Samuel Larner
School of Language, Literature and International Studies
University of Central Lancashire
Preston
PR1 2HE, UK
slarner@uclan.ac.uk

1. Editor's Introduction: from intellectual challenges to established corpus techniques

Forensic Linguistics is the branch of applied linguistics concerned with the interface between language and law. It encompasses a wide range of topics including, but by no means limited to the language of police interviews (e.g. Heydon, 2005; Haworth, 2010) and prisoners (e.g. Mayr, 2003; Medlicott, 2001), language use in the courtroom (e.g. Conley & O'Barr, 1998; Cotterill, 2003; Heffer, 2005); legal language (e.g. Tiersma, 2000; Finegan, 2011; Goźdź-Roszkowski, 2011) and the comprehensibility of legal language such as the UK police caution (e.g. Rock, 2007). The field also covers the authenticity and credibility of language such as in the authorship analysis of a range of texts including SMS text messages (Grant, 2010), ransom demands (Shuy, 2001), suicide notes (Eagleson, 1994), terrorist manifestos (Fitzgerald, 2004) and disputed confessions (e.g. Shuy, 1998, Coulthard, 2004). Although the phrase 'forensic linguistics' is generally attributed to Svartvik (1968), it was only in 1994 that academics who worked at the interface of language and law were unified through the publication of a dedicated journal, *Forensic Linguistics* (now *The International Journal of Speech, Language and Law*). Prior to this, linguists working in this specialist area worked 'in isolation from one another and were largely ignorant of the analytic procedures used by their colleagues' (French and Coulthard, 1994: vii). Despite being a relatively young field, in the time since 1994, there has been an explosion of research articles and monographs as well as two handbooks (Coulthard and Johnson, 2010; Tiersma and Solan, 2012) with a wide range of undergraduate and postgraduate courses in forensic linguistics being taught across the world.

There are several ways to characterise the work of the forensic linguist. Cotterill (2013), for instance, makes a distinction between 'descriptive' and 'investigative' forensic linguistics. The focus of descriptive forensic linguistics is on analysing language produced at any stage throughout the legal process with a view to characterising different genres and text types. Investigative forensic linguistics, on the other hand, is concerned with analysing language that in some way constitutes a crime (e.g. ransom demands, threats, trademark infringement). A similar distinction is proposed by Coulthard and Johnson (2007) who differentiate between descriptions of the language of the law, and the linguist who takes on casework as an expert witness. However, they revised this binary distinction in their later work (2010) after acknowledging that such a 'distinction blurred the boundary between written and spoken language' (p. 7). They therefore characterise the work of the forensic linguist into three areas:

i) the written language of the law; ii) interaction in the legal process; and iii) linguists acting as expert witnesses (p. 7).

Published in the very first issue of *Forensic Linguistics* was Coulthard's (1994) seminal paper which advocated the use of corpora in forensic linguistics, with particular reference to linguistic analysis used for investigative and evidential purposes. He referred to the discipline of corpus linguistics as 'a major new resource for the forensic linguist' (p. 27) given that in the previous 25 years, investigative case work 'was usually undertaken as an intellectual challenge and almost always required the creation, rather than simply the application, of a method of analysis' (p. 27). Through description and discussion of his own cases, Coulthard concluded 'that any improved methodology must depend, to a large extent, on the setting up and analysing of corpora' (p. 40). Over the two decades that have followed, the field of forensic linguistics has grown into a credible branch of applied linguistics, and, despite the fact that there is still considerably more work to be done (Coulthard and Johnson, 2010: 614), corpus techniques and approaches are now accepted and widely used by forensic linguists. Several prominent academics have written about the role of corpora in forensic linguistics in various outlets including handbooks (Kredens and Coulthard, 2012) and encyclopaedias (Cotterill, 2010; Cotterill, 2013). The aim of this introduction is, therefore, to bring together a disparate array of literature which utilises corpora and corpus techniques in forensic linguistics research in the form of an annotated bibliography.

