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Review of Footwear Impression Evidence, Second Edition


The first edition of this text (published by Elsevier in 1990) is probably in every footwear examiner’s library, so it is easy to say that the second edition belongs there too. Small improvements were made throughout, although the first edition will no doubt remain a classic reference, a benchmark in its time. Alas, Tempus Fugit, and the new edition is necessary to provide many needed updates to the original text, particularly in the chapter on enhancement of impressions. The new edition’s format is a little larger than the first edition, allowing some of the photographs to be enlarged, although the contrast is higher in the original so the improvement is debatable. Three new chapters added at the end of the book represent the major change to the work. The chapter devoted to the evidence in the O. J. Simpson case is a highlight of course. If you have the first edition and like it, by all means get the second edition.

It is unfortunate that the publisher did not provide sufficient editing support to correct the numerous grammar and usage mistakes which really hamper the readability of the text. For example, finding “specific size”, “specific sized”, “specific-size”, and “specific-sized”, all referring to the same thing and all on the same facing pages is very distracting. In the same area of text in the first edition, the reference is consistent to “specific-size.” I find the change baffling.

Careful use of terminology is important in any text, but in the identification field, words like “unique” and “individual” require special care since they are terms-of-art. Using such terms in the vernacular must be avoided to prevent misunderstanding or dilution of the power of such terms when they are used by the expert. Mr. Bodziak all too frequently fails to take sufficient care with his use of such terms. For example; “... but together form unique combinations that would be even less likely to repeat (page 418)” “Unique” and “less likely to repeat” are not parallel at all. Although he defines “identifying characteristic” as being individual, based on random occurrences and causing or contributing to the uniqueness of the sole (Glossary, page 478), in the section on identifying characteristics, he frequently uses the redundant terms “unique identifying characteristics”, “random identifying characteristics”, and “individual identifying) characteristics”. While he may just be using the adjectives as emphasis, to the uninitiated, these may appear to be different values or levels of significance. Once again, the first edition is consistent with the usage of “identifying characteristics” without the adjectives. It is a shame that a book with such excellent content is diminished in this way by poor editing.
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