

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18454/RULB.2022.29.1.6>

**ЛЕКСИЧЕСКИЙ КОМПОНЕНТ ЯЗЫКОВОГО ОФОРМЛЕНИЯ РЕФЕРЕНТНОЙ ОБЛАСТИ  
«INVESTIGATIVE ACTIONS» (НА МАТЕРИАЛЕ ФЕДЕРАЛЬНЫХ ПРАВИЛ УГОЛОВНОГО  
СУДОПРОИЗВОДСТВА США)**

Научная статья

**Шашкова В.Н. \***

ORCID: 0000-0003-0977-3061,

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

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

**Аннотация**

Статья посвящена выявлению специфики лексического компонента языкового оформления референтной области «Investigative Actions» в английском языке на материале подъязыка нормативного правового акта «Федеральные правила уголовного судопроизводства».

Цель исследования – определить специфику лексического оформления концептуального поля «Следственные действия» с учётом общих дискурсивных условий употребления номинативных средств, а также особенностей грамматического строя языка.

Теоретическая значимость исследования заключается в разработке вопросов номинации в сравнительно-типологическом аспекте. Практическая значимость обусловлена выявлением аспектов номинации, которые могут быть использованы в дидактических целях в процессе преподавания юридических тем на русском и английском языках.

Анализ лексического компонента проводился по трём основным направлениям: 1) механизмы номинации, используемые при описании референтной области «Investigative Actions»; 2) словообразовательные модели, актуализированные в лексемах, относящихся к исследуемому семантическому полю; 3) модели синтаксического распространения комплексных номинативных единиц.

Анализ выявил два повторяющихся механизма номинации для большинства номинативных средств, используемых при описании референтной области «Investigative Actions»: уточнение сигнификативного значения номинативной единицы за счёт введения дополнительных лексем и метонимию, реализуемую переносом с процесса на результат, который, как правило, отражен в соответствующем документе. Словообразовательные модели представлены суффиксацией и конверсией.

Синтаксические модели, используемые в сложных номинативных единицах, включают следующие базовые структуры: прилагательное + существительное, существительное + существительное, глагол + существительное, вариативность которых крайне ограничена.

**Ключевые слова:** номинативная единица, механизм номинации, уточнение сигнификативного значения, метонимия, аффиксация, конверсия, словообразование, синтаксическая модель.

**THE LEXICAL COMPONENT OF THE LANGUAGE MEANS USED FOR THE REFERENCE ZONE  
“INVESTIGATIVE ACTIONS” (AS EXEMPLIFIED BY THE FEDERAL RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE OF  
THE USA)**

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 is devoted to identifying the specifics of the lexical component of the language used to describe the reference zone “Investigative Actions” in English as exemplified by the sublanguage of the regulatory legal act “Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure”. The analysis of the lexical component was carried out in three main areas: 1) nomination mechanisms used in describing the reference zone “Investigative Actions”; 2) word-formation patterns typically actualized in lexemes belonging to the semantic field under study; 3) patterns of syntactic expansion of complex nominative units.

The purpose of the study is to determine the specifics of the lexical component of the conceptual field “Investigative Actions”, taking into account the discursive conditions for the use of nominative units, as well as the grammar structure of the language.

The theoretical significance of the study lies in the development of questions related to nomination in a comparative typological aspect. The practical value is predetermined by the identification of the nomination aspects that can be used for didactic purposes in the course of teaching legal topics in Russian and English.

The analysis revealed two recurring nomination mechanisms for the majority of nominative units used in describing the reference zone “Investigative Actions”, namely: specification of the significative meaning of the nominative unit by introducing additional lexemes, and metonymy realized by the transference from the process to the result, which is typically represented in the name of the relevant judicial document. Word-formation methods are represented by suffixation and conversion.

Syntactic models used in the complex nominative units of the semantic field “Investigative Actions” include the following basic structures: adjective + noun, noun + noun, verb + noun, the variability of which is extremely limited.

**Keywords:** nominative unit, nomination mechanism, specification of significative meaning, metonymy, suffixation, conversion, word formation, syntactic pattern.

