

*Ketevani Imedashvili*

**THE FRAMAL CONNECTION BETWEEN THE CONCEPTS CRIME AND  
PUNISHMENT IN GEORGIAN AND BRITISH ENGLISH**

**Abstract**

The article aims to describe the framal connection between the concepts *crime* and *punishment*. The interconnection between them is clearly shown by the correspondence between frame elements. Their universal characteristics are reflected in frame elements. The situation of the concepts *crime* and *punishment* is complex which gives us the possibility of thorough research. Frame network compiled by Barkley gives us the illustration of the valency models through example sentences. The description of the prototypical situation of committing a *crime* singles out core and non-core elements of these concepts. The framal analysis of these concepts enables us to understand their immanent nature.

**Keywords:** frame semantics, crime, punishment, frame network, prototypical situation.

**1. Introduction**

A language can be used to create experience frames, which indicate and build a particular context. (Fillmore, 1982). According to B. H. Telia, “Knowledge is always structuralized with a frame. A concept is knowledge which is determined by its all connections and relationships.” (Telia, 1996: 96, cited from A. Alexseevna, concept ‘punishment’ in modern English).

Frame Semantics by Charles Fillmore (1982) is based on the following argument: for researching words, first of all, a human must have a knowledge of the semantic frames or conceptual structures which are the basis of their use. A frame works as a particular organizing way which gives us background knowledge and motivation of their existence in the language (Boas, 2004: 7).

**2. The characteristics of *crime* and *punishment* according to Barkley’s network**

The concepts *crime* and *punishment*, which are analyzed from a Frame Semantics view, have got an exceptional characteristic -they are interdependent. The concept of *punishment* depends on the concept of *crime* and vice versa. We have used a qualitative method for their scientific description. Being a part of a frame system, every kind of knowledge connected with the concepts *crime* and *punishment* is based on human being's experience and is stored in his/her memory and influences the ability of its production and understanding. While characterizing these two concepts there is no manifestation of deep cultural-legal characteristics and it shows their universal character. The concepts *crime* and *punishment* are included in a frame network compiled by Barkley. They contain annotated lexical pairs and exemplary sentences to illustrate the valency models. Therefore, it gives us a detailed analysis of these concepts. After the definition of *crime* and *punishment* scenario there emerge the lists of core and non-core frame elements. The semantic type of the core FEs of these concepts is sentient. Unlike *crime*, *rewards* and *punishments* have got an unexpressed core. The list of non-core frame elements contains degree, instrument, manner, state of affairs, etc.

### **Crime\_scenario**

#### **Definition:**

A (putative) Crime is committed and comes to the attention of the Authorities. In response, there is a Criminal investigation and (often) Arrest and criminal court proceedings. The Investigation, Arrest, and other parts of the Criminal process are pursued in order to find a Suspect (who then may enter the Criminal process to become the Defendant) and determine if this Suspect matches the Perpetrator of the Crime, and also to determine if the Charges match the Crime. If the Suspect is deemed to have committed the Crime, then they are generally given some punishment commensurate with the Charges.

#### **Semantic**

**Type:** Non-Lexical

Frame

#### **FEs:**

#### **Core:**

Authorities[]

The group which is responsible for the maintenance of law and order, and as such have been given the power to investigate Crimes, find Suspects and determine if

a Suspect should be submitted to the Criminal process.

Charge[]                    A description of a type of act that is not permissible according to the law of society.

Crime[]                    An act, generally intentional, that matches the description that belongs to an official Charge.

Perpetrator                []    The individual that commits a Crime.

**Semantic Type:** Sentient

Suspect[]                    The individual which is under suspicion of having committed the Crime.

**Non-Core:**

**Frame-frame Relations:**

Inherits		from:
Is	Inherited	by:
Perspective		on:
Is	Perspectivized	in:
Uses:		
Is	Used	by:
Subframe		of:
Has	Subframe(s): <u>Committing_crime</u> , <u>Criminal_investigation</u> , <u>Criminal_process</u>	
Precedes:		
Is	Preceded	by:
Is	Inchoative	of:
Is Causative of:		

**Rewards\_and\_punishments**

**Definition:**

An Agent (the punisher or rewarder) performs a Response\_action on an Evaluatee for a Reason, the Evaluatee's actions or beliefs. Means and Instrument may also be indicated. The goal of the punishment/reward is to discourage/encourage the actions or beliefs. Words in this frame presuppose that a judgment of the Evaluatee has occurred and that the Evaluatee is (or becomes) aware

of the judgment. This judgment was performed by a cognizer which is either the same as the Agent, or, minimally, a representative of the same institution.

His PUNISHMENT of the prisoners was too harsh.

Her PUNISHMENT was too harsh.

The PENALTY for this crime *is* death.

I believe that this behaviour should be subject to DISCIPLINARY action.

