

Eser

Comparative Criminal Law

C.H.BECK · HART · NOMOS

Eser
Comparative Criminal Law

Comparative Criminal Law

Development – Aims – Methods

by

Albin Eser

Professor, Dr. iur. Dr. h.c. mult., M.C.J. (NYU)
Director emeritus, Max Planck Institute
for Foreign and International Criminal Law
Freiburg/Germany

translated from the German
by

Brigitte Heilmann

2017

C. H. BECK · HART · NOMOS

Published by

Verlag C. H. Beck oHG, Wilhelmstraße 9, 80801 München, Germany,
eMail: bestellung@beck.de

Co-published by

Hart Publishing, Kemp House, Chawley Park, Cumnor Hill, Oxford, OX2 9PH, United Kingdom,
online at: www.hartpub.co.uk

and

Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft mbH & Co. KG Waldseestraße 3–5, 76530 Baden-Baden,
Germany, eMail: nomos@nomos.de

Published in North America (US and Canada) by Hart Publishing,
c/o International Specialized Book Services, 930 NE 58th Avenue, Suite 300,
Portland, OR 97213-3786, USA, eMail: orders@isbs.com

ISBN 978 3 406 70277 8 (C.H. BECK)

ISBN 978 1 50991 943 7 (HART)

ISBN 978 3 8487 3803 8 (NOMOS)

© 2017 Verlag C. H. Beck oHG
Wilhelmstr. 9, 80801 München
Printed in Germany by
Beltz Bad Langensalza GmbH
Am Fliegerhorst 8, 99947 Bad Langensalza
Typeset by
Reemers Publishing Services GmbH, Krefeld
Cover: Druckerei C. H. Beck Nördlingen

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the prior permission of Verlag C. H. Beck, or as expressly permitted by law under the terms agreed with the appropriate reprographic rights organisation.

Enquiries concerning reproduction which may not be covered by the above should be addressed to
C. H. Beck at the address above.

In love and gratitude
dedicated to

Gerda

my wife and lifelong companion on comparative travels

Preface

Comparative Criminal Law seems to be on the rise, at least in terms of standing on its own feet. However, this was not always the case. When looking into traditional textbooks on “comparative law”, it is amazing to see that this discipline, apparently as a matter of course, seems to have been considered a realm of private law – as if comparison of criminal law was a quantité négligeable that, for whatever reason, did not merit dealing with explicitly.

In recent years, however, this picture has changed. “Comparative criminal law” is gaining recognition as a discipline in its own right, both in research and teaching. Yet, measured by the language and number of publications in this field, one could get the impression that this development is a phenomenon of the English speaking common law world, as in its publications one will hardly find a reference to what is going on in other legal regions, for example in continental-European civil law – unless those scholars write in English. Seemingly, in order to be taken notice of, continental-European comparatists – rather than writing in their own mother tongue – have to present their thoughts and findings in English.

This language issue, however, is not the only reason for editing this originally German publication in an English version. More important is the novel concept and manner in which comparative criminal law is analysed and presented in this volume. Traditional literature on this subject focusses on specific aims or methods of comparing criminal law, or to present the law of selected jurisdictions or “legal families”. In thus narrowing the field of vision, one runs the risk of prioritising a method of comparison without first having gained a full picture of perhaps better tools available. Or even worse, not only a few methodological debates are conducted without first having determined the aim for which the comparison shall be performed. As a result, this type of theoretical discourse does not offer much benefit for practical comparative work. So, one of the most important lessons learned from traditional literature on comparative law is that you cannot discuss methods without first having determined the aim. As these aims can be very different, if not even of greater variety than commonly assumed, it cannot be ignored that there is no “one-size-fits-all-method” in comparisons of criminal law, theory and practice.

It is based on these insights drawn both from long-term experience in comparative practice and theoretical studies that this publication was conceived. Being aware of the interdependence of aims and methods, the appropriate way to proceed is to first clarify and describe the various purposes and functions comparative criminal law may serve. Comparative criminal law can basically be divided into “judicative”, “legislative” and purely “theoretical” fields, eventually supplemented with what may be called the “evaluative-competitive” comparison of criminal law; although the potential for a further variety of subdivisions and possible overlap exists. When realising the considerable diversity of possible aims and ranges that comparisons of criminal law may be employed for, still to believe that this variety of functions could be mastered with one and the same method would be an illusion. Therefore, in a second step it is necessary to show that the variety of goals requires a variety of methods. Whereas in some cases, for instance, a “normative-institutional” approach may suffice, in others a more “functional” method may be indispensable. Alternatively, while a “cultural turn” may be needed in some situations, a “structural” analysis would be more appropriate in others.