## Introduction

The problem of a systematic description of a lexical layer related to a certain reference zone remains topical despite numerous studies and proposed options for systematizing nominative units starting with the fundamental work of S. G. Shchur [8], who postulates the idea of a language system, to the functional approaches to the analysis of the elements of the semantic field reflected in the works of A. A. Ufimtseva [5] and I. A. Sternin [4]. The cognitive-discursive paradigm in linguistics focuses on the functioning of linguistic means in a particular type of discourse conditioned by the area of communication the discourse serves, through the prism of knowledge representation models stored in the minds of native speakers and users of the language. The cognitive-discursive paradigm does not deny the traditional systemic characteristics of language units; it allows a researcher to look at them through the prism of categorization of reality based on the functional-role principle and the theory of semantic cases [6, P. 496–530]. It also stipulates the selectivity of the nominative means used in a message that allow the communicators to verbalize certain aspects of a reference zone.

In the context of the cognitive-discursive research paradigm established in linguistics, consideration of the functioning of nominative units in texts of a certain sphere of communication is associated with the study of concepts and conceptual content behind nominations. “Categorization is the main way to give the perceived world an orderly character...” [3, P. 96]. The general trend, which corresponds to the main provisions of the cognitive-discursive scientific paradigm established in linguistics, can be traced in modern research. Thus, the idea of functional mediation of the use of language units finds expression in the collective monograph “The Functional Perspective on Language and Discourse: Applications and Implications”, in which the authors pay attention to key pragmatic concepts such as contextualization, reference, discursive markers, speech acts characteristics of a certain sphere of communication, through the prism of which the sublanguage of a particular discourse is considered [10, P. 189–208].

Another starting point of our research concept is the possibility of conceptualizing discourse from the point of view of the communicative sphere in which it functions, situations of communication in this sphere, and the specifics of the language means which show a solid tendency to manifest themselves in particular situational contexts.

In our study, the reference zone is the area of activity of employees of the internal affairs bodies comprising a series of investigative actions. The fundamental thesis of the study is the possibility of classifying the clusters of vocabulary and complex nominatives which denote concepts from the analyzed reference zone by applying the functional-role approach. We differentiate the terms “conceptual field” and “semantic field”. The conceptual field, as we understand it, reflects the generalized ideas of language users about a certain reference zone, its participants, their actions, and results. The semantic field refers to the structural linguistics and the functional linguistics, and it includes the nominative means pertinent to various aspects of the reference zone.

The functional-role principle, laid down by the studies of Charles Fillmore [6, P. 496–530], the referential-role grammar of Robert van Valin and W. Foley [1, P. 376–410], as well as frame semantics [2, P. 189–191], is based on the categorization of nominative units that form the semantic field depending on the functional roles of actants in a certain area of communication. In its most general form this approach can be presented through the concept of the following semantic cases: actants, their actions differentiated by their reference to particular actants, objects at which the actions are aimed, the circumstances of the actions, the results of the undertaken actions, the evaluation of the results [7, P. 193–194]. The general scheme may certainly vary depending on the field of communication, the reference zone, and, most importantly, the typical communication needs realized in the sphere. Differentiation of nominative units, taking into account the functional-role principle, makes it possible to correlate the conceptual content with the referent behind a lexeme or a complex nominative, thereby reflecting the denotative fields of thematically relevant concepts.

The use of the functional-role principle in identifying the specifics of the lexical component of the language of articles of the criminal procedure legislation of the United States devoted to the regulation of investigative actions predetermines the scientific novelty of the study. The analysis of linguistic literature testifies to the absence of comparative works on the selected material with the use of the functional-role approach both to individual lexemes and to syntagmatic chains that form complex nominatives.

The material of the study is the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure of the United States of America (Section II) [9]. It was chosen for the analysis because it reveals the specifics of investigative actions at the preliminary investigation stage. The total number of the nominatives in the analyzed articles related to the semantic field “Investigative Actions” is 827 units, including complex nominatives.

