

A new approach to identify crimes in Iranian society: Forensic Linguistics

Ferdows Aghagolzadeh¹

Negar Momeni²

Mostafa Asi³

Mohamad Farajiha⁴

Abstract

Forensic linguistics is a discipline coordinated with legal goals in the judicial system, focusing on all branches of linguistics including phonetics, semantics, discourse and etc. This science is not so known in Iran; where as, it can have a lot of applications in judicial system. The authors aim to show how linguistic tools can help the jury and judges especially when there are no clear and typical available proof and documents. Having observed more than 50 live cases in courts and police stations, the authors draw this conclusion that linguistic parameters like semantic tools (meaning of verb), syntactic tools (mood of verb), discorsal tools (power relation)... can be effective to identify and analyze crimes.

Introduction

Forensic linguistics is an interdisciplinary course dealing with law and linguistics. It grew in the late 1990s in United States and Europe and since then it has played an important role in clarifying and discovering realities of the courtrooms. Forensic linguists use linguistic factors including phonetics, phonology, semantics, pragmatics, etc., to help judges and juries to form more precise judgements. For example, the style of writing in a threatening letter or message can help linguists' with identifying the culprit or narrowing the number of culprits down.

This research aims to show the application of linguistic parameters to prove a crime in Iranian courts. The authors gathered more than 50 cases in different judicial systems of Tehran and studied numerous cases in non-Iranian judicial systems. It was found that the police and judges often exert pressure on suspects to confess to committing crimes without any evidence. The authors asked: what can be done when there is no clear evidence for convicting someone? The authors think it is possible to find some evidence in a suspect's words. The authors believe that linguistic parameters can be used by the jury and judges, especially in the absence of clear and/or typical evidence, to determine a suspect's guilt or innocence. The authors believe that the science of Forensic Linguistics must be

¹ Associate Professor in linguistics (Tarbiat Modares University, IR Iran) Aghgolz@modares.ac.ir

² Ph.D. Candidate in linguistics (Tarbiat Modares University, IR Iran), n-momeni@modares.ac.ir

³ Associate Professor in linguistics, Humanities Research Center, IR Iran, s_m_assi@ihcs.ac.ir

⁴ Assistant Professor in Law, Tarbiat Modares University, IR. Iran, m_farajiha@modares.ac.ir

allowed to enter the Iranian judicial system. The main question of this research, however, is this: what are the key linguistic parameters to identify a crime?

Hypothesis: *Linguistic factors including phonetic, semantic, pragmatic, cognitive, syntactic... can be used to prove a crime such as identifying perjury, threatening and etc.*

1- Forensic linguistics

In forensic linguistics, a branch of applied linguistics, we can expect that two fields of law and linguistics approach each other and form a new interdisciplinary branch named forensic linguistics. Toolan (2009) writes

Linguistics-informed studies of language in legal proceedings of all kinds have enjoyed a striking growth over the past few years, with much of the work recognized as falling within the subdiscipline now known as forensic linguistics. A host of law-related issues where language is at issue now benefit from a more searching and rigorous applied linguistic scrutiny than was in the past deemed appropriate and admissible.

He claims that this new science can play a critical role in questioning of suspect, giving instructions to the jury, distinguishing a victim's genuine mobile phone text messages from those fabricated and sent from that phone by their murderer, etc. Foster (2000:16-17) believes there is a close correlation between linguistics and law, linked by stylometrics, and that both are needed in courts.