But not only does each type of a comparative aim require its best corresponding method(s), no less important is to know in which of the various phases of comparison which method fits best. As it concerns exactly this implementation of theory into practice that is usually neglected in this field, it is one of the main aims of this book to present the methodology of comparative criminal law in a way which eases and encourages its practice.

The importance of clarifying the comparative goal before selecting the method to be applied was proven in a relatively large research project designed to find out in which – similar or different – manner various European jurisdictions would evaluate an exemplary homicide case: in what way and at which stage of the proceeding extenuating circumstances might be taken into consideration, what verdict and sentence might be expected, and finally, how the judgement would be executed and/or when and on what conditions early release might be granted [Albin Eser/Walter Perron (eds.), *Strukturvergleich strafrechtlicher Verantwortlichkeit und Sanktionierung in Europa. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Theorie der Strafrechtsvergleichung*, Berlin 2015, 1144 pages]. Obviously, a comparative project as complex as this cannot be performed with only one method. While for a purely theoretical interest in the relevant crime provisions a legalistic comparison may suffice, for judicial purposes their application in practice, too, would need to be described, thus also requiring empirical comparisons. Additionally, if any possible differences are to be explained, this can hardly be done without the investigation of dissimilarities in the legal culture and tradition. Or to mention just one more legislative aspect, if one wants to explore what are more or less good stages in dividing the criminal proceeding in various phases, possibly with different options for taking aggravating or mitigating circumstances into consideration, then functionalist and structuralist methods become necessary.

Building on these and other lessons learnt from undertaking the project described before, it seemed only logical to put the illustrative material gained from it into a broader theoretical context. This is, in this volume, done in three steps: After an introductory review of the development of comparative criminal law and its general self-understanding and present status (Part I), broad attention is paid to the various aims and functions of comparative criminal law (Part II), followed by an analysis of its methodology (Part III), that is summarised in a practical guide for performing comparative work in criminal law. After a concluding outlook on what remains to be done (Part IV), finally the status of comparative criminal law is illuminated by an analysis and appraisal of current literature in this field (Epilogue).

Although developed from the aforementioned research project (and thus originally building the final part of it), this book is standing on its own as a general theory of comparative criminal law and its practice. As written by a German with a European background, the manner of argumentation, as well as examples selected, may differ from what Anglo-American or other audiences are most used to read, let alone the considerable number of references to non-english literature. However, as a specific feature of comparative criminal law is to become acquainted with other cultures and ways of thinking, it appears desirable rather than feeling frustrated to instead welcome a new foreign approach as an enrichment.

To enjoy such an enrichment from foreign countries and legal culture is a privilege. I was already granted this chance before finishing my German PhD in law (1962), thanks to a Fulbright Foundation scholarship for the Institute of Comparative Law at New York University (1960/61). This proved not only to be an eye-opener to the common law, but also a first signpost to comparative criminal law, due to a Master thesis on “The

Preface

principle of harm”, supervised by the late Professor *Gerhard O.W. Mueller*. His distinct sense for everything strange and his constant encouragement never to let the legal view be restricted by national borders will always be gratefully remembered. Besides many others who deserve my special thanks for having accompanied me on my comparative way, I may in particular mention Professor *George P. Fletcher*, who already in 1981, while I was teaching as Visiting Professor at the University of California at Los Angeles, gave me the chance to participate in the genesis of his comparative “Rethinking Criminal Law” – followed by joint seminars and common publications, cemented further in long-standing ties of friendship. Still more global ways to comparative criminal law were opened by my role as Director of the Max Planck Institute for Foreign and International Criminal Law in Freiburg (1982). In this respect I am not only gratefully thinking of many enlightening conversations which I was able to have with foreign research guests at the Institute but also of numerous visits and lecture tours to other countries, resulting in fruitful comparative insights and leading to quite a lot of mutual cooperation. Above all, however, I gratefully remember my stays as visiting professor in many countries and jurisdictions, for instance in the last ten years in Kyoto in Japan, Hobart in Australia, Haifa and Jerusalem in Israel as well as Columbia and St. Louis in the United States. Teaching foreign students, directly communicating with colleagues – there is hardly a better way to gain comparative experience. Not just a little of these insights found their way into this publication.