The functional-role approach to categorizing the nominative means used to describe the reference zone “Investigative Actions” made it possible to single out the following nominative clusters: people who can be involved in investigative actions; investigative actions per se; operational search events at the scene; the results of investigative actions. The analysis of the lexical component of the legal acts was carried out separately for each nominative cluster, taking into account the denotative meaning and the significative meaning.

## Results

The linguistic analysis of the rules reflecting the procedure for investigative actions in the regulatory legal acts of the United States of America had a truncated form and included the following research directions:

- 1) the analysis of the nomination mechanisms used in the nominative units forming the semantic field relating to the reference zone “Investigative Actions”;
- 2) the study of the syntactic models in the complex nominative units, denotatively related to the reference zone “Investigative Actions”;
- 3) the specification of the salient features of the word formation of the nominative units in the semantic field “Investigative Actions”.

The nomination mechanisms most frequently represented in the nominative units of the semantic field under study are specification of the significative meaning of the nominative unit due to the introduction of additional lexemes (67 % of the total number of the nominative units) and metonymy (11 % of the total number of the nominative units). The examples of specification of the significative meaning of the nominative unit are the following: *a forensic examination; an investigative experiment; an aggrieved party*. In most cases, an additional lexeme is expressed by a descriptive adjective. Since adjunction as a type of syntactic connection is generally characteristic of the English language, a descriptive attribute is often expressed by a noun. An example is the word combination *an evidence log*.

Metonymy is the type of transference of the names based on the adjacency of objects and/or phenomena. Moreover, in the field under the study one specific type of this transference is presented: the one based on the relation between the process and the result. In the reference zone “Investigative Actions” the result is represented in a corresponding legal document.

Metonymy is widely used in the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure of the United States: “The judge finds that the defendant is the same person named in *the indictment*” (Title II, Rule 5) [9].

Word formation in the semantic field referring to the referential zone “Investigative Actions” is represented by suffixation and conversion.

The repeated suffixes used in the English lexemes naming investigative actions include suffixes of nouns with generalized meaning **-ion, -tion, -ation**: *inspection, examination, interrogation, confrontation*.

The nomenclature of word formation affixes is much more diverse with the names of persons involved in investigative actions. The most frequent suffixes for the designation of the doer of the action **-er** and **-or** are found in the lexemes: *an investigator, an interrogator, a chief commander*. The actualization of these suffixes is presented in 18% of cases from the total number of lexemes formed by affixation. The lexical semantic group of the participants in investigative actions also includes *a detainee* and *the accused*. The suffix, which came to the English legal language from French, namely **-e**, has the passive meaning of the person to whom the action of the transferred verb is directed. In other words, *a detainee* is the one who was detained. In this lexical cluster with the same word-formation affix, a comprehensive nomination of *an employee of the forensic laboratory* is presented.

In addition, according to the results of the analysis, we can state the variation in the expression of meanings through affixation (for example, *the accused*). On the one hand, this lexeme requires attention to the reference: at the stage of the court hearing *the defendant* is used to nominate a person undergoing a criminal trial. On the other hand, we note the passive meaning expressed by the form of Participle II derived from the verb *to accuse*. The participle is formed by affixation. After that, such a method of word formation as conversion is triggered that actually transfers the considered lexeme to the category of nominative means which denote persons participating in investigative actions.

Conversion as a way of word formation involves a change in part-of-speech belonging of the lexeme and, accordingly, the adoption of a new paradigm of inflection. Examples of conversion in the semantic field describing the referential zone “Investigative Actions” are the following lexemes: *search ← to search; (entry) log ← to log (entries)*.

From the point of view of the specifics of the implementation of conversion, we note the cases of the transition of phrasal verbs into nouns: *a lineup ← to line up, a show-up ← to show up; a walk-through ← to walk through*. Conversion in all the above examples is accompanied by affixation, since the postposition of a phrasal verb, when the latter changes into a noun, becomes a suffixoid within the structure of the word. As can be seen from the examples, only the spelling differs: *a lineup* has a strong tendency to be spelt together (despite the fact that hyphenation is possible), *a walk-through* and *a show-up* are spelt in a hyphenated way. The hyphen in this case marks the fact that the derivation stem consisted of two words.

