Abstract: This article describes Professor Heikki E.S. Mattila’s achievements in the area of comparative legal linguistics. It concentrates on the process of emergence of basic conceptual structure in Mattila’s work. Further developments and methodological requirements of the basic conceptual structure established by him are analyzed as well. Additionally, the establishing of comparative legal linguistics as a teaching subject is scrutinized from the methodological perspective that is based on interdisciplinarity. Likewise, possibilities for expansion of the conceptual structure of the newly established area of knowledge are discussed within a broadened paradigmatic framework. Complete bibliography of Mattila’s legal-linguistic studies is annexed to this article.
Preliminaries

Writing about scholars and artists is challenging, especially if the biographic trap should be avoided. Biographic trap or briefly ‘biographism’ is the perspective upon individual intellectual achievements that aims at explaining whatever artistic or scholarly advancement as a result of individual biographic developments. This is not my aim in this article as I assume that theories and academic subjects related to them develop within paradigms largely independent of researchers’ biographies. Therefore, in my writings I advocated the non-biographic approach to literary production (cf. Galdia 1989)\(^1\). One could claim that an academic discipline is shaped by the state-of-the-art which predetermines its further development until a paradigmatic change takes place. Biographies of researchers seem secondary in such developments. This does not mean, however, that biographies would not matter in academia. Personal commitments of scholars guarantee progress in sciences; scholars fill with dynamic academic institutions that are founded on social, and only exceptionally on personal grounds. Within the context so defined, it seems to me to be possible to speak about individual scholarly achievements such as those discussed in this article. What is more, it is not for the first time that I am writing about Professor Mattila. In my previous writings on his research, I mainly reviewed his publications and analyzed some characteristic features of his legal-linguistic reflection. In this article I focus mainly on the process of establishing the new area of knowledge by Professor Mattila and on issues related to this process. After having spoken about myself, I now return to the real protagonist of my article, Professor Heikki E.S. Mattila.

---

\(^1\) I began my research activities with a book dedicated to the work of a Finnish poetess (cf. Galdia 1989) while avoiding the relation between her work and the circumstances of her life. Later I wrote about Professor Czeslaw Kudzinowski’s academic achievements (cf. Galdia 1990/91) largely excluding the biographic connection. Interestingly, Mattila owns in his personal library also Kudzinowski’s *Słownik fińsko-polski* (Finnish-Polish Dictionary, 1988) in two volumes that he uses regularly for purposes of his research. Both my named publications are also known to Professor Heikki E.S. Mattila whose professional work mainly in the area of legal linguistics I am now starting to describe.
Relevant biographic data

Prof. Mattila’s biography was rendered in the Liber Amicorum (2008) dedicated to him and edited by the staff of the University of Lapland in Rovaniemi, Richard Foley, Tarja Salmi-Tolonen, Iris Tukiainen, and Birgitta Vehmas on the occasion of his sixtieth anniversary. A biographic note included in Mattila’s Liber Amicorum applies the Scandinavian pattern of ironical distance and levelling comradeship that I methodically do not follow (cf. Aarnio/Saarenpää 2008). My biographic observations are partly based on some facts and remarks stated in the biographic note by A. Aarnio and A. Saarenpää as well as on R. Foley et al. (2008) in the Liber Amicorum (cf. Foley et al. 2008), partly on Mattila’s autobiographic essay (cf. Mattila 2003), and also on my personal exchanges with Mattila.

