

Contents

<i>List of Tables and Figures</i>	ix
<i>Foreword by Roger W. Shuy</i>	xii
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xv
Introduction	1
Linguistic expert testimony <i>in</i> or <i>pro foro</i> in Germany	4
Range of variation of linguistic expert testimony in the German legal context	9
Overview of chapters and notes on the genealogy of the texts	14
 Part I The Interdisciplinary Status of Forensic Linguistics	
1 Forensic Linguistics: Its Relatives and Neighbors – An Interdisciplinary Perspective	27
Introduction	27
Interdisciplinarity: Perspectives and postulates	30
Structural similarities and differences between forensic phonetics and forensic linguistics	38
 Part II Forensic Linguistic Research in Germany in the Past	
2 The Linguist as an Expert Witness in German Courts. A View from the 1970s	51
Orientation	51
Applied linguistics and theoretical linguistics	52
Interdisciplinary status of “forensic linguistic” work and the overall aim of linguistic expert opinions <i>in/pro foro</i>	53
Case A: Analyzing the sense of a text passage	54
Case B: A press correction or a repetition of the original statement?	57
Case C: Disputed authorship of an article in the press	58

Case D: Disputed authenticity of the minutes of a works council meeting	59
Case E: Fake edition of a company paper	60
Some methodological characteristics of forensic linguistic expert opinions on authorship attribution (AA)	62
Case I	63
Case II	63
3 Status and Tasks of Forensic Linguistic	
Authorship Analysis	71
Introduction	71
Thesis 1: The notion of “idiolect” in linguistics	72
Thesis 2: The term “forensic linguistics”	73
Thesis 3: Forensic linguistics as an auxiliary science	73
Thesis 4: “Features” as a linguistic term	74
Thesis 5: Methodology of authorship analysis	76
Thesis 6: The need for theoretical reflection	77
Thesis 7: Forensic linguistics as a branch of linguistics	78
Thesis 8: Sub-disciplines of forensic linguistics	79
Thesis 9: Qualitative and quantitative analysis	79
Thesis 10: FL anonymous authorship analysis within a sociolinguistic framework	79
Thesis 11: Dynamic data of speaker-specific behavior	81
Thesis 12: Linguistic “differential diagnosis”	82
Thesis 13: Interdisciplinary perspectives	83
Thesis 14: Documentation of research and casework	84
4 “Shibboleths” as Data of Linguistic Behavior	86
Introduction	86
Origin and history of the concept	89
Descriptive characteristics of shibboleths	90
Salient structural features of shibboleths	92
Working definition of shibboleths and domains of occurrence	101
Summary	107
Part III Ongoing Research in Forensic Linguistics in Germany	
5 Libel, Linguists, and Litigation in Germany	113
Orientation	113

German defamation laws	116
Basic statistics of insults and other offenses	118
Some differences between German defamation laws	121
An exemplaric libel case: <i>Konkubine</i> in today's Standard German (1972)	125
Points of argument	130
What judges and linguistic experts need to learn about one another	133
The status of linguistic expert testimony <i>in/pro foro</i>	139
Outlook and future tasks	141
Appendix I: "Praxiskommentar" (Herdegen 1975)	143
Appendix II: Original text of a forensic linguistic expert opinion (English translation)	144
6 A Heuristic Author and Writer/Typist Taxonomy	149
Introduction	149
Dimensions of variation	150
A heuristic taxonomy of features and variants of authorship and writership of incriminating texts	152
Relevance for applied linguistic and criminalistic classification of text types	162
7 The System and Diagnostic Potential of Orthographic Data in Forensic Linguistic Authorship Attribution	166
Introduction	166
Data of orthographic behavior and anonymous authorship analysis	167
Status and repertoires of data of written language behavior in anonymous authorship analysis	173
Exemplaric description of ambiguous orthographic data in FLAA	182
Summary	190
8 Orthographic Data in Forensic Linguistic Authorship Analysis	192
Introduction	192
Examples of orthographic data in anonymous letters	194
Continua of orthographic behavior and the methodological impact for a "idiosyncrasy coefficient"	208

