

BOOK REVIEWS

Werner Forner and Britta Thörle (Eds.). 2016. *Manuel des langues de spécialité* [Manuals of Romance Linguistics 12]. Berlin: De Gruyter. ISBN 978-3-11-031350-5.

Reviewed by John Humbley (Université Paris-Diderot)

The paucity of research on language for special purposes (henceforth LSP) in or on French has long been noted, in particular by Gambier (1998) and Pöckl (1999), and, in spite of some brilliant but isolated achievements in the field, the situation can hardly be said to have improved since the end of the last century. It is therefore a pleasure to report that the book under review goes a long way towards rectifying the situation. It is presented as a *manuel*, a handbook, a practical overview of research carried out in the area and its main applications. A quick perusal of the list of contributing authors suffices to gather that this new addition to Romance Linguistics is a statement, in French, of research in *Fachsprache*. It can be argued that LSP, *Fachsprache* and *langue de spécialité* have in fact widely differing scopes, and the German tradition is the one with the broadest interests and the loftiest ambitions, going well beyond didactics, which form the backbone of the English and French approaches. The monumental *Fachsprachen* volumes (Hoffmann et al. 1999), because of the language barrier, had little impact in French-speaking countries. Here at last is a cogent presentation in French of some of the key elements of too long neglected thought on specialised communication.

The Introduction, a major 50 page statement of what LSP is, written by the two editors, diplomatically makes no mention of these diverging traditions. Instead, it modestly but energetically presents the two main aims of the book: firstly to provide an outline of various aspects of what is generally considered to be the subfields of LSP – a definition in extension, the lexicographers would say, and secondly to advocate a view of LSP as the authors think it should be defined and analysed. The different subfields are presented in the first, second and fourth sections, and the system as the editors see it is dealt with in the eight chapters in the third part, in addition to the very coherent presentation in the introduction. The first section is devoted to lexicon (of which only one to terminology proper), the second to specialised texts and discourse, including certain domains (medicine, musicology, business and law), the third to the structures which are claimed to define LSP, while the fourth section focuses on a rapidly emerging theme: diachrony in LSP.

The argument of the introduction is that the criteria generally used to define LSP – in particular in contradistinction with Language for general purposes – are

simply beside the point. The features, the editors claim, are not specific to the language used but are determined by the situation and the topic under discussion. The LSP subsystem can be accounted for grammatically by four transformations, called projections, which will be briefly presented in the analysis of the relevant chapters. The demonstrations used to back up this argument, building mainly on previous German studies, little known in French-speaking countries, provide intriguing illustrations which will arouse the reader's curiosity. This preliminary presentation is a very valuable contribution to the still fraught question of just what LSP is.

In the first chapter proper, Christian Schmitt addresses the question of general scientific and technical vocabulary – intermediate vocabulary as he calls it – especially as it was codified by Phal (1971), then goes on to survey legal terminology as defined and illustrated by Cornu (2007), with the aim of demonstrating how close it is to general vocabulary, thereby diminishing Cornu's claims of its specificity. The arguments that the editors put forward in the introduction find no echo here – as indeed in most of the other chapters of the first section – nor does the issue of professional communication, despite being announced in the title (“Vocabulaire général, vocabulaires techniques et scientifiques et la communication professionnelle” General vocabulary, technical and scientific vocabulary and professional communication). The second chapter is the only one that focuses on terminology as such, a typically clear presentation, which moves from theory to practice, by one of the most authoritative linguists in the field, Teresa Cabré. She emphasises the different approaches which can be taken to terminological analyses according to viewpoint adopted: linguistic, communicative or conceptual. Jean Soubrier provides the chapter on loanwords in scientific and technical French, in particular in medical parlance. With fluency in English improving in France, Soubrier forecasts a slowing down in the uptake of loans, which may seem optimistic. The fourth chapter of the section on lexicon is devoted to brand and product names, a fast-growing area of interdisciplinary research, which has hitherto seldom been thought of as LSP. The examples in this chapter by Antje Lobin are from Italian rather than French, but the challenges of this emerging field are clearly presented. Morphologists might balk at the analysis of combining forms which called *préfixoïdes* (such as *bio-*) and *suffixoïdes* (such as *-manie*) here – Schmitt also uses these terms in Chapter 15 – but such liberties are not uncommon in the field of commercial onomastics. They are in fact typical examples of confixation, which is thoroughly investigated in Chapter 12 and which will be alluded to in this context.

