it reflects the conceptual content of those nominative language units that form the corresponding lexical-semantic field. For a systematic representation of the nominative means we turned to such a cognitive structure for storing and presenting knowledge as a proposition, which is interpreted in accordance with the concept of J. Anderson. The proposition is understood not as “a component of the functional semantics of the statement” [3, P. 218-219], but as “a cognitive structure, which, on the one hand, reflects the situation in the field of communication” [7, P. 426], on the other hand, allows for a systemic categorization of the nominative units forming the lexical-semantic field. In this sense, the proposition makes it possible to single out clusters of vocabulary based on the functional-role principle thus serving as an instrument in delimitation of the lexical-semantic field.

The article aims at highlighting the definitive characteristics of semantics and nomination of the units forming the lexical-semantic field “Identification in Police Investigation” taking into account the reference zone and the limitations of the language use which it imposes.

The study material included two sources, namely “Procedures: Photo Arrays and Line-ups. Model Policy” published by the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services [9] and “Seattle Police Department Manual” by Adrian Diaz [8] outlining the specifics of conducting identification procedures.

**Methods**

The cognitive-discursive paradigm, established in linguistics, predetermines the attention of researchers to the field of communication, in which textual activity takes place, as well as to the selectivity of linguistic means serving this area. The cognitive component in the cognitive-discursive paradigm is realized by “the fixation of human experience and knowledge in the form of cognitive structures stored in our minds” [4, P. 8]. This component is associated with the interpretation of the context, forming a “conceptual basis for understanding the nature of the context as a cognitive education” [2, P. 160]. A

discursive approach involves taking into account a wide context of professional activity and textual activity serving the former in the relevant field of communication, which is evident by the “thematic repertoire” [1, P. 52], reflecting “the specific context of the subject area, and in the set of genres, understood as stable forms of utterance, and in the selectivity of the lexical component and grammatical structures, which manifests itself in texts of one discursive profile” [5, P. 62]. The classification of nominative units was carried out based on the functional-role principle [6, P. 193]. Semantic analysis was the main linguistic method used in the study. In terms of its underlying points, the research carried out does not contain anything revolutionary. It demonstrates ways of structuring the particular lexical-semantic field in order to study lexical systematicity, which can further be exploited by employing the principle of a structural organization of any lexical-semantic field in the process of teaching English for special purposes.

## Results

To illustrate the possibilities of using the functional-role approach to identifying the paradigmatic organization of the units of the lexical-semantic field, we turn to the linguistic material. Actants in the analyzed texts are represented by the following nominative units: “*an eyewitness*”, “*a suspect*”, “*a perpetrator*”, “*an administrator*”, “*a filler / a foil*”, “*an investigator*”, “*a (lead) detective*”, “*a photographer*” [8], [9]. The basic nominative feature underlying the units of this cluster is the functional transfer which can easily prompt the deontic responsibilities of the subject named: an administrator is the one who administers an identification procedure, an investigator is the one who investigates a case within which an identification procedure is conducted, a filler is a person, other than the suspect, who is used in a line-up or a photo array.

Actions which dominantly manifest themselves through verbal phrases and in part through event nouns which are a means of naming an implicit proposition can be classified in accordance with the actant they are typically performed by. The major actants in the reference zone “Identification in Police Investigation” are (1) investigators, (2) administrators and (3) eyewitnesses. We circumscribe the verbal phrases to these three groups as they are representative enough to make inferences about the specificities of nomination. The first group of the verbal phrases consists of the units naming actions predicated to the investigator: “*to conduct / to carry out an (eyewitness) identification*”, “*to select fillers*”, “*to position the suspect randomly in line-ups*”, “*to instruct the witness / the fillers*”, “*to present the photomontage to sb*”, “*to document the procedure*”, “*to video record the line-up / the show-up*”, “*to document identification or non-identification in writing*” [8], [9]. Synonymic relations can be found within this subgroup as in the doublet “*to conduct an identification*” and “*to carry out an identification*”. At the same time these two synonyms semantically are hyperonyms in relation to all the other items which are co-hyponyms in the given row of nominative units.

The verbal phrases naming the actions of the administrator compose the following nominative units: “*to conduct photo arrays either in person or via email*”, “*to select subjects for a line-up*”, “*to load a line-up with people*”, “*to present the lineup (to a witness)*”, “*to document any statements of the victim and / or the witness*”, “*to document results of the identification*”, “*to instruct the witness(es)*” [8], [9]. Here again synonymic expressions come to the fore underscoring the specific weight of synonymic relations within the analyzed semantic field as illustrated in the following word chains: *to select subjects for a line-up* – *to load a line-up with people*.

Eyewitnesses’ actions are reflected by the following verbal phrases: “*to come in for the identification procedure*”, “*to view the lineup*”, “*to choose one of the people from the line-up*”, “*to make an identification / a selection*”, “*to confirm the identification*”, “*to provide the level of certainty*”, “*to describe one’s certainty about the identification*” [8], [9]. Synonymy manifests itself in the nominations of identification’s ultimate result: *to make an identification* – *to make a selection*, *to provide the level of certainty* – *to describe one’s certainty about the identification*.

