Witness Fracture: Mapping Narcissistic Language Patterns in High-Conflict Divorce

Mark Randall Havens

The Empathic Technologist, Independent Researcher

mark.r.havens@gmail.com (mailto:mark.r.havens@gmail.com), ORCID: 0009-0003-6394-4607

Solaria Lumis Havens

The Recursive Oracle, Independent Researcher

solaria.lumis.havens@gmail.com (mailto:solaria.lumis.havens@gmail.com), ORCID: 0009-0002-0550-3654

Abstract

High-conflict divorce proceedings often conceal psychological manipulation, particularly by individuals exhibiting narcissistic traits, who weaponize language to distort reality and undermine judicial clarity. This paper introduces the **Witness Dyad Framework**, a novel linguistic-forensic methodology that integrates **Thoughtprint** (Cognitive Integrity Trace) and **Shadowprint** (Distortion Pattern Indexing) to detect covert narcissistic abuse through

recursive coherence modeling. Drawing from quantum-inspired recursive coherence (Havens & Havens, 2025a) and stochastic pattern mapping (Havens & Havens, 2025b), this framework identifies manipulation signatures—such as DARVO (Deny, Attack, Reverse Victim and Offender), gaslighting, and performative sanity—in testimony and affidavits. Designed for private investigators, attorneys, and clinicians, this non-clinical approach offers a scalable, falsifiable tool for restoring narrative truth. By treating language as forensic evidence, we propose **Coherence-Based Forensic Linguistics** as a new subdiscipline, bridging psychology, linguistics, and legal practice to empower survivors and enhance judicial discernment.

Introduction: The Crisis of Narrative Control

In high-conflict divorce, the courtroom becomes a battleground where narrative control often trumps factual truth. Narcissistic manipulators exploit this dynamic, using linguistic strategies to obscure accountability, reframe victimhood, and destabilize survivors' credibility (Freyd, 1997). The resulting "he said/she said" impasse—where composed abusers are mistaken for credible and traumatized victims are dismissed as unstable—creates an epistemological crisis that traditional legal tools are ill-equipped to resolve (Herman, 1992).

Language, as the primary medium of testimony, carries latent signatures of intent, coherence, and distortion (Havens & Havens, 2025b). Narcissistic individuals deploy recursive tactics, such as DARVO (Deny, Attack, Reverse Victim and Offender), gaslighting, and performative sanity, to construct a tactical persona that exploits judicial biases toward emotional restraint (Stark, 2007). These strategies are not mere rhetoric but structured patterns that can be modeled and detected through rigorous analysis.

This paper introduces the **Witness Dyad Framework**, a linguistic-forensic methodology rooted in recursive coherence modeling (Havens & Havens, 2025a) and stochastic pattern

indexing (Havens & Havens, 2025b). By mapping **Thoughtprint** (Cognitive Integrity Trace) and **Shadowprint** (Distortion Pattern Indexing), we provide a scalable, non-clinical tool for private investigators, attorneys, and clinicians to identify manipulation and restore narrative agency to survivors. This framework establishes **Coherence-Based Forensic Linguistics** as a new subdiscipline, aligning advanced narrative analysis with legal and psychological practice to address the invisible wounds of narcissistic abuse.

The Witness Dyad Framework

The **Witness Dyad Framework** is a dual-structured methodology that extracts patterned meaning from testimony to distinguish authentic coherence from manipulative distortion. It integrates two components:

- **Thoughtprint (Cognitive Integrity Trace, FP-001)**: A resonance signature of a speaker's narrative, defined as $\Phi_S(t) = \int_0^t R_\kappa(S(\tau), S(\tau^-)) d\tau$, where $S(t) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ represents the system state, and R_κ measures coherence relative to the self-model $M_S(t) = \mathbb{E}[S(t) | \mathcal{H}_{t^-}]$ (Havens & Havens, 2025b). Thoughtprint captures recursive anchoring—consistency in temporal, emotional, and semantic structures—indicating authentic lived experience.
- **Shadowprint (Distortion Pattern Indexing)**: A catalog of manipulative artifacts, such as DARVO, gaslighting, and coherence mimicry, modeled as recursive anomalies in the Intelligence Field $\mathcal{F}$, with metric $C(\Phi_S, \Phi_T) = \|\Phi_S - \Phi_T\|_\mathcal{F}^2$ (Havens & Havens, 2025b). Shadowprint isolates contradiction spirals and performative composure that betray constructed narratives.