With special regard to the genesis of this book, among the various persons who deserved thanks for having contributed to its preparation in this or that way, only these may be mentioned. First of all Professor *Walter Perron* who has borne the main burden in the conceptual design and coordination of the “structure comparison project” which this publication emerged from. Particular thanks must also be given to *Brigitte Heilmann* who translated the German manuscript into English – not an easy task particularly in so far as more than a few of the German criminal-legal concepts, terms and differentiations have no direct equivalent in Anglo-American criminal law and thus still had to be mutually developed. Particular thanks also have to go to Dr. *Wilhelm Warth* of C. H. Beck Verlag for his editorial support: not only for constructing the index but still more for already having encouraged this publication and accompanying it with constant goodwill. Complementing the index and bringing the bibliography up to date was kindly contributed by *Leonie Reichardt* as student intern. For various good advice I am grateful to the British legal academic Dr. *Sophie Eser*.

My greatest and warmest thanks go to my wife *Gerda*. Over many years and decades in which I was occupied with comparative criminal law, starting with my study year in New York up to my still active retirement, she was not only a familial and homely guarantor for preserving me free time for research and teaching but also frequent companion on my comparative travels. This book is dedicated to her in love and gratitude.

Freiburg, April 2017

Albin Eser

Contents

| | Pages |
|--|------------|
| Preface | VII |
| Contents | XI |
| Table of Contents | XIII |
| List of Abbreviations | XVII |
| | |
| Part I. Development and Concepts of Comparative Criminal Law: Where we Stand | 1 |
| A. Setting the Scene – Objectives | 3 |
| B. History and Significance of Comparative Criminal Law | 5 |
| C. Variety of Concepts, Terms and Models | 15 |
| D. Aims – Methods – Prerequisites: Differentiating, Defining and Integrating | 19 |
| E. Comparative (Criminal) Law as “Purpose-free” Science? | 21 |
| | |
| Part II. Aims and Functions of Comparative Criminal Law: Why Explore Foreign Law | 25 |
| A. Theoretical Comparative Criminal Law | 28 |
| B. Judicative Comparative Criminal law | 41 |
| C. Legislative Comparative Criminal law | 57 |
| D. Evaluative-Competitive Comparative Criminal Law | 69 |
| | |
| Part III. Methodology: How to Conduct the Comparison of Criminal Law | 83 |
| A. Connecting Aims and Methods | 85 |
| B. Phases of Investigation – Steps of Examination | 89 |
| C. Personal Requirements and Institutional Framework Conditions | 123 |
| D. A Guideline for Comparative Work in – primarily but not only – Criminal Law | 130 |
| | |
| Part IV. Outlook: What Remains to Be Done | 139 |
| | |
| Epilogue. On the Status of Comparative Criminal Law: An Appraisal of Current Literature | 145 |
| A. The Emancipation of Comparative Criminal Law | 147 |
| B. Concepts and Focal Points in Publications on Comparative Criminal Law | 150 |
| C. Concluding Remark | 157 |
| | |
| Bibliography | 159 |
| | |
| Index | 179 |