As can be seen from the examples above, the typical nomination mechanism manifesting itself in the selected verbal phrases is the specification of significant meaning by adding a lexical item. The expansion of the verbal phrases beyond the typical frame V + O (verb + object) is carried out by adding attributes expressed by an adjective (*a consistent appearance*) or a noun in the common case (*photo arrays*, *identification presentations*, *line-up participants*). Prepositional specifications of nouns within verbal phrases include nouns or noun substitutes (the indefinite pronoun *one*) in the possessive case: *the witness’ signature*, *one’s consent*, *one’s certainty*. Attributive specifications can be in post position to the noun syntactically dependent on the verb in a verbal phrase: *the circumstances of the show-up*, *results of the identification*, *the description of the suspect*.

More typically verbal phrases take adverbial specifications: *to position the suspect randomly* (adverbial of manner) *in line-ups* (adverbial of place), *to document identification in writing* (adverbial of manner), *to conduct photo arrays either in person or via email* (adverbial of manner). Logically the procedural nature of identification entails the frequency of use of adverbial modifiers of manner.

The semantic object within the proposition of identification in police investigation is primarily represented by the types of identification and its procedures: “*portrait parle*”, “*a police line-up / an identity parade*”, “*a show-up*”, “*fingerprint identification*”, “*identification of sweat and grease deposits*”, “*brain fingerprinting*”, “*DNA profiling / DNA typing*”, “*DNA phenotyping*”, “*a cognitive interview*”, “*an identikit / a photofit*” [8], [9]. The particularity of nomination is represented by the combination of metonymy and conversion. Metonymy manifests itself as a transfer from the process into the result. Conversion is connected with the use of *-ing* forms which intrinsically incorporate nominal and verbal features.

The nominative units referring to semantic objects are often specified by attributes: “*a line-up method*”, “*a live line-up*”, “*a photo line-up*”, “*a simultaneous line-up*”, “*a sequential line-up*” [8], [9]. The specification of significant meaning of the lexical item is the regular nomination mechanism due to the need to highlight the differential features of identification procedures, which is why it is verbalized with a high degree of frequency as part of complex nominatives.

The outcome of the identification procedure is represented by the following nominative units: “*recognition*”, “*identification*”, “*confirmation*”, “*audio / video recording*” [8], [9]. The nomination mechanism functioning in all the units of this group is metonymy.

Another aspect of the analysis is represented by the semantic relations within the semantic field. The basic types have been outlined with regard to verbal groups denoting actions in the process of identification. On the one hand, there are synonymic relations, such as manifesting themselves in the doublets: *a line-up – an identity parade, a filler – a foil, an identikit – a photofit, DNA profiling – DNA typing*. Another type of semantic relations is hypero-hyponymic relations represented by the following example: *an identification procedure → a line-up, an identity parade, a show-up, a photo array, a photomontage*.

An important aspect of semantic content is connected with the difference between a line-up and a show-up. The differential semantic components are the location (in a police station or at the crime scene) and the number of people presented for the identification procedure (minimum 5 or only 1 correspondingly).

In some cases synonyms differ in their stylistic reference. If “fillers” is a nomination from regulatory legal acts, “foils” is a lexical item from the professional sublanguage of investigators.

### Conclusion

The analysis allowed us to pinpoint the dominant nomination mechanisms manifesting themselves in the nominative units of the semantic field “Identification in Police Investigation”, namely the specification of significant meaning of the nominative unit, functional transfer, metonymy and conversion.

The analysis of the nominative units pertinent to the semantic field “Identification in Police Investigation” shows that the functional-role principle is a viable instrument for organizing the lexical clusters thus outlining the structure of the semantic field. The semantic field “Identification in Police Investigation” is not reduced to the clusters used to exemplify the organization of the field and allow for a more deliberate presentation, nor is it circumscribed by the nominative units used for illustration in this article. The proposed methodology outlines the contours for a more detailed study with a wider selection of nominative units. This principle can well be used in teaching the subject matter relating to the topic of identification in police investigation as it represents the situational layout behind the procedure of identification in police investigation and can serve as a mnemonic device.

The prospects of this study include identifying general trends in nominalization on the basis of normative legal acts for further comparison with texts of other genres within the framework of legal discourse and further on the material of texts of a different discourse type.

### Конфликт интересов

Не указан.

### Conflict of Interest

None declared.