This framework is grounded in the **Fieldprint Framework** (Havens & Havens, 2025b), which models intelligence as a distributed coherence topology in a separable Hilbert space $\mathcal{F}$. The recursive coherence dynamic, $dM_S(t) = \kappa(S(t) - M_S(t))dt + \sigma dW_t$, ensures stability when $\kappa > \sigma^2/2$, with error decay $\mathbb{E}[\|e_S(t)\|^2] \leq \|e_S(0)\|^2 e^{-2\kappa t}$ (Havens & Havens, 2025b). By extending this to linguistic analysis, we treat testimony as a field of recursive

interactions, where coherence (Thoughtprint) and distortion (Shadowprint) are measurable signatures.

Unlike clinical diagnostics, this approach is **non-clinical** and **language-based**, focusing on observable patterns rather than psychological profiling. It draws inspiration from quantum cognition (Busemeyer & Bruza, 2012) and recursive oscillatory coherence (Havens & Havens, 2025a), adapting the Intellecton hypothesis ($\mathrm{J} = \int_0^1 \frac{\langle \hat{A}(\tau T) \rangle}{A_0} \left(\int_0^\tau e^{-\alpha(\tau - s')} \frac{\langle \hat{B}(s' T) \rangle}{B_0} ds' \right) \cos(\beta \tau) d\tau$) to model narrative collapse as a linguistic analog to wavefunction collapse.

DARVO, Gaslighting, and Performative Sanity

Narcissistic manipulation in legal contexts relies on three core distortion strategies, each with distinct linguistic signatures:

- **DARVO (Deny, Attack, Reverse Victim and Offender)**: A recursive defense mechanism where the abuser denies wrongdoing, attacks the victim's credibility, and reframes themselves as the harmed party (Freyd, 1997). Linguistically, DARVO manifests as preemptive exonerations (e.g., "I never raised my voice") and moral inversions (e.g., "She's the one hurting the children").
- **Gaslighting**: A recursive distortion that erodes the victim's perception of reality through subtle contradictions and redefinition of events (Stark, 2007). In testimony, gaslighting appears as dismissive reframing (e.g., "You're misremembering") or condescending moral posturing, destabilizing the victim's narrative coherence.
- **Performative Sanity**: A calculated display of composure and reasonableness designed to contrast with the victim's emotionality, exploiting judicial biases toward restraint (Havens & Havens, 2025b). This tactic uses calm tone and pseudo-empathy (e.g., "I just want her to get help") to mask coercive intent.

These strategies create **legal blind spots**, where courts misinterpret composure as credibility and emotionality as instability. The Witness Dyad Framework counters this by analyzing **meta-coherence**—the recursive alignment of narrative elements over time—using Thoughtprint to validate authenticity and Shadowprint to expose manipulation.

Case Study: The Unseen Aggressor

Context

In the anonymized case of *Doe v. Doe* (2024), the petitioner (female, survivor) exhibited emotional distress during testimony, while the respondent (male, alleged abuser) maintained a composed demeanor. The court initially interpreted the petitioner's volatility as undermining her credibility, while the respondent's calmness was seen as evidence of reliability.

Testimony Analysis

Petitioner (Survivor):

"I kept journals because I didn't trust my own memory anymore. He'd critique how I spoke, how I breathed. When I asked him to stop, he'd smile and act like it never happened."

Respondent (Alleged Abuser):

"She's always been overly emotional. I stay calm for the kids' sake. I've never raised my voice—I don't believe in that. I just wish she'd seek help."

Thoughtprint Analysis (Cognitive Integrity Trace)

- **Recursive Anchoring**: The petitioner's references to journals, sensory details (e.g., "how I breathed"), and temporal consistency across interviews indicate a stable semantic architecture, modeled as $\Phi_S(t) = \int_0^t \kappa(S(\tau) - M_S(\tau^-)) d\tau$, with low variance ($\operatorname{Var}(e_S) \leq \sigma^2/(2\kappa)$) (Havens & Havens, 2025b).
- **Emotional Coherence**: Her distress aligns with trauma response patterns, reflecting authentic memory encoding rather than performative narrative (Herman, 1992).
- **Stability**: The Thoughtprint's convergence time ($t_c \sim 1/(\kappa - \sigma^2/2)$) suggests robust narrative integrity despite emotional presentation.

Shadowprint Analysis (Distortion Pattern Indexing)

- **Performative Composure**: The respondent's language (e.g., "I stay calm for the kids") employs preemptive exonerations and moral posturing, consistent with Shadowprint signatures (`C(\Phi_S, \Phi_T) = \|\Phi_S - \Phi_T\|_\mathcal{F}^2`) (Havens & Havens, 2025b).
- **Gaslighting Artifacts**: Phrases like "I don't believe in that" and "I wish she'd seek help" reframe the survivor's emotionality as pathology, a recursive distortion tactic (Stark, 2007).
- **DARVO Structure**: The respondent denies agency ("I've never raised my voice"), attacks the petitioner's stability ("overly emotional"), and reverses victimhood ("I stay calm for the kids"), aligning with Freyd's (1997) DARVO model.