2- Methodology

The authors gathered 50 court cases, police reports, and the Iranian judicial system's reports. The cases included perjury, fraud, bribery, threats, etc. The authors encountered many problems and obstacles. For example, sometimes lawyers had no interest in giving data and information because they did not know anything about forensic linguistics. Sometimes, to given another example, cases were classified. After gathering the appropriate information, the authors analyzed the texts to see if a crime was committed or not. The authors used lingual techniques to find out if the culprit has done the crime of bribery, scurrilous remarks, threatening, defrauding and etc. The authors used Gricean maxims, topic shift, script, presupposition, coherent devices, cognitive meanings, tense of verbs and etc to prove and identify a crime. In this research, only some of linguistic potentialities are represented. However, this area is not much known in Iran and a few Iranian works are not based on field research.³

3- Review of literature

Forensic linguistics was born about 60 years ago. In 1949 Philbrick published *Language and the Law: the Semantics of Forensic English*, which paved the way for future researches (see Eades 1994, Levi 1993, Coulthard & Johnson 2007). Most of the researchers refer to Jan Svartvik's *The Evans Statements* as the first typical work related to forensic linguistics. There Svartvik focused on four

³ As far as the author knows this is the first field research whose data has been gathered from courts, police stations and different parts of judicial systems. This research seems to me to be full in rigors of gathering data.

statements that had been made to police officers by Timothy Evans about the deaths of his wife and baby daughter. The analysis showed the incriminating parts of the four statements had a grammatical style measurably different from that of uncontested parts of the statements and a new forensic area was born (see Coulthard & Johnson 2007, Gibons 2003, Olsson 2004). Initially, the growth of forensic linguistic was slow. This changed about 15 years ago. Since then, there has been a rapid growth in the amount of cooperation between courts and linguists. However, this area is not much known in Iran and the few available works are not based on field research. This is the first field-research based work in Iran. However, the future of this new area in Iran looks very bright and new works are expected to be published.

4- Importance of clear definition of crimes

There are different definitions of crime; however, they have some common features. Perins (1988:3) quotes definition of crime from Mannheim: "Crime is a legal concept referring to an activity which legally implicates a penalty." According to Longman dictionary "illegal activities in general are called crime" (2006: 371). But there is a problem when we want to sue for a crime. In *Criminal Behavior*, Perins quotes an example of crime from Walker as an ambiguous behavior: "a man hits his wife's head with a hammer, this can have different definitions; for example this criminal behavior can be considered as a murder especially if the man has told his wife a sentence like "I'm going to kill you", but if he has said nothing or no one has heard anything, this behavior can be considered as an example of felonious wounding, but if it causes the woman to faint, this behavior is malicious wounding and if his wife dodges, it is impossible to sue for this behavior." We can draw this conclusion that a behavior recognized as a crime should be identifiable and definable legally. The author believes linguistics can be helpful to identify and prove a crime. In the next part, the author shows how effectively the linguistic parameters including phonetic, semantic, and/or syntactic, can help judges and the jury with better judgements.

5- Identification of crimes through linguistic parameters in Foreign and Iranian courts

Forensic linguistics is a new science which could be helpful on its arrival to courts. Linguistic evidence and analysis are of social importance because they may reveal problematic miscommunication, or contribute to the conviction of the guilty and the freeing of the innocent. First, some examples from American and European courts are represented. In the next part a real case recorded in one of Tehran courts is analyzed.

5-1- Foreign Courts

5-1-1- Syntactic evidences

Among all the linguistic parameter, syntactic parameter might be considered as a weak parameter in linguistic analysis especial in courts. But the author starts this part with a syntactic explanation to show this analysis can contribute to adjudication. In the US Steel case reported in Labove and Harris (1994), the authors demonstrated that black steel workers failed to receive just compensation for previous discrimination from their employer, because the release put out by US Steel Co. was worded in a

misleading and technical fashion. Labov and two of his colleagues provided evidence from grammatical analysis and readability measures which demonstrated the linguistic complexity and difficulty of the text (the wording and 'meaning' issues). He then took into account the 'participants', in this case the steel workers. He took two versions of an element of the contested letter:

1. 'there was no question about his getting any back pay'.
2. 'there was no question about his getting the back pay'.