Heikki E.S. Mattila was born 1947 in Helsinki. The combination of his first and of his family name is not rare in Finland. In order to avoid misunderstandings concerning the authorship of his writings he started signing his legal-linguistic publications with Heikki E.S. Mattila, E.S. standing for his other names Eero Sakari. Mattila studied in his native town Helsinki until obtaining his Master of Laws in 1969, and in 1971 also the title of the Licentiate of Laws. During his subsequent studies in Paris, he received the Diplôme de l’Institut de droit comparé in 1975. He spent the time of his doctoral studies mainly in Poland, in Warsaw and in Poznań in the mid-1970s and acquired the grade of the Doctor of Law at the University in Helsinki based on his French language doctoral thesis: Les successions agricoles et la structure de la société. Une étude en droit comparé (cf. Mattila 1979). His thesis concerned the legal problems of farm inheritance in Poland as a socialist country compared with market economy countries. Opponents in the process of attribution of his doctor degree were Professors Andrzej Stelmachowski (Warsaw) and Aulis Aarnio (Helsinki). For a short time, he practiced law between 1981 and 1982 at the Helsinki Child Welfare Office where he was responsible for international family-law matters, especially for international maintenance recovery. His professional career was during several years dominated by his work as editor-in-chief of the Encyclopædia Iuridica Fennica. This encyclopaedia was published between 1994 and 1999. He is also co-author of a Finnish law abbreviations dictionary (2004) and was the editor-in-chief of the Database of Finnish Legal Terms.
between 2012 and 2020. 2003 Mattila was appointed professor of legal linguistics at the University of Lapland in Rovaniemi, he is professor emeritus since 2010. He also held some positions of trust as Secretary-General of the International Association for Philosophy of Law and Social Philosophy between 1983 and 1987. He was between 1992 and 2003 member of the editorial council of *Suomen Laki* and *Finlands Lag* which are Finnish- and Swedish-language compilations of the laws of Finland. He contributed as an expert on legal languages to the activities of the Translator Examination Board of Finland between 1992 and 2009 and to the Consultative State Committee for Language Matters, of which he was a permanent member between 2004 and 2011. He is a member of the scientific council of the Catalan *Revista de llengua i dret* (Barcelona). Mattila is also the founding member of the International Language and Law Association and a member of the Finnish Academy of Science and Letters since 2004. He was elected by the Matthias Calonius Society “Finnish Legal Historian of the Year 2005” and by the Finnish Lawyers’ Association “Finnish Legal Scholar of the Year 2009”. Currently, as a professor emeritus, he holds the position of a docent of Comparative Law at the University of Helsinki, and he continues to contribute to legal-linguistic research as an author of numerous articles and as a translator as well as a supervisor of doctoral theses in his field.

**Intellectual anchorage**

Since the beginning of his academic career, Mattila’s scholarly interests were stable, yet they also expanded over time. His interests focused on law, there especially on private law, mainly family and succession law, private international law and on comparative legal studies. In the background of these interests there are legal theory and legal history, cultural studies, and interest in languages. Aulis Aarnio and Ahti Saarenpää (2008: xv) stressed in the development of Mattila’s research method the international dimension in times when Finnish legal academia in 1970s was dominated by local interests. Indeed, Mattila started publishing on legal theory and comparative issues and he largely travelled for research purposes that was rare in this time. Famous among his Finnish colleagues are his travels to Hungary and
Czechoslovakia in the 70s of the past century in search of materials for his research in which he as a Western researcher travelling to Eastern European countries has had from the very beginning limited chances yet he performed extraordinarily. Beyond these travels, his studies in France and Poland in the 70s were decisive for all his future academic development. The comparative perspective upon law that he studied in France, his subsequent translation of René David’s classical *Les grands systèmes de droit contemporains* into Finnish and his stay in Poland in the 1970s culminated in his doctoral dissertation and a series of articles and translations, also in Polish. In Poland, Mattila established contacts with one of the supervisors of his doctoral thesis, Professor Andrzej Stelmachowski, as well as with Professors Zygmunt Ziembinski, Jan Woleński, Jerzy Wróblewski, Józef Piątowski and Leszek Nowak. These contacts were not only beneficial for him but also for the Finnish legal science that via Mattila’s contacts was able to broaden the spectrum of its exchanges and to invite these scholars to Finland. Meanwhile, at a point Mattila’s interest shifted to the study of the legal language in a comparative perspective. Interestingly, his idea extended also to establishing a formally distinct teaching subject. Foley et al. (2008: xxi) stressed the importance of Mattila’s article *Oikeuslingvistikiikka oppiaineena* (1997) that started the discussion about establishing legal linguistics as a subject of study in Finland, and especially at the University of Lapland where a related subject, namely legal informatics existed already since decades. Since 1996 Mattila was developing this idea and 2003 he was appointed professor of legal linguistics at the University of Lapland in Rovaniemi.