The section on discourse analyses in LSP is even more varied. It starts with a study of scientific texts and discourse by Guimar Ciapusio, who concentrates on various families of textual genres, inspired by the works on German text linguistics. One innovation which will be welcomed in this chapter is the opening to oral

as well as written discourse and to the linguistic means of conveying specialised messages to a non-specialised audience. There is a very wide-ranging chapter on medical texts by Cornelia Feyrer, with an impressive bibliography, typically encyclopaedic in scope. It provides a quick run through the widely varying text types. One of the dichotomies explored is that of the increasing use of English among medical specialists, while at the same time it is acknowledged there is more need for cultural and linguistic mediation on the hospital floor. Though the terms *mediation* or *community interpreting* are not used, the discussion opens up to these themes. This is very aptly exemplified by the study of the notion of pain and how it is expressed and interpreted. Issues of medical popularization and translation are also evoked. The chapter ends with a study of medical visitors' documentation, an original example of unequal communication. Christian Koch breaks new ground by investigating the language (and languages) of musicology, a German speciality which has gained ground in Romance speaking countries, seldom if ever given as an example of LSP. The variety of discourse situations is explained, from the establishment of critical editions to musical analysis, ethnomusic, musical education, rehearsals. The interplay of music and language is a common theme here, well illustrated by the way the conductor part talks part sings to his orchestra, a brilliant example of the partly complementary partly overlapping semiotic systems. Britta Thörle makes an admirable presentation of the issues of language and communication in business and industry, an eminently cross-disciplinary field where much research has been carried out but often in areas only distantly related to linguistics, making it difficult to synthesize. The pioneering work of the Paris-based group *Langue et Travail* is duly acknowledged, and, as in other chapters, the author takes pains to relate spoken and written discourse, giving telling examples of each. One particularly striking analysis is of an exchange between a non-specialist and a specialist where the former cannot make herself understood until the specialist "compacts" her explanation into what is close to a typically written LSP, thereby illustrating the grammatical thesis so eloquently put forward in the introduction. It also begs the question as to whether this compacted code could not be equated with the elaborated code of the sociolinguistics 1960s: Bernstein (1971) was perhaps not so far wrong when he suggested that the failure to master the 'elaborated code' led to professional and social exclusion! The title of Cornelia Griebel's chapter on legal texts and legal translation leads the reader to fear that legal discourse will be viewed exclusively through the prism of legal translation ("Aspects cognitifs et traductionnels" Cognitive and translation aspects), which would have unduly restricted the scope of the chapter. This turns out not to be the case at all, and the cognitive aspects, also mentioned in the title, are presented as a preliminary guide to understanding the different classes of legal texts, all usefully illustrated by well-designed graphics. These dispel any notion which may

have been gathered from Christian Schmitt's first chapter that legal terms are not particularly specialized: they are differently specialized and imply a familiarity with the legal institutions and skill in handling the implicit or explicit intertextuality. This is one chapter that fulfils its promise of conveying to the francophone reader the gist of German scholarship, here in legal language, in particular that of Dietrich Busse, whose works on legal discourse as an institutional language really deserve translation.