He embedded these in a scenario question about the likelihood of the person receiving back pay, which he then tested on people of a similar social background. The issue was whether there was any difference in people's interpreting the sentences negatively (he would not get back pay) or positively (he would get back pay). There was a statistically significant difference: the use of 'any' biased people to the negative interpretation. This was the original wording, so Labov was able to testify that the letter was biased (intentionally or not) in favour of the company, which did not want to pay the back pay. This, therefore, is a good example of how subtle linguistic analysis and testing can be used to examine the meaning of language forms for particular participants in a particular contextual frame. The case was lost, but the judge took the linguistic evidence seriously" (Gibons, 2003: 293).

5-1-2- Morphological evidences

Morphology and word-formation are too much used in coinage of new words. One of the issues for which word-formation is important seems to be in commerce. When one product enters the consumption market, their producers try to choose a good brand (commercial name) for it. Here there might be some disagreements for some similar brands. Some of these are Avita v.s. Aveda, McSleep v.s. McDonald, Comset v.s. Comsat, Citizen v.s. Citizem, Arcopal v.s. Argopal and etc. Linguists can play an important role in solving these problems. Gibons (2003:293) gives a morphological proof in one of these problems: "In another trade name case, Oyanadel and Samaniego (1999) gave evidence concerning brands of baby cream. An old established brand was "Hipoglos", a name derived from a technical term for fish oil. A new brand came onto the market called "Fasaglos" FASA being an acronym for the company name. Oyanadel and Samaniego were able to testify that "-glos" is not a productive morpheme in Spanish; in other words, it is not used generally as the last part of words to make new words-it had been taken directly from "Hipoglos". The evidence was accepted, and the trade name "Fasaglos" was rejected."

5-1-3-Phonetic and Phonological evidences

Phonology and phonetics are two main branches of linguistics which have almost the same definitions in different sources. Phonology is one branch of linguistics which studies sound system (Crystal, 2003:350; Kentowicz, 1994:2 and etc.) and phonetics is the study of the full range of vocal sounds that human beings are capable of making (Kentowicz & Kissebeth, 1979:1 Jensen, 2004:1 and etc.) These two branches can also play role in the conviction of the guilty and the freeing of the innocent. Shuy (1993:35-42) mentioned a case in which there was disagreement between prosecution and defense transcript of tape recorded event. It was a crucial sentence over which the two were at odds. Prosecution

transcript was: *“I would take a bribe, wouldn’t you?”* and defense transcript was: *“I wouldn’t take a bribe, would you?”*

The point here is that the evaluator of the intelligence offered by the tape had a schema in which the suspect said he would take a bribe. Therefore, the analyst heard it that way, despite the physical evidence to the contrary. The listener must not fall into the trap of overdependence on the written transcript of an oral event. Transcripts do not usually provide the important clues to conversation such as: stress (loudness), intonation (question marking versus statements), pauses (which carry their own form of meaning), interrupting (which can be a significant indication of speaker control and speaker intention), and many other things. Shuy as a linguist listened to the whole tape and analyzed all the statements. There were 14 statements about money offered by the guilty named Janice. But the main question was if Poli, one of the culprits, took the bribe or not. In fact, the crucial statement was among many other statements which occurred between them. In these statements, Janet tried to persuade Poi to take the bribe, but she changed the topics or gave no response or gave almost non-relevant responses. Therefore, the mentioned schema [Poli was guilty] turned to be the odds between the prosecutor and attorney of defendant. Here, the linguist could solve the problem by phonological and phonetic evidences. After listening to the recorded tape, Shuy argued that in this sentence, there is one pause after which there are two syllables. In fact, this sentence has six syllables, one pause and two syllables. Having offered this pattern, Shuy transcribed the sentence as follows:

I wouldn’t take a bribe, would you?

— — — — — ‘ — —

Therefore, Poli pled innocent to bribery.

5-1-4-Discourse evidences

This area "discourse" is so broad that we can not separate any analysis from it. The author believes one of the best cases which can be analyzed in this area is defamation. Shuy as a pioneer in forensic linguistics classified defamation in language crimes. He (2010) says

“Defamation is another of the areas in which there has not been much literature describing the past experience of forensic linguists, but this paucity of activity is not likely to endure.”