**Law and its language**

Mattila was born in Finland, a country whose earlier law was written in Swedish. In consequence, the Finnish texts of this law were - like the text of Finland’s national anthem - a translation from Swedish. Historically, therefore Finnish law is like many other legal systems a translated law. Until today, Finland’s laws are drafted and applied in two official languages of the country, Finnish and Swedish. This feature of Finnish law led to the question whether the belonging of Swedish and Finnish languages to different linguistic families would actually
lead to particular problems in coining one law in two languages. The answer to this question was surprising as no particular problems beyond those known from the general theory of translation were identified in bilingual legal texts in Finland. The reason for this finding is apparently that both legal texts refer to one legal system that constitutes the background of all interpretive activity in law. This finding strengthened Mattila’s approach to the language of law that contrasts legal terms and legal concepts. Mattila, himself a bilingual Finnish and Swedish speaker, was involved in legislative drafting in both languages. This experience contributed to his firm standing as a legal linguist for whom transgressing the limits of national languages is a matter of principle.

Within legal linguistics, Mattila’s initial interests focused particularly on legal concepts in relation to legal terms that he developed in his publications into a central area of legal-linguistic studies. This interest has its roots in legal theory and legal doctrine. Corresponding areas in applied linguistics were lexicology and lexicography that remain central to his conception of legal language to this day. Later Mattila’s conception was expanded by general semiotic and communicational aspects (cf. Mattila 2013) while remaining focused on legal terminology. An impressive achievement in this area of his interests is his work as the editor-in-chief, assisted by thirty-one sectorial editors and more than three hundred article authors of the *Encyclopædia Iuridica Fennica* (EIF), published under the auspices of the Finnish Lawyers’ Association. This national encyclopaedia was not only intellectually but also economically a challenge in a country with a limited number of potential readers for such a work. It covered the totality of the Finnish legal culture in eight volumes containing three thousand seven hundred two-column pages. The conception of the legal encyclopaedia was based on the above-mentioned strict distinction between legal concepts and legal terms. It focused on legal concepts in contradistinction to legal dictionaries that are based on legal terms. This distinction is also visible in Mattila’s research on general questions of legal language and on legal abbreviations that complemented the main areas of his legal-linguistic interest.

Mattila’s interest in foreign languages such as French, Latin, Spanish, Italian, German, Polish and Russian is also related to his Finnish mother tongue that may easily impede rather than advance academic careers. Mattila became internationally renowned due to his publications in English and French, yet his research published in Finnish and Swedish is no less significant. It seems to me that the whole
of his legal-linguistic conception and the depth of his legal-linguistic analyses can be fully assessed only in his Finnish language publications. These writings reach further, also in terms of detailed legal-linguistic analyses than the English texts which have often a synthetic, textbook-like format. A high price has regularly to be paid for writing in a lesser used language such as Finnish. English editions of his main work helped Mattila to avoid being marginalized and they also established his position as a noted expert in legal-linguistic studies. Not all legal linguists were as lucky as he is. Some of them, for instance Maria Teresa Lizisowa (1937 – 2019) remain internationally unknown, notwithstanding their unique contributions. Mattila, due to his knowledge of the Polish language mentions Lizisowa’s work. Other renowned non-Polish legal linguists do not. Knowledge of languages provided additional input into the development of his interests. Since the beginning of his professional career Professor Mattila was particularly attracted by two countries, France and Poland. The influence of these two countries and their – not only legal – culture is omnipresent in his whole academic work. His doctoral thesis Les successions agricoles et la structure de la société. Une étude en droit comparé (1979) although written in French, concerns the comparison of the Polish and the Finnish agrarian legislation. As far as Poland is concerned², Mattila’s biographers (cf. Foley et al. 2008: xviii) refer particularly to his studies in Poland in his younger years and the influence of Polish scholars such as Zygmunt Ziembiński, Jan Woleński, Andrzej Stelmachowski, Leszek Nowak, and JerzyWróblewski on his legal thinking. From this time dates his interest in and knowledge of the Polish language and numerous translations from Polish into Finnish. Mattila regularly follows publications on legal-linguistic issues that appear in Polish. He also stressed the particular importance of Polish achievements in the area of legal theory and legal linguistics/legilinguistics and the leading role that this journal has for

² Poland-related research comprises next to Mattila’s doctoral dissertation also scholarly articles such as Środki prawne stymulujące zmiany pokoleń w rolnictwie fińskim (‘Legal instruments stimulating the transfer of farms to the next generation’), In: Wieś współczesna 12/1976, pp. 137–140, Palestra ja puolalaisuus, In: Defensor Legis 1–2/1979, pp. 49–51, and Formy prawne sąsiedzkiej współpracy zespołowej rolników w Finlandii (‘Legal Forms of Farmer Cooperation in Finland’), In: Zagadnienia ustroju prawnego rolnictwa, Ossolineum, Warszawa 1980, pp. 121–130, as well as several translations of Polish academic texts into Finnish.
the advancement of legal-linguistic/legilinguistic studies all over the world.