**FEs:**

**Core:**

Agent [Agt] The Agent is the person doing the rewarding or punishing.

**Semantic Type:** Sentient Jake's REWARDS to his best workers were very generous.

Evaluated (Eval) Evaluated is the person or thing about whom/which a judgment has made and to whom reward/punishment is dealt. With verbs, the Evaluated is typically expressed as Object.

The boss REWARDED you for your diligence.

Reason [Reas] Typically, there is a constituent expressing the Reason for the Agent's judgment. It is usually a 'for'-PP, e.g.

**Semantic Type:** State\_of\_affairs I PUNISHED him for his impudence.

**Core Unexpressed:**

Response action [Action] The reward or punishment given to the Evaluated by the Agent.

If a person be guilty of impiety let him be PUNISHED with death.

**Non-Core:**

Degree [Degr] Degree of reward or punishment.

**Semantic Type: Degree**

Depictive [Depict] Depictive phrase describing the Agent of the reward or punishment.

Instrument [Ins] The Instrument with which the reward or punishment is carried out.

**Semantic**

**Type: Physical\_entity**

Manner [Manr] Manner of performing the reward or punishment.

**Semantic Type: Manner**

Means [Mns] The action that is taken that results in punishment/reward.

**Semantic**

**Type: State\_of\_affairs**

His parents DISCIPLINED him by taking away his toys.  
The Bar Association REWARDED her by hosting a lunch in her honor

Place [Place] Where the event takes place.

**Semantic**

**Type: Locative\_relation**

Purpose [Purp] The Purpose of the reward or punishment.

**Semantic**

**Type: State\_of\_affairs**

Result [Result] Result of the reward or punishment.

Time [Time] When the event occurs.

**Semantic Type: Time**

**FE Core set(s):**

{ Agent, Response\_action }, { Evaluee, Reason }

**Frame-frame Relations:**

Inherits from: Intentionally affect, Response

Is Inherited by: Corporal punishment, Execution, Fining, Revenge

Perspective on:

Is Perspectivized in:

Uses:

Is	Used	by:
Subframe		of:
Has		Subframe(s):
Precedes:		
Is	Preceded	by:
Is	Inchoative	of:
Is Causative of:		

As shown in the table, the frame elements of *crime* and *punishment* contain the following: authorities, perpetrator, suspect, evaluatee, etc. From my point of view, every frame element is not obligatory because sometimes crime is committed, but it is not followed by a trial and punishment.

### **3. The analysis of framal elements of the concepts *crime* and *punishment***

The concepts *crime* and *punishment* remind us a lot of nouns that can be described by the terms of frame semantics, i.e. according to the conceptual frames which are the basis of them and are necessary for their understanding. The cognitive category of the concept *punishment* is the mixture of cognitive categories which belong to the same concept, for instance: murder, murder weapon, reason of crime and so on. Every person has a different experience and perception of this concept, therefore the cognitive category of the concept *punishment* arises from the following terms in human consciousness: penalty, house arrest and electronic monitoring and so on.

The concepts *crime* and *punishment*, which are researched by us, have got some special characteristics because their circumstances are complex. The situation of crime contains at least three elements: 1) the subject of crime 2) the criminal action 3) the object of crime. Due to the fact that in an ideal situation subject of crime becomes the object of punishment we can talk about the following elements of the punishment situation: 1) the subject of *punishment* 2) the criminal action 3) the object of *punishment*. The existence of mutual elements gives us the opportunity to talk about the framal connection between *crime* and *punishment* (Данилов, 2004).

According to Danilov, the framal connection between the concepts *crime* and *punishment* leads to the manifestation of legal characteristics of a *crime* into the concept of a *punishment*, for instance, we can allocate the characteristics 'necessity of conviction' in both concepts. In most cases, a *crime* is followed by a *punishment* and the characteristic of the concept of *crime* 'specification of a subject of a

crime' is transformed into 'specification of an object of a punishment'. The characteristics of the concept of *punishment* 'deterrence', 'protection', 'reformation' and 'retribution' have no correspondence in the concept of *crime*. The specifications of the concept *punishment* represent projections of the concept *crime*. The characteristic of the concept *crime* 'circumstance', criminal situation of the concept criminal action characterizes the circumstance which determines the strictness of punishment or the possibility of impunity. The characteristic 'defense' becomes the sign of legal protection which is the evidential matter of the possibility of sentence mitigation. The characteristic 'necessity of conviction', as a characteristic of the concept of *crime* indicates to the necessity of sentencing. The characteristic of the concept of *crime* 'subjective-objective perception' indicates to subjective-objective influence. The given characteristic of the concept of *punishment* indicates to subjective –objective action and inevitability of punishment in accordance to committed crime (Данилов, 2004).