One example of a defamation case that made use of a forensic linguist was a case brought by a woman against a local television station and a deputy sheriff. She claimed that this station had defamed her in a three-part television news series in which she believed she was accused her of being the person who murdered her husband. The police were baffled by that case and she had not been indicted for this murder, although as the deputy sheriff stated, she was the number one suspect.

More than once in these programs, the deputy sheriff stated that the woman was “the only suspect.” Note his use of “the” here, rather than “a.” He also said, “we don’t have enough evidence to prove that she did it beyond a reasonable doubt but I think we have a lot of the reasons why.” His “why” is an unfinished thought but it strongly suggests, “why she did it.”

More damaging to the defense, however, was the deputy sheriff’s statement on the third

program: “The suspect walked directly into that house, up the stairs, into the bedroom, and shot the man right between the eyes while he was sleeping.” Earlier he had said the woman was the only suspect. Now he said that the suspect (there was only one) shot and killed the man. Having the opinion that the woman was the only suspect is one thing but explicitly indicating that this only suspect was the one who committed the murder is an offer of a fact, not an opinion. It was a specific accusation that she did it. Among other things, the job of the forensic linguist in this case was to clarify discourse referencing such as this.

5-2-Iranian courts

Before reviewing our case recorded in one of Tehran's court, it is better off taking a quick look at the justice system in Iran after Islam and the 1979 Islamic revolution.

“With the fall of Sassanian dynasty, Islamic legal system gradually replaced Zoroastrian legal system. One of the important motivations of Iranian to Islam was this point that Islam emphasized justice and equity. In Rashidun era, judiciary was separated from the Mojriye. There was a decentralized manner in the judicial system since Umayyad era until the early Abbasid caliphate. After the establishment of the Abbasids, under the influence of Iranian civilization, the judicial system focused on centralized manner. This system was based on the direction of Sunni jurisprudence and continued until the fall of the Abbasids by Hlaku” (Amin 1381). After the Islamic Revolution in 1979 (1357), the justice system was changed. Based on 156 original constitution, the judiciary branch is an independent system supporting the individual and social rights and having responsibility to realize justice. Duties of the Judiciary based on this principle are as follow:

- investigating and issuing sentences on grievances, abuses, complaints, resolving disputes, solving disagreements, obtaining the necessary decisions and implementing actions in those part of Hasbiyh Affairs, which are specified by law.
- restoring public rights, justice and legitimate freedoms.
- Supervising the implementation of laws.
- crime detection, prosecution and punishment of offenders and enforcement of regulations codified by Islamic penal code.
- appropriate action to prevent crime and reform criminals

As far as the authors know since the Islamic Revolution till now, the legal tools and police investigations have been used to prove a crime. In other words, the linguistic approach in Iran's Judiciary system has no place for proof of guilt. The case to be analyzed is a real court case recorded in 89/2/12 (2010/5/12).

5-2-1- use of linguistic tools in analysis of crime

A case which the author have seen, is the one related to the dispute between two families. A young boy (21 years) committed sexual assault on a woman (44 years) who was his tenant's grandfather. Here the two parts of the whole document are analyzed. Notably, in the first section, lying in a court is considered as a language crime in accordance with many linguists such as Shuy. In the second part, the authors tried to rebuild context of interrogation.

Summary of Case: One morning (6:15 a.m.) when the woman wanted to take his daughter to school bus, encountered with the boy in the parking place. When daughter went out of parking place, the woman was sexually assaulted. The woman complaint to the police station and then the case was followed in the court. Under the police pressure the boy confessed to doing sexual assault, but denied in the court. He claimed the woman has made this story till not to pay their rent (4 months were retarded). This case was reviewed in two stages on 89/2/12 (2010/5/2). In the first stage, the defendant denied the guilt and there was no legal proof. Even the interrogator asked the plaintiff how she wanted to convince the judicial system, she could not provide any legal evidence and her only reaction was to cry. But when the defendant was under coercion, he confessed in the second stage.