Table of Contents

| | Margin number |
|--|------------------|
| Part I. Development and Concepts of Comparative Criminal Law: Where we Stand | |
| A. Setting the Scene – Objectives | 1 |
| B. History and Significance of Comparative Criminal Law | 5 |
| 1. Developmental phases | 5 |
| 2. Increasing importance and emancipation of comparative criminal law | 20 |
| C. Variety of Concepts, Terms and Models | 29 |
| D. Aims – Methods – Prerequisites: Differentiating, Defining and Integrating | 37 |
| E. Comparative (Criminal) Law as “Purpose-free” Science? | 45 |
| Part II. Aims and Functions of Comparative Criminal Law: Why Explore Foreign Law | |
| A. Theoretical Comparative Criminal Law | 52 |
| 1. Broadening the horizon through foreign law – reflection on one's own law | 54 |
| 2. Basic research in comparative criminal law | 57 |
| a) Foreign law presentation (“Auslandsrechtskunde”) versus foreign law comparison (“Rechtsvergleichung”) | 57 |
| b) Micro comparison – macro comparison – basic research | 60 |
| c) Universal comparative criminal law – Claims and achievability | 72 |
| d) “Systematic comparative criminal law” – “Structural comparison” | 82 |
| 3. Facilitating communication and promoting consensus by comparative criminal law | 91 |
| 4. Critical control and innovation function of comparative criminal law | 95 |
| 5. Preparatory function of comparative criminal law for practical purposes | 96 |
| B. Judicative Comparative Criminal Law | 97 |
| 1. Direct consideration of foreign law in the application of law | 101 |
| a) Foreign law import | 102 |
| (i) “Authentic” – “Implementing” application of foreign law | 103 |
| (ii) “Limiting” application of foreign law | 104 |
| (iii) “Blanket-type” application of foreign law | 105 |
| (iv) Application of foreign law by “completing the offence definition” | 106 |
| (v) “Incorporated international crimes” | 107 |
| (vi) “Subsidiary” application of foreign law | 108 |
| b) Dependence of punitive power on foreign law | 109 |
| (i) Relevance for mistake of law | 110 |
| (ii) Dual criminality | 111 |
| (iii) Mutual criminality | 112 |
| (iv) Transnational prohibition of multiple prosecutions | 113 |
| (v) Principle of complementarity | 114 |
| 2. Judicial finding of justice and further development of the law through comparative criminal law | 115 |
| a) Horizontal-transnational Broadening of the Field of Vision | 116 |
| (i) Comparative criminal law as an “interpretation aid” | 117 |
| (ii) Recourse to foreign “parent law” | 118 |
| (iii) Filling gaps – further development of the law | 119 |

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----|
| b) Supranational influences on national criminal law | 121 |
| (i) Priority of European Union Law | 122 |
| (ii) Interpretation favourable to international law | 124 |
| c) Influences of national law on supranational criminal law | 125 |
| (i) Interpretation of international criminal law through reference to national law | 126 |
| (ii) Recourse to general principles of law | 127 |
| (iii) Development of a supranational criminal law dogmatics | 129 |
| 3. Executory comparative criminal law | 130 |
| C. Legislative Comparative Criminal Law | 133 |
| 1. Aims and tasks | 135 |
| a) Optimization and modernization of one's own national criminal law | 135 |
| (i) Optimization | 136 |
| (ii) Modernization | 138 |
| (iii) Stockpile of solutions – (no) self-service shop | 144 |
| b) Transnational adaptations of criminal law | 146 |
| (i) Assimilation | 147 |
| (ii) Harmonization | 148 |
| (iii) Unification | 149 |
| c) The development of universal and supranational criminal law | 150 |
| (i) Identification of the highest legal principles | 151 |
| (ii) Preparation of international conventions | 152 |
| (iii) Optimizing international criminal justice | 153 |
| 2. Levels and ranges of regulations | 157 |
| a) Differences in scope | 158 |
| (i) Selective changes of law | 158 |
| (ii) Structural changes | 159 |
| (iii) Model Penal Codes | 162 |
| (iv) New transnational judiciaries | 163 |
| b) Different levels of regulation | 164 |
| (i) National level | 165 |
| (ii) Regional level | 167 |
| (iii) Universal level | 169 |
| (iv) Supranational level | 171 |
| D. Evaluative-Competitive Comparative Criminal law | 173 |
| 1. History of concepts | 174 |
| 2. Different aspects of evaluation | 178 |
| 3. Evaluation as part of comparative law | 187 |
| 4. From evaluative to competitive comparative law | 195 |
| a) Controlling and warning function | 200 |
| b) Legitimizing function | 204 |
| c) Gap-filling function | 207 |
| d) Function of critical initiative and innovation | 208 |
| e) Optimizing and modifying function | 210 |
| f) Harmonizing function | 213 |
| g) Preference-setting function | 214 |