Chapters 10 to 17 form the third section of the book, on the "sub-systems of speciality", which takes up the features which define LSP as the editors see it, and examines them individually. The first chapters of this section are more closely linked to each other than those in the other sections of the book, not just thematically, but more importantly through a common theory. Nadian Kreipl starts off by examining verbs of relation (such as *provoquer*, *résulter de*, *permettre*...) and nominalisation and how the two act together to produce specialized discourse. This is done in a practical way – part of the chapter could be construed as a tutorial – and the results are analysed from a semantic viewpoint. The examples are taken from two small contrasting corpora, one in economics, the other a literary, narrative corpus. The feature that distinguishes them the most is the presence of these verbs of relation: 28% in the economics corpus, 2% in the narrative. The question as to the possible differences between specialities receives an answer in Chapter 13. Chapter 11, by Carolin Patzelt, focuses on what the editors call *analytisms* in this book. These are defined as verbs or verb phrases (less commonly nouns) which are dissociated analytically (thus the name) into two units, one functional and one referential. For the verb *prouver* (Eng. evidence), for example, the analytism would be *constituer une preuve* (lit. constitute evidence), the verb conveying the function, the noun the reference. This author, as indeed her colleagues in further chapters, note the resemblance between German *Funktionsverbgefüge* and French constructions with *verbe support* (Eng. light verbs), but insist on a different scope, analytisms for example excluding phraseologisms and enabling the expression of *Aktionsarten*, which are then exemplified and analysed in their different functions: smoothing information flow, cutting down on polysemy, facilitating passive and factitive constructions. There follows another section on such textual functions as connectors. This chapter is illustrated by many examples, which all appear to be invented for the purpose rather than taken from specialised texts, as is the case in many though not all of the other chapters of this third section. Chapter 12, by Ulrike Scholtz, is in fact made up of two independent sub-chapters, one on confixation and the other on relational adjectives, the common point being the exemplification in both cases taken from ecology in Spanish. Confixes, which are often termed combining forms in English, go under a variety of names in French and German, and it is Kocourek's choice (1991) which is taken up here. These are the Greek and Latin

roots which have been used to expand scientific (rather than technical) vocabulary since even before the Renaissance. True to the general argument of the editorial team, confixation is treated as a mark of style, and doublets are noted in French and more systematically in Spanish, where a traditional and learned form find themselves in complementary distribution, the latter providing a scientific tone. Relational or denominalised adjectives (*politique économique*, for example) have long been regarded as typical of LSPs in the Romance languages, and it is easy to see how this can be shown to be a stylistic ploy. The next two chapters are both by one of the editors, Werner Forner: Chapter 13 on the frequency of use of markers of speciality and Chapter 14 on divergence and convergence in these markers. The chapter on frequency is based on empirical evidence from a variety of contexts (economics, agriculture, advertising, literature – all in French) and takes on again the form of a tutorial for the manipulation of the different markers. The chapter begins with a run-down on the “rules” of specialization alluded to at the beginning of this review (1. nominalisation, 2. verbs of relation, 3. analytisms, 4. adjectivisation), all explained, step by step, often in tabular form. The demonstration takes the four markers and examines the frequency in which they appear in the various parts of the sub-corpus. The results, which generally back up the claims made by the editors, sometimes yield surprising evidence, for example that certain markers can be very diversely represented in different yet specialised economics texts. One would like to know more. All these transformations, once combined, give a scale of speciality. The discrepancies are explained by differing stylistic needs: to appear serious (the adjective *sérieux* frequently figures here), authors, specialists or not, are said to use and abuse these markers. In divergences and convergences, the author compares how these markers are used in the Romance languages, where there is fairly general agreement, and in German and English, where divergence appears, unsurprisingly in the use of compounding and in the use of verbs of relation (more than twice as many in French as in German). This chapter contains other surprises: *Le Monde* and *Il Corriere della Sera* (p. 316) are claimed to use LSP style, contrary to their Spanish, Portuguese and British counterparts, and perhaps even more shockingly that French Marxist leaflets distributed to workers in the 1960s used LSP markers to achieve a “scientific” aura, despite being almost incomprehensible. Perhaps a little more evidence would be welcome here too. This chapter includes a postscript, which in fact relates to the preceding chapters as well. It contains thoughts on how common features characterise European LSPs and how they come about. The theme of a common European LSP is investigated in detail by Christian Schmitt in the fifteenth chapter, in which he examines how word and term formation have converged in the different languages through the use of Latin roots from the Renaissance on. He shows how the productivity of Neolatin forms has increased over the centuries while their inherited counterparts have