Finally culpability was issued. That which occurred after 2 hours of interruption and caused the defendant to confess was a legal proof for culpability, but the stage which was before the time of confession when the accused boy denied was linguistically valuable (the first stage). **In the first stage, the accused boy has not confessed yet and the interrogator also asks the plaintiff how she wants to convince the justice system. But even in this section in terms of language features, there are some evidences for culpability.** For example following conversation between an interrogator (IR) and the defendant boy (IE) shows this claim:

Part One - 6-1

?IR: Did you see this woman? Did you talk to her

?in xanumo ?æslæn didi? bahaʃ sohbæt kærdi?

IE: Yes
bæle.

?IR:How long did it last
?tʃeqædr tul keʃid

: seconds. I was passing by her, my hand touched her, I apologized. IE 15
. punzdæh saniye. daʃtæm ?æz kenareʃ ræd miʃodæm dæstæm beheʃ xord

IR: After 15 seconds, you went to Tabriz⁴?
bæ?d ?æz punzdæh saniye ræfti tæbriz?

⁴ The accused boy claimed that he was going to Tabriz that day and even neighbors could witness.

IE: Yes
bæle.

IR: Why Tabriz? Say, Qazvin is better.
tʃera tæbriz? mæsælæn qæzvin ke behtære.

. IE: Because, we are from Tabriz, originally; I went to my father
tʃon ma tæbrizi hæstim. ræftæm piʃe pedæræm.

IR: why?
tʃera?

. IE: Because, I was scared
tʃon tærside budæm.

IR: What did you want there?
tʃikar daʃti unʃa?

IE: I had some works to do there.
?undʃa kar daʃtæm.

When the defendant said "tʃon tærside budæm (I was scared)", he implicitly says something has made him frightened. Since this sentence lacks an "agent" (creator of fear); certainly it has at least one "cause" for this fear. The authors are going to analyze this short section of the entire case in terms of some aspects:

Semantic and pragmatic points of view

Speaking about field of semantic roles, Saeed: 2003; Dowty: 1986; Safavi: 1379; Kearns: 2000 and etc believe that these kinds of sentences have a semantic role as a cause. In the sentence "tʃon tærside budæm (because I was scared)", "I" is a patient or theme and subsequently a fact should be considered as a "cause". There is no "agent" in this sentence because, according to Saeed, Dowty..., the "agent" should bear the features + volition, + animacy and + cause. Here, there is an action which causes scare, because the action lacks + volition, + animacy, but has got + cause. What is this action?

Examining context, we noticed that there is no element causing this scare. The co-text tells us, the sentence before "I was scared," is "(Go to Tabriz)". How about this sentence? This is next to " (Oh we're from Tabriz originally, I went to my father)". **If you continue these series, you do not find "cause" of scare. So the point embeds in the sentence "because I was scared" (in reference with the previous sentences nothing as confession has already achieved). The term " tʃon / because" in this sentence shows that this sentence is a causee of causer which has happened before. In fact, this sentence coordinates with other sentences or with a particular concept.** These coordinators (tʃon) deal with the relationship between text and context. Some formal features connect external factors of the text to situational context or to intertextual context (previous texts). Fairclough (2001: 108-107) tells how to connect simple sentences to each other is related to the value of conjunctive coordinators. Generally speaking, the thing that makes the text understandable for us is cohesion.

Brown and Yule (1983: 193) say that formal cohesive links between sentences in the text is called cohesion. The links are: 1 - repetition 2 - incomplete repetition 3 - lexical substitution like adjective instead of noun 4 - pronoun.

Each link has a special meaning. Fairclough (2001) says: "and" indicates that the following two elements coming together have the same value or confirm each other. The word "even though" and other links like this show it is expected something to happen, but it does not, but "as a result" shows that it is expected something to happen and it is does. The word "**then**" and other links like this show causal relationship.