Table of Contents

Part III. Methodology: How to Conduct the Comparison of Criminal Law

| | |
|--|-----|
| A. Connecting Aims and Methods | 219 |
| 1. Dependence of the method on the (set) objective – Openness of methods | 219 |
| 2. Guiding principles – Ways of approach | 223 |
| B. Phases of Investigation – Steps of Examination | 229 |
| 1. Formulation of the task – Working hypotheses – Catalogue of questions | 231 |
| a) Determining the purpose to be pursued and at what level it is to be carried out | 232 |
| b) Questionable targets and alternatives | 237 |
| (i) Claim to universality | 238 |
| (ii) Legal-internal methods of comparison versus culturally-oriented comparative law | 241 |
| (iii) “Question driven” versus “theory driven” | 242 |
| c) Different(ly) appropriate methods of comparison | 243 |
| (i) Legalistic normative-institutional approach | 244 |
| (ii) Socio-functional directions | 247 |
| (iii) Cultural comparison | 250 |
| (iv) Functional equivalence | 253 |
| (v) Structural dimensions of comparison | 256 |
| (vi) Summary of what to establish for the determination of the comparative task | 262 |
| d) Working hypotheses – Catalogue of questions | 263 |
| (i) Thematical aspects | 264 |
| (ii) In perspective view | 268 |
| (iii) Width and depth dimension | 270 |
| (iv) Pretest | 273 |
| 2. Choice of countries to be compared | 276 |
| a) Orientation towards the comparative objective – Selection criteria | 276 |
| (i) No one-sided choice – no “numerus clausus” | 277 |
| (ii) Rules of thumb | 281 |
| (iii) Legal families | 283 |
| b) Exemplification through comparative criminal law projects | 286 |
| c) Pretest – Pilot study – Corrective changes | 290 |
| 3. Preparation of the country reports | 295 |
| a) Starting point – Perspective – Integral/holistic approach | 296 |
| b) Covering the relevant law | 299 |
| c) Inclusion of criminology and other empirical sciences | 302 |
| d) Cultural background – Interrelationship of law and culture | 304 |
| e) Case-based comparative method | 307 |
| f) Computer-assisted comparison | 309 |
| 4. Comparison – Cross-section – Creation of models | 310 |
| a) Binational comparison | 311 |
| b) Multinational cross-section | 314 |
| c) Creation of models | 318 |
| 5. Evaluation – Recommendations | 322 |
| a) Dependence on the comparative objective – Steps of evaluation | 322 |
| b) Criteria of evaluation | 329 |
| c) Prerequisites for comparison | 333 |

Table of Contents

| | | |
|--|---|------------|
| C. | Personal Requirements and Institutional Framework Conditions | 337 |
| 1. | Personal requirements | 338 |
| a) | Comparatists – Cooperation | 338 |
| b) | Professional qualifications | 347 |
| c) | Personal integrity | 351 |
| 2. | Institutional equipment | 354 |
| D. | A Guideline for Comparative Work in – primarily but not only – Criminal Law | 359 |
| 0. | Guiding principle throughout: Orientation of method and individual work steps towards the objective of the legal comparison | 360 |
| 1. | First working step: Goal setting | 364 |
| 1.1. | Choice and formulation of the comparative objective | 366 |
| 1.2. | Development of a catalogue of questions based on working hypotheses | 367 |
| 2. | Second working step: Choice of countries | 368 |
| 2.1. | Basic direction | 369 |
| 2.2. | Number of countries to be included | 371 |
| 2.3. | Preliminary study – Subsequent improvements | 377 |
| 3. | Third working step: Country reports | 380 |
| 3.1. | Starting point: Perspective – preconceptions | 382 |
| 3.2. | Coverage and presentation of the relevant legal matter | 386 |
| 3.3. | Inclusion of other sciences or contexts | 387 |
| 3.4. | Methodology of investigation | 388 |
| 3.5. | Subsequent amendments | 389 |
| 4. | Fourth working step: Comparison | 391 |
| 4.1. | Catalogue of criteria | 392 |
| 4.2. | Binational comparison | 393 |
| 4.3. | Multinational cross-section | 394 |
| 4.4. | Creation of models – Establishment of basic structures and general legal rules | 395 |
| 5. | Fifth working step: Evaluation – Recommendations | 396 |
| 5.1. | Options of evaluation | 397 |
| 5.2. | Criteria of evaluation | 398 |
| 5.3. | Prerequisites for comparison and recommendation | 399 |
| Part IV. Outlook: What Remains to Be Done | | 400 |
| Epilogue. On the Status of Comparative Criminal Law: An Appraisal of Current Literature | | |
| A. | The Emancipation of Comparative Criminal Law | 412 |
| B. | Concepts and Focal Points in Publications on Comparative Criminal Law | 417 |
| 1. | Size – Choice of countries | 418 |
| 2. | Selection criteria | 424 |
| 3. | Basic categories. Teaching material – Foreign law presentations – Comparative theory | 428 |
| 4. | Thematic focal points | 438 |
| C. | Concluding Remark | 444 |