Mattila himself stressed that professional contacts with the laws of France and Poland shaped his idea of comparison. In Poland, he wrote about agricultural law and published several articles that witness to his perspicuous attitude and commitment to detail. The link between comparative law and legal linguistics is better visible in the Finnish language version of his textbooks where not only the legal languages but also the legal systems are characterized. Due to place constraints, his findings upon legal systems were not included in English and French editions.

Work in progress

Becoming a legal linguist was for Mattila the result of a long searching process that was unavoidable as legal linguistics in the systematic sense did not exist in his youth and Mattila had to shape it, i.e. first to invent himself as a legal linguist and not just to decide to join an existing discipline. Becoming professor of applied linguistics is different from becoming professor of legal linguistics. Mattila is one of few persons worldwide who were confronted with this choice and he also courageously exercised options that this choice offers against all odds. Mattila himself regularly stressed to work actually on one book notwithstanding his five editions (in three languages) of *Comparative Legal Linguistics* that appeared in print since its original Finnish language version in 2002. Clearly, there is difference to be made between ‘work’ and ‘book’. Yet, metaphorically his attempt to shape comparative legal linguistics as a discipline and not as a collection of knowledge published about different legal languages all over the world is the underlaying tendency of his work. His work definitely expanded over time, while the importance of legal translation diminished in it, mainly because the native Finnish that Mattila uses also as a translator is accessible to a very limited number of readers.

The first Finnish edition of *Vertaileva oikeuslingvistiiikka* was published in 2002, later, in 2006 it was translated into English (from the French manuscript) by Christopher Goddard, a British-born lawyer and legal linguist, founder of the laudable master program in legal
linguistics at the Riga Graduate School of Law. The second edition of
his *Comparative Legal Linguistics* appeared in print in 2013. Almost
simultaneously, the French original of the English translation was
printed in Quebec by the publishing house Yvon Blais as
*Jurilinguistique comparée* (2012) in Mattila’s linguistic version that
was reviewed by Professor emeritus Jean-Claude Gémar, a leading
Franco-Canadian traductologist and legal linguist. Already the first
editions of the Finnish and English linguistic versions were acclaimed
by many reviewers. On the first English language edition of
*Comparative Legal Linguistics* (2006) at least eleven reviews were
published. Many reviews on his publications witness to the interest
brought to his books as standards on legal-linguistic research. Mattila’s
textbook on comparative legal linguistics in its Finnish-, English- and
French-language versions established itself as a reliable account of
legal-linguistic achievements in the concerned academia worldwide.
Overall, as far as one can see, Mattila’s work is the only introductory
textbook into problems of comparative law and legal language available
today. It is the most reliable source of information for everyone
interested in linguistic aspects of law.

