Les traducteurs, notamment, ces "bros consommateurs" de dictionnaires. Les professionnels de la traduction sapprovisionnent dans les librairies techniques et générales, donc par le canal de distribution des gros éditeurs scientifiques. La pénétration de ce marché n'est pas difficile: contrairement à ce que pourrait croire, les éditeurs de dictionnaires sont parfois à la recherche d'auteurs. 

4. L'apparition récente, sur le marché de la micro-informatique, de logiciels d'aide à la terminographie permet d'accélerer la collaboration des dictionnaires. Il est en outre possible aux organismes de recherche de publier eux-mêmes, et ce, rapidement et à peu de frais, les ouvrages réalisés sur ordinateur. Les outils de terminotique sont en effet interfacables avec les logiciels de PAO. Ces dictionnaires sur support informatique peuvent être vendus à des banques de terminologie et des bourses d'échange de glossaires ont été créées par certains distributeurs de logiciels de gestion de fichiers terminologiques.

5. L'élaboration commune d'un dictionnaire, par deux ou plusieurs centres de recherches européens qui ne travaillent encore ensemble, peut ouvrir la voie, pour ces organismes, à des projets de coopération dans leur domaine d'activités.

6. L'apprentissage des règles de terminologie et de terminographie qui se fait lors de l'élaboration d'un dictionnaire s'inscrit dans la polyvalence de la formation des savants et aux techniciens. J.-C. Baudet ne soulignait-il pas(7) que les ingénieurs doivent, afin de remplir les tâches de manière variée qui leur sont confiées aujourd'hui, être des cadres, des gestionnaires, des directeurs du personnel, et des documentalistes? Pourquoi ne deviendraient-ils pas aussi des terminographes? Certains scientifiques et techniciens se diront trop occupés pour faire des dictionnaires. On peut se demander si ce manque de disponibilité ne cache pas, parfois, un manque d'intérêt pour les questions linguistiques. Pourtant, ce sont les spécialistes qui créent les termes et en consacrent l'usage. Les mécanismes de fonctionnement de leur vocabulaire professionnel, cet outil de travail docile et efficace, ne peuvent donc pas les laisser indifférents...
"Well, naturally!" "I interpreted this to mean that they had an intuitive knowledge of styles within science, and that they also had an intuition of some sort of scale of subject areas within science, a scale of abstractness perhaps—mathematics being the ultimate in abstractness and botany and zoology being more tightly linked to living reality. There is no reason to be surprised if the results of the linguistic analysis correspond to the intuitions of native speakers". (PORTER, 1976)

Robert De BEAUGRANDE, of the University of Florida, mentions (BEAUGRANDE, 1987) that most linguists dwell on the assumption that language should be described in the most general terms. This approach predisposed linguistic research to look for the most abstract elements of a language and at the same time to disregard differences among discourse domains such as literature, chemistry, etc. Mainly for this reason we do not have any explicit or well developed means of defining the status of a Language for Special Purposes or Special Purpose Language /LSP/.

Since linguistic theory offers no single definition of Language for Special Purposes, many various approaches to the question have been suggested.

One approach regards a given LSP as a language or domain in its own right. We find, according to De BEAUGRANDE, different taxonomies like "engineering English", "scientific English" or "legal English". Each of them is to a great extent heavily dependent upon English for General Purposes/EGP/ and "is free to use any parts of the latter without express justification". However, even LSPs based on different LGPs often have common cognate resources. LSP thus tends to be more international or indeed universal, especially since English terms are widely borrowed.

Another approach defines LSP in terms of a style or register, differences between styles being accounted for by differences in the relative predominance of various linguistic features. There are, for example, some characteristics of English LSP such as high frequency of passives and impersonal constructions. On the other hand, these features are not obligatory and may be freely selected by individual language users. Precision, conciseness, objectivity, absence of expressiveness and emotion, are also some of the peculiarities on different language levels which distinguish scientific writing from other varieties.

Yet another approach views LSP as "artificial" and LGP as "natural". However, language is not a natural phenomenon like the production of noises and cries (De BEAUGRANDE 1987, after SAUSSURE 1916). Moreover, we know too little about the origins of language and the causes which can change or steer its development to decide what sort of intervention should be treated as artificial and which as natural.
Philosophical reflection is concerned with the question of whether language is an adequate vehicle for ideas, and whether science is not in many ways the natural enemy of language. It is emphasized that languages are capable of adapting to the growing needs of science and technology, and that artificial languages, ie. symbols, formulae etc., are only one part of LSP.

The statistical analysis of LSP, again, was promoted by the needs of foreign-language studies at institutions of higher education. This approach to LSP provides lists of linguistic phenomena, both simple and complex, that are considered essential to a description of LSP texts. There are two drawbacks about this approach: the isolation of linguistic units, and the neglect of semantics.