Hence, the relationship between the sentences shows a general belief and common ideology in the society. **With this explanation, " tʃɒn/ because" falls in the category of "then". The causee has a causer which is clearly identifiable in reference to prior sentences or has a causer which is implicitly mentioned.** However, what is certain is that a simple phrase "because" says that we should seek "causer" in intertextuality. We can not find "the causer" for the sentence " tʃɒn tærsidæm /because I was scared" in the text. So, where is it? It must be found in the accused's thoughts or in unsaid sentences. Here you can also get help from Grice's maxims (quality, quantity, relevance, and manner).

Cutting (2003) says: if one of the Gricean maxims breaks, there is something that the speaker is going to hide or change. Here, what the speaker is going to hide is the "causer"; the cause that made the boy be scared (the author thinks relevance is violated). And, there is not a clear cause with + volition and + animacy in the text; therefore, we have to say that a special action has caused the boy to be scared. There is the action or cause which the speaker is going to hide according to Gricean maxim, that is the criminal act. The authors think interrogator could have asked this question, " So, what have you done?" but asked: " What did you want there?"

Syntactic and semantic points of view

From syntactic - semantic point of view, verb "tærsidæm (to be scared)" can also be interpreted. In some languages, in addition to active and passive voice, there is a middle voice. Function of middle voice varies in languages, but there is a common feature emphasizing on the fact that the subject of verb is under influence of action described by the verb. This can be shown in several types. Saeed (2003: 170-173) and Hageaman (1994) categorize the types as follow: 1- Neuter intransitives: this type of middle is where the subject undergoes a non-volitional process or change of state. ("جنگل سوخت" in Persian or "break" in English). The external cause is not represented, but can often be shown in a related active form. 2- Bodily activity and emotion: in some languages, verb is used with middle voice when activities require effect on body or emotion of subject, like (to be scared) 3 – Reflexives: In some languages the middle is used where the subject's action affects the subject himself, or a possession or body part of the subject like in classical Greek: Lou-omai.

wash-1sg Middle = I wash myself

4 – Autobenefactives: This type of middle is used to signify that the action of the subject is done for his or her own benefit, like in Somali:

hari-ō

moiran

take-1sg-middle share = I take a share for myself

With this explanation, the verb "to be scared" in the Persian language falls in the second type, of course the cause or agent has been omitted. In this sentence, agent/cause has effect on the accused boy; however, he tries to hide the cause. In Persian language these middle verbs include: ترسیدن⁵ ، ... خوشحال شدن (خوشحالم کرد) ، شوک شدن و

The result: the defendant tries to hide the fact, so he resorts to telling lies. These tools can help interrogation improve or can identify the lies when the defendant resorts to lying, even if the defendant does not admit to lying

7-2 - Part two

The following conversation immediately comes after the first part. In this section the author aims to recontextualize the interrogation with the help of power relations:

IR: From yesterday till now, you have said thousands kinds of words! A liar has a bad memory. I ordered this woman to go out; probably, you feel more relief and tell the truth. Do not think you in the store; you are speaking in front of . a judge

æz diruz ta hala hezar jur hærf zædi! ?adæme doruqgu kæm hafezæst. mæn be ?in xanum goftæm bere ?
.birun [ayæd to rahæt bafi raste]o begi! fekr nækon ?inja mæqazæst joloye qazi hærf mizæni

IE: I didn't offend.

Ësaræt nækærdæm.

IR: How old are you?

Ëænd salete?t

. IE: 21 years old

bistoyek sal.

IR: Where are you from?

?æhle kojæ?id?

IE: Tabriz.

tæbriz.

! IR: You are not telling the truth. You are denying

. hæqiqæto nemigi. ha]a mikoni

IE: Silence

IR: After 15 seconds, you went to Tabriz!

bæ?d ?æz punzdæh saniye ræfti tæbriz!