The representation of conversion in English among the nominative units that form the semantic field “Investigative Actions” (9% of all cases of using various methods of word formation) is explained by the fact that the nominative units from the semantic field “Investigative Actions” referentially correlate with actions performed during the investigation. Naming actions by means of abstract nouns is one of the most frequent ways of sequentially presenting the stages of investigative actions.

The next aspect of our study was the analysis of syntactic models for the expansion of the nuclear structure of nominal and verbal phrases related to the semantic field “Investigative Actions”.

In complex nominatives in English, in which the core is expressed by a noun, the main syntactic models are two types of syntagmatic chains based on adjunction:

- 1) Adj + N: *operative group, warrantless arrest;*
- 2) N + N: *entry log, task forces.*

The third syntactic model is the connection, the functionality of which is widely represented due to the analytical nature of the English language. In this regard, we do not consider it possible to link this characteristic exclusively to the semantic field “Investigative Actions”. However, the frequency of this type of connection and the actualization of the syntactic model of the expansion of nominal groups, based on the prepositional connection of components, suggests that this model is the basis for new complex nominative units. For example, N + prep + (Adj) + (Adj) + N: *collection of evidence; investigator in charge; lawfulness of an operative investigative measure*.

Among verbal phrases, on the one hand, we note interchangeability due to synonymous relations: *to perform / to conduct / to carry out investigative actions*. The syntactic variants of the distribution of verb phrases generally fall under the following model: V + N. The model itself with three verbal variants of its implementation is a common frame and allows concretization, as well as specification of the significative meaning of individual lexemes due to the introduction of an additional lexeme. For example, *to conduct an examination; to carry out a show-up; to perform operative-investigative tasks*. A verbal phrase can be extended by including in its composition a cluster of verbs: *to detect, record and seize evidence*.

It is object relations that prevail in verb phrases within the framework of the semantic field “Investigative Actions”. However, circumstantial meanings also find expression: *to examine the crime scene carefully; to be assessed in the aggregate*.

### Conclusion

The typical nomination mechanisms for the reference area “Investigative Actions” are the specification of the significative meaning of the nominative unit and metonymy, reflecting the transfer of names based on the relations between the process and/or action and the result. The repeated ways of word formation are affixation and conversion. As the analysis shows, the most diverse in terms of the nomenclature of affixes are nominative units with the meanings of the doer of the action and investigative actions per se, which is determined by the thematic area of the study.

The syntactic models of the expansion of nominal and verbal phrases in English in relation to the description of the reference zone “Investigative Actions” differ in the degree of inclusion of additional lexemes. So, the most frequent are syntagmatic chains built according to the following models: Adj + N, N + N, taking into account the possible inclusion of additional elements: (Adj) + N + prep + (Adj) + N, as well as V + N.

Based on the results obtained, we conclude that the ways of expressing the meanings related to the conceptual field “Investigative Actions” in English are predetermined by the sphere of communication. Of course, this inference is tentative and requires the establishment of a relationship between the specific factors that determine the indicated correlation and the linguistic means which tend to be regularly used for this purpose. In this we see the prospects of our research.

### Конфликт интересов

Не указан.

### Conflict of Interest

None declared.