become fossilized and are no longer productive. There are some very thought-provoking analyses of the overall composition of the lexica of European languages, with a fresh look at the Saussurian distinction between internal and external linguistics, and a critical view of “nationalistic” tendencies in French dictionaries which do not acknowledge the immediate origin of Neolatinisms, i.e. from neighbouring European languages. These and related questions, Schmitt argues, would plead for a new field of study: Eurolinguistics, which would examine how these Neolatinisms developed and are indeed still developing in European languages. The second-last chapter in this third section, by Eva Lavric, is devoted to error analysis in second-language LSP. It relies on error analysis studies as a means of accessing the interlanguage of the learner and applies these to a situation where the advanced learner is producing a specialised text in the second language. Errors are analysed according to the degree of specialisation of the texts in which they occur, and encompass errors in use of terminology, errors in general academic vocabulary and errors of style. The seventeenth and last chapter of this section, by Werner Forner, is the logical conclusion to what has gone before: applying the analysis of LSP to the classroom. Entitled “L’enseignement de la langue marquée” (Teaching the marked language), this chapter explains how to bring the students to identify the markers and outlines the techniques which enable them, using the four “rules”, presented in chapter fourteen and profusely illustrated here by graphics, to transform a marked (i.e. LSP) text into an unmarked text and vice versa. The discourse analysis used here is directly inspired from the heyday of French didactics research in the 1970s and 80s. It pleads more generally for an approach to LSP in which the actual discipline concerned is of secondary importance.

The very welcome opening to diachronic LSP studies forms the last part of the book and is divided into four chapters: the first two on the language of science and techniques in the Ancient world and in the Middle Ages, the third, a major review of the emergence of nomenclatures in the new sciences from the Renaissance to the Enlightenment. Johannes Kramer explicitly refers to Forner’s syntacto-semantic criteria for defining an LSP and concludes that Greek and Roman antiquity knew none of them, though it is possible to isolate specialized vocabulary, which is often highly developed. Difficulties in adapting Greek terminology to Latin structures is noted. What could be termed specialized texts were mainly didactic in nature with the possible exception of medicine, which was in turn plagued by the unsystematic nature of its vocabulary, deplored even by contemporary observers. The thrust of the nineteenth chapter, by Elmar Eggert, is to convey the importance of translation in the emergence of specialized discourse in the Western European vernaculars. Translation was essentially from Latin of course, but also – in science and philosophy – from Arabic and even Hebrew. The role of the school of Toledo is underlined here. Space unfortunately precludes any detailed analysis of the strategies used to

fill in the many terminological gaps, but the principles of early term formation are given and briefly illustrated. Fortunately this chapter is particularly well supplied not only with extensive bibliographical references – a major achievement of this volume – but also with explicit pointers to where the reader can find greater detail about topics mentioned in passing. The penultimate chapter can be considered the *bouquet final* of a pyrotechnical demonstration of LSP: it is a collective effort, coordinated by Philippe Selosse and enlisting the services of three other specialists, to the effect that this is a handbook within a handbook. An introduction sets the stage for the emergence and consolidation of nomenclatures from the Renaissance to the Enlightenment, which are illustrated in turn by the subchapters on botany (by Selosse himself), zoology (Alessandro Minelli), chemistry (Bernadette Bensaude-Vincent). It is left to Gerda Haßler to explain in the very last chapter what textual genres were used over this period. Selosse's explanation of how botany moved through three stages between the sixteenth to the eighteenth century is a paragon of clarity where everything falls into place. The profound nature of each change gave rise to understandable polemics, so it is no wonder that scientific opinion in France took longer than elsewhere to embrace the Linnean classification system. Minelli adds to Selosse's presentation of Linnaeus' innovations, concentrating on zoology, but also explaining how the binomial system was introduced into publications and how classifying endings – recognized today as a principal feature of the taxonomy – were first applied piecemeal, to relatively small classes, rather than the whole system. Bensaude-Vincent completes the picture with an account of the most spectacular achievement in the field of nomenclature, that of chemical substances. She underlines the European dimension in the search for an adequate language basis for the systematisation of the classification and analyses the reasons for and the repercussions of using Greek roots as the source of terms. The chapter on textual genres is a very useful complement to the study of diachronic change in LSP. Haßler explains how text types changed as Latin gradually but unevenly gave way to the vernaculars, and examines certain text types in detail: the dialogue, inherited from Latin and used initially as a form of popularisation but famously by Galileo for scientific purposes. The importance of conversation in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries for broadening knowledge of science is underlined, as is the role of the letter and even the didactic poem. The Enlightenment brought great changes to text types, with those mentioned being largely replaced by the essay, the treatise and the memoir. The chapter and the book finish off with an all-too-brief mention of the *Encyclopédie*, which did so much to stabilised scientific and technical French.