Before presenting the annotated bibliography, it is necessary to describe the articles included in this Special Issue. It would be impossible to cover every aspect of forensic linguistics in a single issue, but in presenting this collection of four papers, it is hoped that a range of current approaches are represented which between them draw out some of the most interesting methodological considerations of using corpora in forensic linguistics research. The four articles selected for publication all have an applied focus; that is, the research described in these pages has potential impact at various stages of the legal process ranging from evidence gathering, to prosecution and trial, and issues of corpus construction and interrogation—including balancedness and representativeness—are importantly determined, influenced, and limited, by the data and resources available.

In the first paper, **Tatiana Tkačuková** argues for corpus approaches to be used in socio-legal studies. Through an analysis of judges' use of the discourse marker 'well' in court cases where lay people represent themselves (litigants in person), Tkačuková highlights areas where judges can be trained to more effectively interact with litigants in person, whilst also drawing out some of the difficulties in gaining access to forensic data. In the second paper, **Tammy Gales** focusses on the use of grammatical stance markers in stalking threats and argues that such an analysis may provide insight into the definition and delineation between 'threat', 'harassment', and 'defamation', which are important distinctions in law. Gales further argues that understanding grammatical stance in stalking threats may contribute to the demonstration of a victim's claim of feeling fear, required by law for a conviction of stalking. Gales' research paves the way for future research which may assist threat assessors and law

enforcement agencies. In the third paper, **Claire Hardaker** highlights how corpus methods may facilitate forensic pragmatic analyses of impoliteness and linguistic aggression. Specifically, she identifies common responses to perceived trolling in one particular form of computer-mediated communication: posts to Usenet forums. Whilst recognising that further work is required, Hardaker's research lays the foundation for future studies in online linguistic manipulation and online crimes such as trolling and cyberbullying. **Dawn Archer and Cliff Lansley**, in the final paper, argue that whilst making quick decisions about deception in high-stakes, real time scenarios is less than desirable from an academic perspective, practitioners are required to do this, so they question how technology can assist them to do their job better. They explore the role that corpus techniques, particularly the use of Wmatrix, may play in determining the validity of language features previously identified as being related to deception detection in high stakes situations.

2. Annotated Bibliography of the use of Corpora and Corpus Techniques in Forensic Linguistics Research

In bringing together this annotated bibliography of over 50 references, it is hoped that the development of corpus linguistics in forensic linguistics, as well as the multitude of ways in which corpora have been developed and used in a variety of different applications, will be shown. The list is necessarily restricted and whilst it is representative of the vast array of data and methods used, it should not be considered exhaustive. Entries have been listed chronologically for convenience. All entries have been classified into broad themes using Coulthard and Johnson's (2010) tripartite distinction, that is as being most relevant to: A) the written language of the law; B) interaction in the legal process; or C) linguists acting as expert witnesses, or rather research related to using language as evidence. It is perhaps also worth noting that whilst the bibliography contains research by established and eminent forensic linguists, many of the entries are written by academics who would not normally consider themselves forensic linguists. Their work, nonetheless, either draws on forensic data, or has implications for the field, which demonstrates how forensic linguists draw on a multitude of linguistics sub-disciplines and specialities, rather than being confined to only research which can clearly be labelled as forensic. What becomes apparent from the annotated bibliography is that although there are some notable exceptions of corpus-driven approaches, largely confined to exploring linguistic patterns and constructions in legal discourse, forensic linguistics research which utilises corpus linguistics has, to date, largely utilised corpus-based approaches. In their handbook, Coulthard and Johnson (2010) highlight the relationship between power and (dis-)advantage in forensic linguistics, and predict critical forensic linguistics—the analysis of power and (dis-)advantage relationships in legal texts— as an area that will be taken up in the next two decades (p. 602-3). Given the increased reliance on corpora and corpus analysis, it seems likely too that Corpus-assisted Discourse Analysis and Corpus-Based Critical Discourse Analysis will gain prominence, particularly in research which explores interaction in the legal process.