⁵ to scare, to make happy, to get shocked

IE: No, I went to the store and I picked some money, then went to Tabriz.
næ raftæm mæqaze , pul bærdæftæm bæ?d raftam tæbriz.

IR: When did you go?
key ræfti?

IE:In the morning I went. In the evening, I arrived Tabriz.
sobh ræftæm. bæ?d ?æz zohr residæm tæbriz.

IR: No one can save you, even a lawyer cannot. (Referring to a friend of the accused's father, because the plaintiff claimed the lawyer, his father's friend, was teaching them what to say before the interrogation starts.) If I release you, you will turn a night owl⁶. You mean this woman had a dream.

hit]kæs nemitune neftatet bede, vækil hæm nemitune. velet konæm beri xofa]e]æb be]i. ya?ni ?in xanum xab dide.

In this part of the case, power relations is clear in the form of particular vocabularies and language structures. Mayer (2008: 15) says: power does not just prohibit and negate, but produces: it produces identities, knowledge and possibilities for behaviour and it does this through discourse. He quotes from Foucault (1977:27) that power, then, is inextricably linked with knowledge: 'power and knowledge directly imply each other...there is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations. Mayer went on to say that Foucault shows us how knowledge can be put to work through discourse practices in specific institutional settings to regulate the conduct of its members and the prime example of the symbiotic relationship between knowledge and power, in that disciplinary surveillance of the prison creates a new kind of 'knowledge' of the prisoner's body and mind which in turn creates a new kind of power. A body of knowledge about the nature of criminals is essential to justify rehabilitation and discipline. Mesthrie and et al. (2000:324) say power, for Foucault, is secured not so much by the threat of punishment, but by the internalization of the norms and values implied by the prevailing discourses within the social order. Here it is natural if we accept that Richardson (2007: 47) says: "Words transmit the role and effect of society and our judgments of value as well as. In addition to their real meaning, words represent the conotational meaning."

With this explanation, now we can analyze the sentence " (From yesterday till now, you have said thousands kinds of words! A liar has a bad memory)". This sentence was produced by the power status, interrogator. Fairclough (2001) classifies "power" into two categories "power in discourse" and "power behind discourse". "Power in discourse" can be found in military institutions where there is a clearly identified and strong surveillance system. However, "power behind discourse" is found in institutions where surveillance system is hidden, discourse between doctor and his patient is an example. **Here interrogator imposes "power in discourse"; accordingly, he foregrounds the next sentence ". (A liar has a bad memory)".**

Besides," (Do not think you are in the store; you are speaking in front of a judge.)" is produced by the same foregrounding. Imperative verb " (do not think)" especially in a single form indicates the superior

⁶ A criminal who pled guilty to numerous rapes. He had this name, because he committed all his crimes at nights or very early in the morning.

status of interrogator. Fairclough (2001:106) says: "power relation is a bilateral relationship; it has two participants. If we want to talk about them with pronouns, we should use we/you (ما/شما) and I/you (من/تو). He claims some pronouns represent "respecting"; for example, in Persian language we address someone " شما (Joma)" instead of " تو (to)" or use some verbs like " فکر نکنید (fekr nækonid)" instead of " فکر نکن (fekr nækon)". On the other hand, Fairclough (2001: 105) talks about mood of verbs. He says non-systematic symmetry of distributed sentences between participants show that bilateral relationship between participants has a special meaning. "Giving order" or "asking a question to get information" show the articulator has powerful status; it means when we are talking about imperative or interrogative mood, power relation appears. In our sentence " (Do not think you in the store; you are speaking in front of a judge.)", pronoun "تو (to)" is implicitly used and imperative verb " فکر نکن (do not think)" is also mentioned. In imperative sentences, the hearer (the accused boy) has the subordinate role. Besides, power status, interrogator, does not intend to announce the setting by " fekr nækon ?inĵa mæqazæst ĵoloye qazi hærf mizæni.", but he wants to implicitly warn the hearer (accused boy) that he has the subordinate role and has to tell the truth in front of interrogator.