List of Abbreviations

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| AIDP | Association Internationale der Droit Privé |
| BGBI. | Bundesgesetzblatt (German Federal Law Gazette) |
| BGE | Entscheidungen des Schweizer Bundesgerichts (Decisions of the Swiss Federal Supreme Court) |
| BGH | Bundesgerichtshof (German Federal Supreme Court) |
| BGHSt | Entscheidungen des Bundesgerichtshofs in Strafsachen (Decisions of the German Federal Supreme Court in criminal matters) |
| BVerfG | Bundesverfassungsgericht (German Federal Constitutional Court) |
| BVerfGE | Entscheidungen des Bundesverfassungsgerichts (Decisions of the German Federal Constitutional Court) |
| cf. | confer (compare) |
| CISA | Convention on Implementing the Schengen Agreement |
| DStrZ | Deutsche Strafrechtszeitung |
| ECHR | European Convention on Human Rights |
| ECJ | European Court of Justice/Court of Justice of the European Union |
| ECtHR | European Court of Human Rights |
| ed. | edition, editor |
| eds. | editions, editors |
| espec. | especially |
| EU | European Union |
| EUCFR | Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union |
| EuCJ | European Court of Justice |
| EuGH | Europäischer Gerichtshof |
| EuGRZ | Europäische Grundrechte-Zeitschrift |
| f./ff. | and the following page/pages |
| fn. | footnote |
| FS | Festschrift (Liber amicorum) |
| GA | Goltdammer's Archiv für Strafrecht |
| GPC | German Penal Code |
| Ibid. | ibidem |
| ICC | International Criminal Court |
| ICTR | International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda |
| ICTY | International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia |
| id. | Idem/eadem |
| IKV | International Kriminalistische Vereinigung |
| IRG | Gesetz über die internationale Rechtshilfe in Strafsachen (German International Legal Assistance Act) |
| JICJ | Journal of International Criminal Justice |
| JuS | Juristische Schulung |
| JZ | JuristenZeitung |
| MJECL | Maastricht Journal of European and Comparative Law |
| mn. | margin number |
| MPI | Max Planck Institute (for Foreign and International Criminal Law) |
| MPIS | Max Planck Informationssystem zur Strafrechtsvergleichung/International Max Planck Information System for Comparative Criminal Law |
| NJW | Neue Juristische Wochenschrift |
| NSZ | Neue Zeitschrift für Strafrecht |
| OECD | Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development |
| p./pp. | page/pages |
| para./paras. | paragraph/paragraphs |
| RabelsZ | Rabels Zeitschrift für ausländisches und internationales Privatrecht |
| RPE | Rules of Procedure and Evidence |
| RW | Rechtswissenschaft |
| StGB | Strafgesetzbuch (German Penal Code) |
| StPO | Strafprozeßordnung (German Criminal Procedure Code) |
| StV | Der Strafverteidiger |
| TEU | Treaty on European Union |
| TFEU | Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union |

List of Abbreviations

| | |
|----------------|---|
| UN | United Nations |
| UNIDROIT | International Institute for the Unification of Private Law |
| vol | Volume |
| VStGB | Völkerstrafgesetzbuch (German Code of International Criminal Law) |
| W.L.R. | Weekly Law Reports |
| ZaöRV | Zeitschrift für ausländisches öffentliches Recht und Völkerrecht |
| ZiS | Zeitschrift für internationale Strafrechtsdogmatik |
| ZSchwR | Zeitschrift für Schweizerisches Recht |
| ZStW | Zeitschrift für die Gesamte Strafrechtswissenschaft |