Text type-specific distribution and constraints of linguistic and orthographic features	225
Summary	233

Part IV Outlook and Future Tasks

9 Language and Law: Some Needs	237
Introduction	237
Linguists and lawyers: misconceptions of each and of each other	240
Problems in forensic interaction: "tricks of the trade"	253
Intrinsic deficits of linguistic basic research and interdisciplinary projection	256
Summary	264
10 Outlook	265
<i>Notes</i>	272
<i>References</i>	274
<i>Index of Authors</i>	282
<i>Subject Index German</i>	284
<i>Subject Index English</i>	286

List of Tables and Figures

Tables

3.1a	Terminological variants for the description of the variation of forms	75
3.1b	Terminological variation for speaker-specific linguistic features	75
5.1	Defamation laws (excerpt) in the German Penal Code	116
5.2	Share represented by attempts with regard to individual offenses (by offense group)	119
5.3	Insults. Total number of offenses recorded for 1987–2003	121
5.4	Libel letters of Mr. A, June–August 1972	125
5.5a	Questionnaire 2a	128
5.5b	Questionnaire 2b	128
5.6	Distinctive contexts for the word <i>Konkubine</i>	131
6.1	Author and writer constellations from a layman's perspective	152
6.2	Heuristic taxonomy of text products	154
6.3	Distinctive text-profile matrices	160
7.1	Domains of data of forensic text analysis	168
7.2	Deviations in orthography and language	177
7.3	Three heuristic classes of data of orthographic behavior in German	179
7.4	Features of orthographic behavior: excessive and (simultaneous) repeated use of graphemic signs (mainly punctuation)	181
7.5	Styles of orthographic behavior	182
8.1	Classes and types of the "Fugen-s" in German	199
8.2	"Fugen-s" in identical words in the three German-speaking countries	200
8.3a	Spelling of a well-known emblem in German	207
8.3b	Concomitant exceptional spellings	207
8.4	Descriptive and explanatory potential of orthographic data	212
8.5	Different spelling variants of a stereotyped expression	214

8.6	Spacing with parenthesis dashes ± empty space (ES) before and after parenthesis dashes	216
8.7	Low idiosyncrasy coefficients of OD in a written text of everyday communication	220
8.8	Omission marks (three dots) at the end of a quotation at the end of a sentence at the end of a text-paragraph	221
8.9	Results of spelling experiment with German students (aged 21–28)	224
8.10a	Text type-specific contrast(s) of <i>grammatical</i> , <i>textual</i> and <i>semanto-pragmatic</i> features in anonymous extortion and blackmail letters versus defamation and libel letters	226
8.10b	Text type-specific contrast(s) of <i>graphemic</i> , <i>orthographic</i> and <i>layout</i> features in anonymous extortion and blackmail letters versus defamation and libel letters	227
8.11	Textual parameters and measuring instances	233
9.1	Heuristic taxonomy of needs of cooperations in the field of language and law	239
9.2	Lawyers' assessment of language proficiency of a cleaning lady (original wording of statement sent to the court)	249
9.3	Official court transcript of taped notes of witness interrogation on command of language	251
9.4	Fuzzy norms: Data on hyphenization in German in the word <i>5-Jahresvertrag</i>	260
9.5	Early occurrences of the word <i>lebensalter</i>	263

Figures

1.1	The field of linguistics	28
1.2	Forensic linguistics and neighboring sciences	29
5.1	English translation equivalents of German insult and defamation offenses	118
5.2a	Section 185, 'insult' (§185 StGB "Beleidigung")	122
5.2b	Section 186, 'malicious gossip' (§186 StGB "Üble Nachrede")	122
5.2c	Section 187, 'defamation' (§187 StGB "Verleumdung")	123
5.3	Areas of forensic linguistic expert testimony	140

6.1	Hierarchical affiliation of features of authorship and writership	157
8.1	Anonymous threatening letter	195
8.2	Example of an exceptional anonymous extortion letter	202