**Characteristic features of Mattila’s conception of comparative legal linguistics**

Professor Mattila’s conception of legal-linguistic studies that he termed
‘comparative legal linguistic’ became particularly productive for the
development of the legal-linguistic research (cf. Galdia 2006: 271;
Lundmark 2012: 51 sqq.). Mattila developed his conception of
comparative legal linguistics in close relation with comparative law.
The initial matrix of comparative legal linguistics can be found in René
David’s conception of comparative law (cf. David 1978). David’s
textbook on comparative law was translated by Mattila into Finnish and
published between 1982 and 1986. Furthermore, Gérard Cornu’s
conception of ‘legal linguistics’ (cf. Cornu 1990) shaped his initial
approach to the language of the law. These two conceptions merged in
Mattila’s thinking into comparative legal linguistics\(^3\). Yet, unlike most legal comparatists, he did not concentrate on the functional or structural elements of different legal systems. Instead, he focused rather on the linguistic form of law and predominantly on the legal terminology. He finally combined the analysis of legal terminology with communicative aspects of law. By so doing, he made an important step toward the consolidation of the disparate data that legal-linguistic research engendered until he started his systematizing work in legal linguistics. In his research published mainly in the Finnish language Mattila pondered over the systematic frame of reference for the comparative-linguistic approach that he now follows with admirable consequence (cf. Mattila 2008; 2010). Mattila started with identifying general features of the legal language that he distilled through the analysis of particular legal languages such as English, French, German, Spanish and Latin. Mattila (2018: 122 -127) perceived as characteristic of the language of law: the frequency of definitions, tautology, information density, abstraction, hypothetical nature (i.e. the timelessness of law that regulates also future factual constellations), neutrality, frequency of references, organized text structure and formalism, frequency of abbreviations, and sentence complexity. Today, all these characteristic features of the legal language may be exposed to further critical scrutiny. First of all, it seems expedient to distinguish between the ideal language of law defined by jurists where precision and timelessness should reign and the reality of the use of language in the area of law where ambiguity, vagueness, and underdetermination of meaning are omnipresent. In most legal-linguistic studies, the legal language is determined within this dichotomy of ideal and reality. As mentioned, Mattila focused particularly on problems of legal terminology that he also synthesized in his chapter Legal Vocabulary published in The Oxford Handbook of Language and Law (cf. Mattila 2012). Legal-linguistic comparison emerged in his conception of legal linguistics between rivalry and complementarity of legal languages. Consequently, Mattila can justly claim that some languages play a formatting role in this process while others mostly follow paths beaten by the dominating legal languages. This result justifies the choice of languages that are analyzed in his works. His survey of languages starts with legal Latin,

\(^3\) Mattila knew personally René David (1906 – 1990) whom he also visited at David’s home in Aix-en-Provence. He also met Gérard Corru (1926 – 2007) during a research travel to Paris.
continues over German, French, and Spanish, and ends with the English legal language. Other languages that are treated in his works such as Greek, Polish, Russian, Finnish and the Scandinavian languages are researched in combination of diachronic and synchronic aspects putting stress upon linguistic interrelations in the process of emergence of singular legal languages. For Mattila, legal Latin has always been fundamental to the development and the understanding of the legal language. Mattila insisted therefore in many publications upon the importance of legal Latin for the legal-linguistic research (cf. Mattila 2004, 2010, 2020). Unlike many other legal writers, he did not limit his involvement in this area to erudite statements but became engaged in a series of research projects into legal Latin and its contemporary use that led to surprising results. They are accounted for in his book’s chapter on legal Latin (cf. Mattila 2013). In fact, legal Latin takes a particular position in Mattila’s research. His main achievement in this area was beyond the description of the state of the art in legal Latin studies also the finding that legal Latin formulae were used with different frequency in different legal languages. Mattila summed up his findings upon this subject in El latín jurídico. Historia, uso internacional, problemas de comunicación, published 2020 in Chile. Mattila stressed, unlike many other writers dealing with Law and Language, the shaping role that the Latin language has had for the emergence of the legal language and engaged in detailed, also quantitative analyses in this largely abandoned area (cf. Mattila 2002). In his approach he revigorated the research into legal Latin which may have consequences also for the processes in which the language of the global law is coming into being.

Legal language that emerges in Mattila’s perspective is analyzed in his work in contrast to ordinary language. Meanwhile, also plain language claims that are related to ordinary language are taken into consideration, although they do not dominate Mattila’s reflection upon linguistic aspects of legal terminology. More often than not, the plain language claims lead to expectations concerning the understandability of law by everyone that can only disillusion their well-intentioned authors. Mattila sees limits of such undertakings. His views are particularly valuable as they make plain the politically complex nature of law. Indeed, law is complex, not only linguistically, because it is a social discursive practice that is rooted in the deep structure of society. Scandinavian legal writers, and Mattila among them, were among the first to draw our attention to power-dependent language use in law. Many Scandinavian classics of legal theory
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elucidated already some decades ago the conditions and the contexts of language used in law that they perceived as ideological and clearly not as a simple result of alleged linguistic clumsiness of jurists. Language use in law is therefore mainly an issue of ideology and not of linguistic didactic. Meanwhile, Mattila’s approach to the issue is conciliatory. In his view, plain language attempts make sense within legislative drafting, yet they also have their inherent limits embodied in the reducible yet finally unavoidable complexity of modern law.