Reference	Annotation	Theme
Mosteller, F. & D. Wallace. 1964. *Inference and Disputed Authorship: The Federalist*, Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.	Focussing on function words, corpus statistics are used to establish authorship of *The Federalist Papers*.	C
Coulthard, M. 1994. 'On the use of corpora in the study of forensic texts', *Forensic Linguistics. The International Journal of Speech Language and the Law*, 1 (1), pp. 27-43.	Makes the argument for the discipline of corpus linguistics as a resource for the forensic linguist.	C
Winter, E. 1996. 'The statistics of analysing very short texts in a criminal context', in H. Kniffka, S. Blackwell & M. Coulthard (eds) *Recent Developments in Forensic Linguistics*, pp. 141-180. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.	Acknowledging that forensic texts are typically very short, this vocabulary analysis research analyses three criminal statements of between 481 and 616 words to determine whether authorship can be ascertained.	C
Hänlein, H. 1998. *Studies in authorship recognition: a corpus-based approach.* Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.	Adopts a corpus-based, computational approach to explore how intuitive judgements about style can be demonstrated empirically.	C
Cotterill, J. 2001. 'Domestic discord, rocky relationships: Semantic prosodies in representations of marital violence in the O.J. Simpson trial', *Discourse and Society* 12 (3), pp.291-312.	A critical linguistic analysis of the 100,000 word opening arguments from the OJ Simpson criminal trial, focussing on the semantic prosodies of domestic violence words and phrases.	B
Kredens, K. 2002. 'Towards a corpus-based methodology of forensic authorship attribution: a comparative study of two idiolects' in B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (ed.) *PALC'01: Practical Applications of Language Corpora,* pp. 405-437. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.	A corpus-based study of two musicians' idiolect, carried out on forensically-comparable data.	C
de Klerk, V. 2003. 'The language of truth and reconciliation: was it fair to all concerned?', *Southern African Linguistics & Applied Language Studies* 21 (1), pp.1-14.	Adopts a corpus approach to the description of recordings from South Africa's Amnesty Hearings of Truth and Reconciliation Commission.	B

Bhatia, V.K., N. Langton, & J. Lung, 2004. 'Legal discourse: opportunities and threats', in T.A. Upton & U. Connor (eds) *Discourse in the Professions: perspectives from corpus linguistics*, pp. 203-227. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.	Identifies potential opportunities and limitations for corpus analyses of legal discourse. Argues that corpus linguistics is a tool that can be integrated with qualitative analyses.	A, B
Cotterill, J. 2004. 'Collocation, connotation, and courtroom semantics: lawyers' control of witness testimony through lexical negotiation', *Applied Linguistics,* 25 (4), pp.513-537.	Analyses lexical aspects of witness cross-examination in sexual assault and domestic violence trials by drawing on a five million word corpus, highlighting the lexical negotiation which occurs between lawyers and witnesses.	B
Kit, C., J.J. Webster, K.K. Sin, H. Pan, & H. Li. 2004. 'Clause alignment for Hong Kong legal texts: a lexical-based approach', *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 9 (1), pp.29-51.	Describes research into clause alignment for English-Chinese bilingual legal texts.	A
Solan, L.M & P.M. Tiersma. 2004. 'Author identification in american courts', *Applied Linguistics*, 25 (4), pp.448-465	Discusses different approaches, especially corpus linguistics, to authorship analysis in light of criteria for admitting expert evidence in United States' courts.	C
Turell, M.T. 2004. 'Textual kidnapping revisited: the case of plagiarism in literary translation', *International Journal of Speech, Language and the Law*, 11 (1), pp. 1-26	Using analyses derived from the software *CopyCatch*, this research explores the issue of plagiarism between translations, focussing on Spanish translations of Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*.	C
Archer, D. 2005. *Questions and Answers in the English Courtroom (1640-1760): a sociopragmatic analysis*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.	Uses a corpus-based approach to explore discursive strategies used by judges, lawyers, witnesses and defendants in courtroom data from the late Early Modern English period (1640--1760).	B
Heffer, C. 2005. *The Language of Jury Trial: a corpus-aided analysis of legal-lay discourse*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.	Analysis of a corpus of official trial transcripts, with a full description of legal-lay communication. Makes a linguistics argument for the use of lay jurors in trials.	B