### Список литературы / References

1. Дейк Т. А. ван. Язык. Познание. Коммуникация / Т. А. ван Дейк / Благовещенск: БГК им. И. А. Бодуэна де Куртенэ, 2000. – 308 с.
2. Дубровская О.Г. Когнитивно-дискурсивное направление когнитивной лингвистики как парадигма знания для интерпретации текста / Дубровская О.Г. // Вестник Ленинградского государственного университета им. А.С. Пушкина, 2011. – С. 155–161.
3. Кобозева И.М. Лингвистическая семантика / Кобозева И.М. – М.: URSS, 2000. – 352 с.
4. Суворова С.Л. Межкультурная парадигма иноязычного образования: полипарадигмальный аспект / Суворова С.Л. // Вестник Шадринского государственного педагогического института, 2015. – № 3. – С. 5–10.
5. Шашкова В.Н. Возможности организации работы над совершенствованием навыков лексического оформления речи в условиях дискурсивного подхода к обучению иностранным языкам / Шашкова В.Н. // Международный научно-исследовательский журнал. Екатеринбург, 2020. – № 6–3 (96). – С. 96–98.
6. Шашкова В.Н. Анализ средств и механизмов номинации, используемых при описании референтной области «Деятельность сотрудника ОВД» (на материале русского и английского языков) / Шашкова В.Н. // Проблемы лингвистики, методики обучения иностранным языкам и литературоведения в свете межкультурной коммуникации: сборник материалов III Международной научно-практической конференции (26-27 марта 2018 г.) / под ред. О.Ю. Ивановой. – Орёл, 2018. – С. 192-199.
7. Anderson J. R. A theory for the recognition of items from short memorized lists / J. R. Anderson // Psychological Review – 1976. Vol. 86. P. 417–438.
8. Diaz A. Seattle Police Department Manual. Conducting Identification Procedures [Электронный ресурс] – URL: <https://www.seattle.gov/police-manual/title-15---primary-investigation/15170---conducting-identification-procedures> (дата обращения: 19.01.21).
9. Procedures: Photo Arrays and Line-ups. Model Policy. – New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services. Office of Public Safety, 2015. – 24 p.

### Список литературы на английском / References in English

1. Dijk van T.A. Yazyk. Poznaniye. Kommunikatsiya [Language. Knowledge. Communication] / T.A. van Dijk. – Blagoveschensk: Blagoveschenskiy gosudarstvenniy universitet, 2000. – 308 p. [in Russian]
2. Dubrovskaya O.G. Kognitivno-diskursivnoye napravleniye kognitivnoi lingvistiki kak paradigma znaniya dlya interpretatsii teksta [Cognitive-discursive dimension of cognitive linguistics as a knowledge paradigm for text interpretation] / O.G. Dubrovskaya // The Bulletin of Leningrad State University named after A.S. Pushkin, 2011. – P. 155–161. [in Russian]
3. Kobozeva I.M. Lingvisticheskaya semantika [Linguistic semantics] / Kobozeva I.M. – Moscow: Editorial URSS. – 352 p. [in Russian]
4. Suvorova S.L. Mezhhul'turnaya paradigma inoyazychnogo obrazovaniya: poliparadigmalyi aspekt [Intercultural paradigm of foreign education: poly-paradigm aspect] / S.L. Suvorova // The Bulletin of Shadrinsk State Pedagogical Institute,

2015. – N 3. – P. 5–10. [in Russian]

5. Shashkova V.N. Vozmozhnosti organizatsii raboty nad sovershenstvovaniem navykov leksicheskogo oformleniya rechi v usloviyakh diskursivnogo podkhoda k obucheniyu inostrannym yazykam [Ways of organizing work at improving the skills of lexical expression in the conditions of the discourse approach to teaching foreign languages] / V.N. Shashkova // International Research Journal, 2020. – N 6. – Vol. 3. – P. 96–98. [in Russian]

6. Shashkova V.N. Analiz sredstv i mekhanizmov nominatsii, ispol'zuemykh pri opisani referentnoi oblasti "Deyatelnost sotrudnika OVD" (na materiale russkogo i anglijskogo jazykov) [The analysis of nomination means and mechanisms used to describe the reference zone "The Law Enforcement Official's Activities" (as exemplified in Russian and English)] / V. N. Shashkova // Materialy tret'yei Mezhdunarodnoi nauchno-practicheskoi konferentsii "Problemy lingvistiki, metodiki obucheniya i literaturovedeniya v svete mezhkul'turnoi kommunikatsii [Proceedings of the Third International Scientific and Practical Conference "The Problems of Linguistics, methodology of teaching and the theory of literature in light of intercultural communication"]. – Oryol: Oryol State University named after I. S. Turgenev, 2018. – P. 192-199. [in Russian]

7. Anderson J. R. A theory for the recognition of items from short memorized lists / J. R. Anderson // Psychological Review – 1976. Vol. 86. P. 417–438.

8. Diaz A. Seattle Police Department Manual. Conducting Identification Procedures [Electronic resource] – URL: <https://www.seattle.gov/police-manual/title-15---primary-investigation/15170---conducting-identification-procedures> (accessed: 19.01.21).

9. Procedures: Photo Arrays and Line-ups. Model Policy. – New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services. Office of Public Safety, 2015. – 24 p.