#### **4. The prototypical situation of *crime* and *punishment***

According to Barsalou, “attributes in a frame are not independent slots but are often related correlationally and conceptually... a frame’s core attributes correlate highly, often correlate together across contexts” (Barsalou, 1992: 35, cited from V. Evans & M. Green 2006: 224) The *punishment* gives possibility to imagine *crime* and vice versa. Charles Fillmore (1977) considers, that meanings are transformed into scenes. If we percept the frames of *crime* and *punishment* as a prototypical description of scenes, in this case, they are specified by background concepts. Certain emotional condition in a human being leads to committing a crime. Probably, we imagine a scene of murder. A weapon of murder is one of the major frame elements. This case is followed with some type of punishment, for instance, imprisonment. An advantage of the crime scene which is based on prototypes is that it has not got certain limits. The human being is a criminal in any case, no matter how many crimes he/she commits. The punishment has its own function, notwithstanding the fact whether it is imprisonment, house arrest or fine.

The basis of the frame semantics is that the connection between the lexical units and frames is unlimited. The unlimitedness does not mean nonexistence of the structure. The concepts and words connected to them have determined one-direction background interconnections that frames capture (Gawron, 2009: 12).

The prototypical situation of committing a crime can be construed as follows:

*A man in Tbilisi, committed a crime for burglary at 2 o'clock. A judge sentenced him to 5 year imprisonment.*

**Crime frame-definition**

This frame is about committing crime unintentionally. A criminal commits a crime when he/she is ready emotionally as well as physically, which happens at a certain place, time and situation.

**Punishment frame-definition**

This frame is about imposing punishment for committing the crime. Of course, punishment has its own place, time and reason.

**Frame elements of punishment**

**core non-core**

- criminal -place
- amendment -duration
- judge -circumstance

**Frame elements of crime**

**Core**

- criminal
- killing
- the injured party

**non-core**

- place
- time
- weapon of crime

The core frame elements mentioned above are of a high importance for *crime* and *punishment*. The first core frame elements of these concepts coincide. The non-core frame elements place of *crime* and location of *punishment* differ from each other, because the purposes of *crime* and *punishment* are different. The differences existing between frame elements lead to divergence between frames themselves. The core frame element of *crime* conditions non-core frame element of *punishment* – its duration.

**Conclusions**

Therefore, the frame of *crime* represents the basic frame element of the concept of *punishment*. We have to consider that frame elements are changeable, because frames of concepts *crime* and *punishment* constantly strengthen, change and transform in terms of information that a human brain receives. Those concepts have not got strictly determined boundaries as well as we cannot set certain



boundaries to their frame elements. This is mainly conditioned by their generality and wide range of characteristics. As research has shown, these concepts are interrelated and have lots of mutual characteristics. One of them is that semantic type of core FEs of *crime* and *punishment* is sentient. When it comes to their non-core frame elements, for instance, existence of numerical difference between them emphasizes the prominent difference once more. From my point of view, these two concepts are indivisible and interdependent, but the correspondence between the frame elements and their interconnection depends on the ideal situation: when the subject of crime becomes the object of punishment.

**References:**

- 1) Baker, 2021. Baker, K. Frame Semantics, Constructions, and the FrameNet Lexical Database, available at: [https://framenet.icsi.berkeley.edu/fndrupal/framenet\\_search](https://framenet.icsi.berkeley.edu/fndrupal/framenet_search) [2021, 15 May].
- 2) Baker, Fillmore, 2009. Baker K., Fillmore Ch., A Frames Approach to Semantic Analyses, 2009
- 3) Boas, 2004. Boas H. From Theory to Practice: Frame Semantics and the Design of FrameNet, 2004
- 4) Evans, Green, 2006. Evans, V., Green M, Cognitive Linguistics, an introduction, 2006
- 5) Gawron, 2009. J. M, Frame Semantics, 2009
- 6) Coine, Bauer, Rambow, Coine, 2011. B., Bauer, D., Rambow O, VigNet: Grounding Language in Graphics using Frame Semantics, 2011
- 7) Petruck 1996, Petruck M, Frame Semantics 1996
- 8) Tellia 1996, cited from: A Alexseevna, concept 'punishment' in modern English
- 9) Репрезентация концептов CRIME и PUNISHMENT в британской и американской юридической терминологии Данилов Кирилл Владимирович, Available at: <http://www.dslib.net/germanskie-jazyki/reprezentacija-konceptov-crime-i-punishment-v-britanskoj-i-amerikanskoj.html>

*Author's email: [katyimedashvili@gmail.com](mailto:katyimedashvili@gmail.com)*

*Author's biographical data*

*The author of the article is a PhD student at Javakhishvili State University, currently working in Cognitive Linguistics. Her main interests are conceptual metaphors and cognitive analysis of law terminology. She has an extensive experience of teaching English to multi-level and different age groups. The author teaches at Business Academy of Georgia.*