Juola, P. & R.H. Baayen. 2005. 'A Controlled-corpus Experiment in Authorship Identification by Cross-entropy', *Literary & Linguistic Computing* 20 pp. 59-67.	Using a corpus of Dutch university writings, measures linguistic distances between texts for authorship purposes.	C
Grant, T. 2007. 'Quantifying evidence in forensic authorship analysis', *International Journal of Speech, Language & the Law,* 14 (1) pp. 1-25.	Outlines a sampling and testing method in an attempt to quantify results from authorship analysis investigations. Tests the method against a corpus of authors' texts which decreases in size.	C
Jones, N.J. & C. Bennell. 2007. 'The development and validation of statistical prediction rules for discriminating between genuine and simulated suicide notes', *Archives of Suicide Research*, 11, pp. 1-15.	Uses statistics to discriminate between a corpus of 33 authentic and 33 simulated suicide notes.	C
Mazzi, D. 2007. 'The construction of argumentation in judicial texts: combining a genre and a corpus perspective', *Argumentation,* 21 (1), pp. 21-38.	Focuses on the construction of argumentation in a corpus-based genre analysis of judicial texts.	B
Williams, C. 2007. *Tradition and change in legal English: verbal constructions in prescriptive texts*, Bern/New York: Peter Lang.	Analyses legal texts for linguistic and pragmatic functions, focussing in particular on tense, aspect, modality and verbal constructions.	A
Barlow, M. 2010. 'Individual Usage: A corpus-based study of idiolects', *34th International LAUD Symposium*, Landau, Germany. Available Online: http://michaelbarlow.com/barlowLAUD.pdf.	Corpus-based investigation into lexical and syntactic features of idiolectal variation, based on the speech of five White House Press secretaries.	C
Cavalieri, S. 2009. 'Reformulation and conflict in the witness examination: the case of public inquiries', *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law*, 22 (2), pp. 209-221.	Analyses a corpus of witness examination transcripts from famous Public Inquiries in Northern Ireland, England and Scotland to explore how witness examination has developed as argumentative dialogue.	B
Liao, M.Z. 2009. 'A study of interruption in Chinese criminal courtroom discourse', *Text & Talk,* 29 (2), pp. 175-199.	Explores interruptions in a corpus of transcripts from four Chinese criminal trials.	B

Trebits, A. 2009. 'Conjunctive cohesion in English language EU documents – a corpus-based analysis and its implications', *English for Specific Purposes* 28 (3), pp. 199-210.	A corpus-based study into the textual organisation patterns, particularly conjunctions, in a 200,000 English word corpus of European Union legal and business documents. Results are compared to the BNC.	A
Fitzpatrick, E. & J. Bachenko. 2010. 'Building a forensic corpus to test language-based indicators of deception', in M. Davies, S. Wulff & S. Thomas (eds) *Corpus-linguistic Applications: current studies, new directions*, pp. 183-196. Amsterdam: Rodopi.	Describes a corpus of criminal statements, police interrogations and civil testimony that was annotated for language-based cues to deception and to verify details relevant to the cases. Article focuses on methods for building corpora for deception research and pertinent issues.	C
Mazzi, D. 2010. '"This argument fails for two reasons": a linguistic analysis of judicial evaluation strategies in US supreme court judgments', *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law*, 23 (4), pp. 373-386.	Through an analysis of a corpus of US Supreme Court judgements, the verbal and adjectival tools, and underlying patterns of judges' argumentative positions are explored.	B
Mollet, E., A. Wray, T. Fitzpatrick, N. Wray, M. Wright. 2010. 'Choosing the best tools for comparative analyses of texts', *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 15 (4), pp. 429-473.	More generally explores useful variables for analysis in texts produced by different authors based on an analysis of 381 different measures. Conclusions are made which draw out links between this work and forensic authorship analysis.	C
Turell, M.T. 2010. 'The use of textual, grammatical and sociolinguistic evidence in forensic text comparison', *International Journal of Speech, Language & the Law*, 17 (2), pp. 211-250.	Outlines two quantitative approaches to authorship analysis which involve comparing forensic texts with a general corpus in order to determine markedness and saliency.	C
Woolls, D. 2010. 'Computational Forensic Linguistics: searching for similarity in large specialised corpora', in M. Coulthard & A. Johnson (eds) *The Routledge Handbook of Forensic Linguistics*, pp. 576-590. Abingdon: Routledge.	Discusses how computational analysis may be useful in the comparison of documents for authorship, particularly plagiarism, with a focus on the reliable handling large quantities of data.	C