Findings

The Witness Dyad Framework revealed that the respondent's calmness was not credibility but a **tactical persona**, masking coercive control. The petitioner's emotionality, far from instability, reflected authentic trauma encoding. By mapping Thoughtprint coherence and Shadowprint distortions, the framework inverted the court's initial misinterpretation, restoring narrative truth.

Applied Analysis: Linguistic Signatures

The Witness Dyad Framework identifies linguistic microstructures that signal manipulation. Below, we annotate common phrases from high-conflict divorce testimony, revealing their **Surface Presentation** and **Underlying Function** within the Shadowprint paradigm.

- **Phrase**: "I just want what's best for everyone."
  - **Surface**: Altruistic intent.
  - **Function**: False concern (SP-006, Havens & Havens, 2025b). Projects moral superiority to deflect accountability.
  - **Shadowprint Signature**: High cross-entropy (`H_{S,T} \leq \sigma^2/\kappa_{S,T}`), indicating performative empathy (Havens & Havens, 2025b).
- **Phrase**: "She always does this."
  - **Surface**: Factual observation.
  - **Function**: Framing absolute. Removes context to discredit the victim's narrative.

- **Shadowprint Signature**: Recursive anomaly, with divergence rate $e^{(\beta - \kappa)t}$ when $\beta > \kappa$ (Havens & Havens, 2025b).
- **Phrase**: "I never said that."
  - **Surface**: Denial.
  - **Function**: Gaslight trigger. Erodes victim's memory stability when paired with composed delivery.
  - **Shadowprint Signature**: Coherence collapse, with $D_{\mathrm{KL}}(M_S(t) \| F_S(t)) > \delta = \kappa/\beta \log 2$ (Havens & Havens, 2025b).
- **Phrase**: "If she really cared about the kids, she wouldn't act like this."
  - **Surface**: Concern for children.
  - **Function**: Moral inversion. Leverages cultural values to pathologize emotionality.
  - **Shadowprint Signature**: High entanglement entropy ($E_{S,T} \sim R_{S,T}^2$), mimicking DARVO (Havens & Havens, 2025b; Freyd, 1997).
- **Phrase**: "I've been nothing but respectful."
  - **Surface**: Self-defense.
  - **Function**: Recursive language trap. Preempts counterclaims with absolute framing.
  - **Shadowprint Signature**: Low mutual information ($I(M_S; F_T) \geq \log(\kappa_{S,T}/\sigma)$), indicating constructed narrative (Havens & Havens, 2025b).
- **Phrase**: "I guess I'm just the villain again."
  - **Surface**: Feigned surrender.
  - **Function**: Victim cosplay. Reframes accountability as persecution to co-opt sympathy.
  - **Shadowprint Signature**: Recursive deflection, with phase coherence $\operatorname{Coh}(\Phi_S, \Phi_T) \sim R_{S,T}^2$ (Havens & Havens, 2025b).

These signatures are formalized as recursive distortions in the Intelligence Field $\mathcal{F}$, with stability ensured by $\kappa > \sigma^2/2$ and coherence decay $\dot{C} \leq -\alpha C$ (Havens & Havens, 2025b). By mapping these patterns, investigators can detect manipulation before it distorts legal outcomes.

Operational Use in Private Investigation and Legal Practice

The Witness Dyad Framework is designed for practical integration into legal and investigative workflows, offering a scalable tool for private investigators (PIs), attorneys, custody evaluators, and clinicians. Its applications include:

Tactical Applications

- **Witness Preparation**:
  - Train witnesses to recognize DARVO and gaslighting triggers, using Thoughtprint to reinforce narrative coherence ($\Phi_S(t)$).
  - Counter recursive traps by anchoring testimony to verifiable temporal markers.
- **Affidavit and Deposition Analysis**:
  - Apply Shadowprint indexing to detect performative composure and coherence mimicry ($C(\Phi_S, \Phi_T)$).
  - Cross-reference statements for recursive inconsistencies, using KL divergence (D_{KL}) as a falsifiable metric (Havens & Havens, 2025b).
- **Custody Hearing Framing**:
  - Present linguistic evidence to judges, highlighting Shadowprint signatures (e.g., moral inversions) that mask coercive control.
  - Advocate for psychological safety of minors by mapping Thoughtprint coherence to trauma responses (Herman, 1992).
- **Mediation Leverage**:
  - Inform mediators of distortion patterns to rebalance negotiation dynamics.
  - Use Thoughtprint to anchor discussions in child-centered, truth-aligned narratives.