The most recent approach emphasizes not the language, but the purpose. According to this theory, the LSP in question occurs within a specific social context among a limited group of users who have learned it voluntarily. This theory is at variance with the tenets of general linguistics, where language is seldom defined in terms of its purpose.

The purpose-centred approach to LSP would be quite reasonable and simple if the acquisition and use of LSP were more explicitly regulated. Usually, the situation is that scientists are not given any specific language instruction when they enter a specialized field of knowledge. They are expected to absorb a specialized vocabulary, along with a number of standard rhetorical gestures, during the practical initiation into the domain. Often, they have to infer the meaning of terms from contexts, many of which may not be helpful or representative. The ability to use its LSP is often treated as a sign of qualification in the specialism itself.

Many writers have claimed to be defining the "Language of Science", but refer in fact only to scientific terminology (PORTER D. 1976 after GROVE 1949, SAVORY 1953, JESPERSEN 1958, BAUGH 1959). For example, according to SAVORY, the comparatively high frequency of words of Greek and Latin origin is a characteristic feature of scientific texts. It is also a well-known fact that terms are often polysemic, as they belong to several fields of discourse and obtain their text-specific meaning only in relation to other terms occurring in the co-text. Ideally, each word in LSP should have only one meaning, independent of the context, in contrast to LGP, where words can have many meanings depending on the context in which they appear.

The above are some of the reasons why it is impossible to provide a single meaningful definition of LSP within the conceptual framework of standard linguistic theory. Nonetheless, one aspect of LSP certainly exists, its communicative potential. At this point it would be reasonable to run through and select some of the characteristics that distinguish LSP from LAP. These differences concern the lexicon, as well as syntax: tense-forms, sentence-length, clause typology etc., and stylistics.
In 1938, BLOOMFIELD, in his section in the international encyclopedia of unified science entitled "Linguistic Aspects of Science", noted that formal scientific discourse uses a limited vocabulary and syntax, and moves from sentence to sentence only within the range of conventional rules (see PORTER 1976).

The vocabulary of LSP is characterized by the frequent use of internationalisms. The terminology is very demanding, and usually no overt definitions are given, it being taken for granted that the reader belongs to the initiated. Certain collocations are favoured in particular fields. The valency of verbs is unique. There prevail certain rules for the creation of new words and terms; certain prefixes are favoured as productive, while others are discarded.

The syntax of LSP differs from that of LGP, e.g.:

- high frequency of passives,
- avoidance of pronominal reference (other than "it/they/")
- subject NPs usually 3-4 words long on average, NPs in other functions 2-3 words long,
- nominalizations.

VARANTOLA (1986 (1987) and DRASKAU (1983) have noted LSP-related texts, which include: longer sentences (20 to 30 plus words), more complicated overall sentence patterns and longish, structurally complex noun phrases. Premodification of the type (Noun + head noun) is more common in scientific texts because of its inherent compactness, non-explicitness and the greater demands it makes on readers' extralinguistic knowledge. The use of passives and noun-phrase-types, together, produce the confusing and diffuse syntactic picture which characterizes LSP.

Third, the typical style markers of LSP are:

- no repetitions, paraphrases or intext summaries,
- the crucial-information principle,
- no background information (personal experience, anecdotes),
- objective, impersonal style,
- highly specialized terminology.

A scientific text may open with polite phrases, and conclude with a summary, evaluating the findings and recommending courses of action. The function of scientific-technical writing in its purest form may be described as informative, objective, factual and impartial.

As can be seen from this superficial outline, there are several features accounting for the differences between LSP and LGP on all levels of language: lexicon, syntax, stylistics. A technical text reflects linguistic and stylistic norms binding on the given sub-language of the province of discourse as part of the national, standard language. The linguistic norms primarily hold true for the choice of technical vocabulary ranging from technical terms to jargon, and for the preference of certain morphological elements and types of word-formation and also of syntactic struc-
Stylistic norms concern the use of rhetorical elements, e.g. clichés, and the compositional plan of the text (compare GLASER, 1979/LSP) is a comparatively recent and controversial notion in linguistics. The most general and least controversial definitions are given by R. GLASER: "The ESP reflects the speech habits of a professional group... It deals with a job-specific subject and state of affairs by using general and specific linguistic means and by including optional non-linguistic visual elements which convey further information. These may be symbols, formulas, graphs, flow charts, maps and various kinds of illustration", and by L. HOFFMANN (1979): "By LSP we understand a complete set of linguistic phenomena occurring within a definite sphere of communication and limited by specific subjects, intentions and conditions".
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