Boyce, M. 2011. 'Mana aha? Exploring the use of mana in the legal Māori corpus', *Victoria University of Wellington Law Review,* 42 (2), pp. 221-239.	Describes the 8 million word Legal Māori Corpus, which consists of printed legal texts from the 1920s to present day. Focusses in particular on the word *mana*.	A
Breeze, R. 2011. 'Disciplinary values in legal discourse: a corpus study', *Iberica*, 21, pp. 93-116.	Using four 500,000 word corpora containing commercial law texts from academic journals, case law, legislation and legal documents, six adjective/adverb sets which are prominent in legal discourse are analysed to explore how legal writers communicate meaning. Results are compared to the BNC and British Academic Written English Corpus.	A
Engberg, J. & I. Pellón. 2011. 'The secret to legal foretelling: generic and inter-generic aspects of vagueness in contracts, patents and regulations', *International Journal of English Studies*, 11 (1), pp. 55-73.	A genre analysis of three one million word corpora (U.S. patents, contracts, and regulations on technical matters), which are computationally analysed for features of vagueness.	A
Finegan, E. 2011. 'Legal writing: attitude and emphasis. Corpus linguistic approaches to "legal language": adverbial expression of attitude and emphasis in Supreme Court opinions', in: M. Coulthard and A. Johnson (eds) *The Routledge Handbook of Forensic Linguistics*, pp. 65-77. Abingdon: Routledge.	Focusses on adverbial expressions of attitude and emphasis in United States Supreme Court decisions.	A
Goźdź-Roszkowski, S. 2011. *Patterns of linguistic variation in American legal English: a corpus-based study,* Frankfurt am Main/New York: Peter Lang.	Adopts a corpus-based approach to the analysis of variation in legal English with reference to recurrent linguistic patterns.	A
Marcińczuk, M, M. Piasecki & M. Zaśko-Zielińska. 2011. 'Structure annotation in the Polish corpus of suicide notes', in I. Habernal & V. Matoušek (eds) *Text, Speech and Dialogue - 14th International Conference*, Proceedings, pp. 419-426.	A corpus of Polish Suicide Notes is described along with its annotation system which codes for document structure, textual content and linguistic features.	A

Mouritsen, S.C. 2011. 'Hard cases and hard data: assessing corpus linguistics as an empirical path to plain meaning', *Columbia Science and Technology Law Review*, 13, pp. 156-205.	Argues for the role that corpus methods can play in legal interpretation, particularly how plain or ordinary meanings of terms in given contexts i.e. legal ambiguity, can be quantified.	A
Cheng, L. 2012. 'Attribution and judicial control in Chinese court judgments: a corpus-based study', *International Journal of Speech, Language & the Law*; 19 (2), pp. 27-49.	Corpus-based study into attribution and judicial control in appellate judgements in mainland China, Taiwan and Hong Kong courtrooms.	B
Csomay, E. & M. Petrovic. 2012. '"Yes, Your Honor!": a corpus-based study of technical vocabulary in discipline-related movies and tv shows', *System: An International Journal of Educational Technology and Applied Linguistics*, 40 (2) pp. 305-315.	Adopts a corpus-based approach to investigate whether watching foreign, discipline-specific language television programmes may lead to the learning of technical legal vocabulary.	B
Mooney, A. 2012. 'Human rights: law, language and the bare human being', *Language and Communication,* 32 (3), pp. 169-181.	A corpus analysis of the term "human rights" is carried out on a corpus of American and British print media data.	C
Prentice, S., P. Rayson, & P.J. Taylor. 2012. 'The language of Islamic extremism: towards an automated identification of beliefs, motivations and justifications', *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 17 (2), pp. 259-286.	Wmatrix is used to calculate frequency counts, key words, and concordance analysis of 250 extremist terrorist statements to gain insight into motivations for terrorism. Concludes by discussing how the results may feed into counter-terrorism strategies.	C
Breeze, R. 2013. 'Lexical bundles across four legal genres', *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics,* 18 (2), pp. 229-253.	Investigates the occurrence of lexical bundles in four legal corpora (academic law, case law, legislation, and legal documents) to show differences between lexical bundle types and their functions.	A
Eder, M. 2013. 'Mind your corpus: systematic errors in authorship attribution', *Literary & Linguistic Computing*, 28 (4), pp. 603-614.	In controlled tests of authorship, several corpora consisting of English, German, Polish, Ancient Greek and Latin prose texts were 'damaged' to investigate the link between a 'dirty' corpus and attribution accuracy.	C