Mattila’s comparative approach differs from the monolingual perspective adapted by some other researchers, such as G. Cornu, P. Tiersma, and M. T. Lizisowa who usually focused on the relation between the ordinary language and the legal language perceived as special register. Mattila prepared the ground, both in terms of diachronic and synchronic research, for the mapping of the conceptual framework in legal-linguistic comparative studies. He identified the method for comparative research into legal terminology and legal translation. Additionally, he also selected the relevant languages for the legal-linguistic research. Finally, his research facilitates the broadening of the perspective in legal linguistics, particularly concerning speech acts in law, toward pragmatic issues which I favor. Mattila’s approach is not only developed along the lines of comparative law, but it can be made operative in comparative law as well. Mattila’s work is suitable to function as a background source for researching detailed legal-linguistic constructions. In this context, also Bernard Grossfeld (1990: 103) argued from the perspective of comparative law that legal language is its essential concomitant which in his view does not make it any easier. Meanwhile, comparative law is closest to legal linguistics in the research directed toward contrasting or comparing legal-linguistic operations such as legal argumentation and legal justification. On the other side, legal-comparative research that focuses upon legal regulation is rather remote from the objectives pursued by legal linguists as is the research into foreign law, i. e. the law of a foreign country. Meanwhile, every comparison is a challenge. Therefore, the comparison of incomparable has to be avoided and Mattila solved this problem in a convincing way in his conception of comparative legal linguistics.

Not much criticism on Mattila’s conception of comparative legal linguistics was expressed in literature. It is understandable as for new coinages and paradigmatic changes there are no standards of evaluation. Comparative legal-linguistic research did not exist before
Mattila’s fundamental work, at least in the systematic shape. He had the chance, and he also took the risk in shaping it.

Establishing the subject within academic curriculum

Scholars rarely impose upon themselves the task of establishing a new area of knowledge. While occasional legal-linguistic research has a long tradition and even history, systematic studies of the language of law are new. Only a couple of scholars elucidated this subject regularly and established conceptual structures that enabled the new subject to emerge. Among them is Professor Heikki E.S, Mattila and his conception of comparative legal linguistics. Establishing the subject of study and its first professorship in Rovaniemi (Finland) took time and involved a lot of preparatory work that was supported by Finnish academic institutions (cf. Foley et al. 2008). Mattila established the subject within the faculty of law as connected to comparative law. His approach fits perfectly in such a frame of reference. Meanwhile, the general theory of law allows also for other affinities between legal linguistics and another legal discipline within legal sciences. Methodically, Mattila’s approach is interesting as it helps us to understand how legal linguistics can be established as an independent subject within legal studies or within linguistic studies. It apparently needs an established discipline such as comparative law in Mattila’s case or applied linguistics in some other cases to become a subject of teaching and research in its own right. This older sister discipline provides the institutional link to the system of academic knowledge. In Finland, this initial success did not bring the expected expansion of institutional legal linguistics as an independent area of knowledge. Instead, Mattila’s chair disappeared shortly after his retirement and institutional support for the new subject clearly did not grow in Finland in recent years.
In place of conclusions

Heikki E.S. Mattila is a prolific contributor to the legal-linguistic discourse. Therefore, it would be presumptuous to draw conclusions at the end of my above remarks on the upcoming, the background and the structure of his writings. Much can still be expected from this committed legal linguist especially because his comparative approach to the legal language can easily be expanded. It can comprise many more languages and explore more legal-linguistic phenomena. As no approach is perfect, it can be assumed that Mattila’s work will in one way or another find followers able to integrate and to re-shape it in case of necessity. Already today it is referenced and quoted as a standard work. For my own legal-linguistic research, Mattila’s pioneering work was essential not only as encouragement to deal with an area of knowledge that decades ago was neglected by many tone-setting scholars, especially jurists. Beyond this challenging circumstance, I was also able to use his work as reference on multiple legal-linguistic issues that I would not be able to describe better than did Mattila. This saved me time and efforts and enabled to concentrate on issues that I perceive as complementary to Mattila’s findings. I tried to unite numerous legal-linguistic topics in a conception of pragmatic legal linguistics that displays comparative fundamentals along the lines of Mattila’s findings. Therefore, I have reasons to feel profound gratitude for Mattila’s steps in establishing comparative legal linguistics as a systematic area of knowledge in its own right. Many legal linguists will definitely share my sentiments when thinking about the way that led to the manifestation and subsequent expansion of our knowledge about legal linguistics by Professor Mattila’s pioneering efforts. Today, this research is documented in numerous monographs and academic articles and regularly reported in this journal.
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