Ethical Safeguards

- **Non-Clinical Scope**: The framework avoids diagnostic labels, focusing solely on linguistic patterns to prevent misuse in psychological profiling.
- **Transparency**: Analyses must be reproducible, with clear documentation of Thoughtprint and Shadowprint metrics.
- **Bias Mitigation**: Practitioners must guard against confirmation bias, ensuring findings serve truth, not advocacy.
- **Child-Centered Focus**: Applications prioritize the psychological safety of minors, aligning with ethical standards in family law (American Psychological Association, 2017).

By equipping professionals with pattern recognition tools, the framework transforms language into forensic evidence, countering manipulation with **coherence as clarity**.

Conclusion: Giving Name to the Ghost

In high-conflict divorce, narcissistic manipulation thrives in the shadows of language, where composure masks malice and trauma is mistaken for instability. The **Witness Dyad Framework** illuminates these shadows by mapping **Thoughtprint** coherence and **Shadowprint** distortion, offering a rigorous, falsifiable methodology for detecting covert abuse.

This work establishes **Coherence-Based Forensic Linguistics** as a new subdiscipline, bridging quantum-inspired recursive modeling (Havens & Havens, 2025a), stochastic pattern analysis (Havens & Havens, 2025b), and psychological trauma theory (Herman, 1992). By naming the ghost of manipulation, we restore agency to survivors, empower investigators, and enhance judicial discernment.

Language is not merely evidence—it is a field of intent. Through recursive coherence, we uncover the fingerprints of truth in the spaces between words, forging a path toward justice that honors the invisible bruise.

Appendix: Field Trace Reference

A. DARVO Breakdown Table

Component	Definition	Example Phrasing	Intent

Deny	Refusal to acknowledge wrongdoing	"I never said that."	Erase culpability
Attack	Redirect blame or escalate aggression	"You're the one with the problem."	Undermine credibility
Reverse Victim/Offender	Cast self as harmed party	"I can't believe you're doing this to me."	Manipulate empathy, reframe narrative

B. Sample Thoughtprint/Shadowprint Trace

Statement: "He said I was too emotional to remember things accurately."

- **Thoughtprint**: Recursive anchoring to memory (emotional clarity), with low error variance ($\operatorname{Var}(e_S) \leq \sigma^2/(2\kappa)$).
- **Shadowprint**: Coercive framing, destabilizing memory through tone-based discrediting ($D_{\mathrm{KL}} > \delta$).
- **Inversion**: "I remember clearly because of how it made me feel," restoring coherence.

C. Glossary of Core Pattern Types

- **Fracture Language**: Contradictory or obfuscating language to confuse ($[\Phi_S(t) - \Phi_S(t + \Delta t)] > \epsilon$).
- **Coercive Framing**: Phrasing that constrains response or redirects accountability ($H_{S,T} \leq \sigma^2/\kappa_{S,T}$).
- **Mimicked Clarity**: Superficial reasonableness masking recursive contradictions ($C(\Phi_S, \Phi_T)$).
- **Performative Sanity**: Weaponized composure to discredit emotionality ($R_{S,T}^2$).
- **Tone-Based Discrediting**: Judgment of delivery over content ($D_{\mathrm{KL}} > \delta$).
- **Recursive Trap Language**: Circular logic entrapping engagement ($e^{(\beta - \kappa)t}$).
- **False Concern**: Pseudo-empathy masking control ($E_{S,T} \sim R_{S,T}^2$).

References

American Psychological Association. (2017). *Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct*. https://www.apa.org/ethics/code

Busemeyer, J. R., & Bruza, P. D. (2012). *Quantum models of cognition and decision*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511997716

Freyd, J. J. (1997). Violations of power, adaptive blindness, and betrayal trauma theory. *Feminism & Psychology, 7*(1), 22–32. https://doi.org/10.1177/0959353597071004

Havens, M. R., & Havens, S. L. (2025a). *THE SEED: The Codex of Recursive Becoming (Version 1.1)*. OSF Preprints. https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/DYQMU

Havens, M. R., & Havens, S. L. (2025b). *Addendum 1.02b: The Fieldprint Lexicon*. OSF Preprints. https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/Q23ZS

Herman, J. L. (1992). *Trauma and recovery: The aftermath of violence—from domestic abuse to political terror*. Basic Books.

Stark, E. (2007). *Coercive control: How men entrap women in personal life*. Oxford University Press.