Johnson, A. 2013. 'Embedding police interviews in the prosecution case in the Shipman trial', in C. Heffer, F. Rock and J. Conley (eds) *Legal-lay Communication: textual travels in the* law, pp. 147-167. Oxford: Oxford University Press.	Uses corpus-based methods and WordSmith Tools to analyse police interviews in the Harold Shipman trial, and how the content became repeated, embedded and transformed in the prosecution's case during trial.	B
Wright, D. 2013. 'Stylistic variation within genre conventions in the Enron email corpus: developing a text-sensitive methodology for authorship research'. *The International Journal of Speech Language and the Law,* 20 (1), pp. 44-75.	Explores idiolectal variation, specifically focussing on greetings and farewells, in e-mails sent between employees at Enron. Initially analysing a small, four author corpus, the findings are then compared to a larger, 126 author reference corpus.	C
Biel, L. 2014. 'The textual fit of translated EU law: a corpus-based study of deontic modality', *Translator*, 20 (3), pp. 332-335.	Focusses on deontic modality patterns in non-translated Polish law and translated European Union law. Analysis is based on a corpus of Polish translations of EU acquis and a reference corpus of naturally occurring legal Polish.	A
Ishihara, S. 2014. 'A likelihood ratio-based evaluation of strength of authorship attribution evidence in SMS messages using N-grams', *International Journal of Speech, Language & the Law*, 21 (1), pp. 23-49.	Describes a corpus of SMS text messages compiled by the National University of Singapore. A series of forensic text comparisons are carried out with a focus on n-grams.	C
Johnson, A. and D. Wright. 2014. 'Identifying idiolect in forensic authorship attribution: an n-gram textbite approach'. Language and Law/Linguagem e Direito, 1 (1), pp. 37-69. Available online: http://ler.letras.up.pt/uploads/ficheiros/12684.pdf.	Analyses a corpus of 2.5 million words across 63,000 e-mails sent by Enron employees, and uses a range of stylistic, corpus and computational analyses to identify n-grams which might characterise an author's writing style.	C
José Marín, M. 2014. 'Evaluation of five single-word term recognition methods on a legal English corpus', *Corpora*; 9 (1), pp. 83-107.	Five single-word term recognition methods are tested on a 2.6 million word legal corpus consisting of texts from the United Kingdom Supreme Court.	A

Larner, S. 2014. 'A preliminary investigation into the use of fixed formulaic sequences as a marker of authorship', *International Journal of Speech, Language & the Law*, 21 (1), pp. 1-22.	Describes a corpus of 100 personal narratives, authored by 20 writers, used to determine whether formulaic sequence usage is sufficient to differentiate between authors.	C
Larner, S. 2014. *Forensic Authorship Analysis and the Word Wide Web*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Pivot.	Assesses whether the web as corpus is reliable as an evidential tool in forensic authorship analysis, with specific reference to idiolectal co-selections.	C
Lian, Z. & T. Jiang. 2014. 'A study of modality system in Chinese-English legal translation from the perspective of SFG', *Theory & Practice in Language Studies*, 4 (3), pp. 497-503.	Analyses modality in English translations of Chinese legislation to highlight problems in translation. Data is compared to a parallel corpus of China's Legal Documents.	A
Pan, H. 2014. 'Translating conjunctive cohesion in legal documents', *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, 22 (1), pp. 1-20.	Adopts a corpus-based approach to explore the issue of conjunctive cohesion in legal documents.	A
McQuaid. S.M, M. Woodworth, E.L. Hutton, S. Porter, & L. ten Brinke. 2015, in press. 'Automated insights: verbal cues to deception in real-life high-stakes lies'. *Psychology, Crime & Law*.	Uses Wmatrix to differentiate between language used by 78 genuine and deceptive pleaders during televised press conferences.	C

References

Conley, J.M. and W. O'Barr. 1998. *Just Words: law, language and power*. London: University of Chicago Press.