### Список литературы / References

1. Ван Валин Р. Референциально-ролевая грамматика / Р. ван Валин, У. Фолли // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. - Вып. XI.–М., 1982. – С. 376–410.
2. Демьянков В. З. Фреймовая семантика / В. З. Демьянков // Краткий словарь когнитивных терминов. Под общей редакцией Е. С. Кубряковой. - М.: Филологический факультет МГУ им. М.В. Ломоносова - 1996. – С.189–191.
3. Кубрякова Е. С. Язык и знание: На пути получения знаний о языке: Части речи с когнитивной точки зрения. Роль языка в познании мира / Е. С. Кубрякова. – М.: Языки славянской культуры - 2004. – 560 с.
4. Стернин И. А. Методы исследования семантики слова / И. А. Стернин. – Ярославль: Истоки - 2013. – 34 с.
5. Уфимцева А. А. Лексическая номинация (первичная нейтральная) / А. А. Уфимцева. – 2-е изд. – М.: LIBROKOM - 2010. – 88 с.
6. Филлмор Ч. Фреймы и семантика понимания / Ч. Филлмор // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. Вып. XXIII / Сост., ред., вступ. ст. В. В. Петрова, В. И. Герасимова. – М.: Прогресс - 1988. – С. 52-93.
7. Шашкова В. Н. Анализ средств и механизмов номинации, используемых при описании референтной области «Деятельность сотрудника ОВД» (на материале русского и английского языков) / В. Н. Шашкова // Проблемы лингвистики, методики обучения иностранным языкам и литературоведения в свете межкультурной коммуникации: сборник материалов III Международной научно-практической конференции (26-27 марта 2018 г.). – Орел: ФГБОУ ВО «ОГУ имени И.С. Тургенева», 2018. – С. 193–194.
8. Шур С. Г. Теории поля в лингвистике: учебное пособие / С. Г. Шур. – М.: Наука, 1974. – 254 с.
9. Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. 2021 Edition. Michigan Legal Publishing Ltd., 2021. – 88 p.
10. The Functional Perspective on Language and Discourse: Applications and Implications. Edited by Maria de los Angeles Gomez Gonzalez, Francisco Jose Ruiz de Mendoza Ibanez, Francisco Gonzalvez-Garcia, Angela Downing. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co, 2014. – 292 p.

### Список литературы на английском / References in English

1. Van Valin R. Referential'no-rolevaya grammatika [Reference-Role Grammar] / R. van Valin, W. Folly // Novoye v zarubezhnoi lingvistike [The new in foreign linguistics]. – Moscow, 1982. – V. XI. – P. 376-410. [in Russian]
2. Demyankov V. Z. Freimova semantika [Frame semantics] / V. Z. Demyankov // Kratkiy slovar' kognitivnykh terminov [A brief glossary of cognitive terms]. Under the general editorship of E.S. Kubryakova. - Moscow: Philological Faculty of Moscow State University named after M. V. Lomonosov – 1996 - pp. 189–191. [in Russian]
3. Kubryakova E. S. Yazyk i znaniye. Na puti polucheniya znanii o yazyke: Chasti rechi s kognitivnoi tochki zreniya. Rol' yazyka v poznanii mira [Language and knowledge. On the way of acquiring knowledge about the language: Parts of speech from the cognitive perspective] / E. S. Kubryakova. – Moscow: Yazyki slavyanskoi kul'tury - 2004. - 560 p. [in Russian]
4. Sternin I. A. Metody issledovaniya semantiki slova [Methods of word semantics research] / I. A. Sternin. - Yaroslavl': Istoki, 2013. - 34 p. [in Russian]
5. Ufimtseva A. A. Leksicheskaya nominatsiya (pervichnaya neutral'naya) [Lexical nomination (primary neutral)] / A. A. Ufimtseva. – Moscow: LIBROKOM - 2010. – 88 p. [in Russian]
6. Fillmore Ch. Freimy i semantika poznaniya [Frames and semantics of cognition] / Ch. Fillmore // Novoye v zarubezhnoi lingvistike [The new in foreign linguistics]. – Moscow: Progress. – 1988. – V. XXIII. – P. 52–93. [in Russian]
7. Shashkova V. N. Analiz sredstv i mekhanizmov nominatsii, ispol'zuemykh pri opisanii referentnoi oblasti “Dejatelnost 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”]. – Orel: Orel State University named after I. S. Turgenev, 2018. – P. 192–199. [in Russian]
8. Schur S. G. Teorii polya v lingvistike [Field theories in linguistics]: teaching aids / S. G. Schur. – Moscow: Nauka, 1974. – 254 p. [in Russian]
9. Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. 2021 Edition. Michigan Legal Publishing Ltd., 2021. – 88 p.
10. The Functional Perspective on Language and Discourse: Applications and Implications. Edited by Maria de los Angeles Gomez Gonzalez, Francisco Jose Ruiz de Mendoza Ibanez, Francisco Gonzalvez-Garcia, Angela Downing. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co, 2014. – 292 p.