7-Conclusion

Forensic linguistics is a sub-branch of applied linguistics which has grown rapidly in last twenty years. "Forensic linguistics covers a wide range of topics, including the language used in trials by judges, lawyers and witnesses; the language of the law itself; the language used in civil cases; and the language used in criminal cases" (Shuy: 2007). Forensic linguists are trained to analyze semantics, grammatical referencing, speech acts, conveyed meaning, language clues to intentions, discourse structure and framing, and the characteristics of malicious language (Shuy in press). Having studied more than 50 cases, the author draws this conclusion that linguistic parameters can be used by the jury and judges especially when there are no clear and typical available proof and documents. It is possible to find some proof in culprit's words to indict the crime.

References

- 1- امین، سید حسن (1381) *نظام قضایی ایران پس از اسلام، فصلنامه تاریخ اسلام*، 10: 1.
- (Amin, Seyed Hasan. (1381/2002), *Judicial System in Iran after Islam*, Tehran: **Islamic History Quarter**, 1-10.
- 2- صفوی، کوروش. (1379) *مقدمه ای بر معناشناسی، تهران: انتشارات سمت.*
(Safavi, Kurosh (2000), *An Introduction to Semantics*, Tehran: Samt Publication.)
- Toolan, M. (2009) "Legal definitions", *Language and communication*, in press, 1-11.
- Foster, D. (2000) "On the trail of Acronyms", *Cornel Law Review*, 85: 627-655.
- Eades, D. (1994) "Forensic linguistics in Australia: an overview", *Forensic linguistics*, 1:2, 113-132.
- Levi, J.N. (1993) "Evaluating jury comprehension of the Illinois capital sentencing instructions", *American speech*, 68:1, 1-26.

- Coulthard, Malcolm; Johnson, Alison. (2007) *An introduction to forensic linguistics, language in evidence*. London and New York: Rutledge.
- Gibbons, John, (2003) *Forensic linguistics: an introduction to language in the justice system*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers.
- Olsson, J. (2004) *Forensic linguistics: an introduction to language, crime and the law*, London: Continuum.
- Perrins, L. (1988) *Criminal behavior*, Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers.
- Longman dictionary* (2006), Longman publication.
- Crystal, D. (2003), *A dictionary of linguistics & phonetics*, USA: Blackwell publishers.
- Kenstowicz, Michael, (1994) *Phonology in generative grammar*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers.
- Jensen, John T., (2004) *Principle of generative phonology*. Amsterdam: Publication data.
- Shuy, Roger W., (1993) *language crimes*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers.
- Shuy, Roger W., (2010) "Forensic linguistics in Aronoff, Mark and Janie Rees-Miller, eds., the handbook of linguistics", In Press, 1-32.
- Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia (2011), www.wikipedia.com
- Saeed, John I. (2003) *Semantics*. USA: Blackwell publishing.
- Dowty, David R. (1986) "Thematic roles and semantics" *Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 12:340-54.
- Kearns, K. (2000) *Semantics*. Britain: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Brown, G. & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*, Britain, Cambridge University Press.
- Fairclough, N. (2001). *Power and language*, United Kingdom: Longman.
- Cutting, J. (2003). *Pragmatics and discourse*. New York: Rutledge.
- Hageaman, L. (1994). *An introduction to government and binding*. USA: Blackwell publishing.
- Mayer, A. (2008) *Language and power*, London and New York: Continuum.
- Foucault, M. (1977) *Discipline and punish: the birth of the prison*. London: Allen Lane.
- Mesthrie, R., Swann, J., Deumert, A. and Leap, W. (2000) *Introducing sociolinguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Richardson, J. (2007) *Analyzing newspaper: an approach from critical discourse analysis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Shuy, Roger W., (2007) "Language in American courtroom", *Language and Linguistic Compass*, Georgetown University Press, 1-15.