Cotterill, J. 2003. *Language and Power in Court: a linguistic analysis of the O.J. Simpson trial*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Cotterill, J. 2010. 'How to use corpus linguistics in forensic linguistics' in A. O'Keefe and M. McCarthy (eds) *Routledge Handbook of Corpus Linguistics*, pp. 578-590. Abindgon: Routledge.

Cotterill, J. 2013. 'Corpus analysis in forensic linguistics' in C. Chapelle (ed.) *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. London: Wiley-Blackwell.

Coulthard, M. 1994. 'On the use of corpora in the analysis of forensic texts', *Forensic Linguistics* 1 (1), pp.27-43.

Coulthard, M. 2004. 'Author identification, idiolect, and linguistic uniqueness', *Applied Linguistics*, 25 (4), pp.431-447.

Coulthard, M., & A. Johnson. 2007. *An Introduction to Forensic Linguistics: language in evidence*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Coulthard, M. & A. Johnson. (eds) (2010). *The Routledge Handbook of Forensic Linguistics*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Eagleson, R. 1994. 'Forensic analysis of personal written texts: a case study', in J. Gibbons (ed.), *Language and the Law,* pp. 362-373. London: Longman.

Finegan, E. 2011. 'Legal writing: attitude and emphasis. Corpus linguistic approaches to "legal language": adverbial expression of attitude and emphasis in Supreme Court opinions', in M. Coulthard & A. Johnson (eds) *The Routledge Handbook of Forensic Linguistics*, pp. 65-77. Abingdon: Routledge.

Fitzgerald, J. R. 2004. 'Using a forensic linguistic approach to track the Unabomber', in J. H. Campbell & D. Denivi (eds), *Profilers,* pp. 193-221. New York: Prometheus Books.

French, P. & Coulthard, M. 1994. 'Editorial introduction', *Forensic Linguistics*, 1 (1), pp.vii—vx.

Goźdź-Roszkowski, S. 2011. *Patterns of Linguistic Variation in American Legal English: a corpus-based study*. Frankfurt am Main/New York: Peter Lang.

Grant, T. 2010. 'Text messaging forensics: txt 4n6: idiolect free authorship analysis?', in M. Coulthard & A. Johnson (eds), *The Routledge Handbook of Forensic Linguistics*, pp. 508-522. Abingdon: Routledge.

Haworth, K. 2010. 'Police interviews in the judicial process: police interviews as evidence', in M. Coulthard & A. Johnson (eds) *The Routledge Handbook of Forensic Linguistics*, pp. 169-181. Abingdon: Routledge.

Heffer, C. 2005. *The Language of Jury Trial: a corpus-aided analysis of legal-lay discourse*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Heydon, G. 2005. *The Language of Police Interviewing: a critical analysis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kredens, K. & M. Coulthard. 2012. 'Corpus linguistics in authorship identification', in P. Tiersma & L. Solan (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Language and Law*, pp. 504-516. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mayr, A. 2003. *Prison Discourse: language as a means of control and resistance.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Medlicott, D. 2001. *Surviving the Prison Place: narratives of suicidal prisoners*. Aldershot, Hants: Ashgate.

Rock, F. 2007. *Communicating Rights: the language of arrest and detention. B*asingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Shuy, R. 1998. *The Language of Confession, Interrogation and Deception.* London: SAGE.

Shuy, R. 2001. 'DARE's role in linguistic profiling', *DARE Newsletter*, 4 (3), pp.1-5.

Svartvik, J. 1968. *The Evans Statements: a case for forensic linguistics*. Göteborg: University of Gothenburg Press.

Tiersma, P. 2000. *Legal Language.* London: University of Chicago Press.