This volume can rightly be claimed to lift French LSP studies out of the doldrums. Among the positive features, readers will appreciate the hands-on approach. The chapters are not essays (or not just essays): they usually contain

extracts from or reports on field studies, including much oral transcription, a part of LSP which is awkward to deal with and time-consuming to transcribe and describe, but fundamental, even if, as one of the editors say, in the ever more connected world, we are communicating more and more in written rather than spoken form. As has been mentioned, this collective work is styled a manual rather than an encyclopaedia, which would imply a practical introduction rather than an exhaustive survey of the state of the art. Not that most chapters are lacking in bibliographical references, very many of which will be unknown to the francophone reader, and as mentioned earlier, one of the most appreciable contributions of this work is to open up the field of French LSP to the broader approach afforded in the many German-language studies. From this point of view, the book fills a huge gap. But this sometimes comes at the expense of studies which are well known in francophone circles but missing here. When speaking of the intermediary scientific or technical vocabulary it is wholly appropriate to remember the pioneers, but much work has been done since by Tutin (2007),¹ Drouin (2007), etc., which deserves to be highlighted. Similarly, in the otherwise excellent chapter on language in the business context, no reference is made for example to d'D'Iribarne's (2009) intercultural differences, which would be natural references for the French-speaking reader. The chapter on loans can now be updated with Rachele Raus' (2013) work on institutional terminology (with an in-depth treatment of *gender mainstreaming*, Soubrier's prime example), and Onysko and Winter-Froemel's (2011) on catachresis and non-catachresis loans, which can usefully replace the luxury/necessity dichotomy. In the chapter on confixation neither Lurquin's (1998) prospective work nor Cottez' (1980) dictionary of reference are mentioned, though the latter is acknowledged in attestations. The role of dictionaries in stabilising terminology in the 17th and 18th century is generally overlooked, for example Quemada's (1955) survey of medical dictionaries of the past. The most striking omission, at least for the reviewer, is not a French reference, but a British one and a very well-known one, that of the works of Michael Halliday (Webster 2004) on the evolution of scientific discourse and the explanation through systemic-functional linguistics, and in particular the grammatical metaphor: the proximity of this approach to that advocated by the editors is such that an explicit comparison is called for.

It is always possible to take issue with some analyses or viewpoints. The general thesis, that LSP can be reduced to the four "reductions", would probably be the first, especially as the editors' definition *in extension* (in the form of the chapters they have included) suggests a much wider scope than their four-point list of criteria would suggest. But the clarity of exposition is a welcome call to debate.

1. See also the Scientext project of the University of Grenoble Alpes for current research on basic scientific vocabulary scientext.msh-alpes.fr/scientext-site/

There are in addition many other points which are open to discussion. One will suffice here as an example, that given by Christian Schmitt of the incorporation of Neolatinisms (exemplified in some detail by the example of *morphology*) into the various European languages, in which he implies that there is a sort of linear development and that a later attestation in one language implies a borrowing (p. 336–337). This seems to ignore the plurality of lexical and terminological creation, cogently argued by Keller (1990).

This is an essential contribution to LSP studies in and on French.

References

- Bernstein, B. 1971. *Class, Codes and Control*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
doi: 10.4324/9780203014035
- Cornu, G. 2007. *Vocabulaire juridique*. Paris: Quadriga/PUF.
- Cottez, H. 1980. *Dictionnaire des structures du vocabulaire savant. Éléments et modèles de formation*. coll. Les Usuels du Robert. Paris: Le Robert.
- Drouin, P. 2007. "Identification automatique du lexique scientifique transdisciplinaire." *Revue française de linguistique appliquée* 12: 45–64.
- Gambier, Y. (ed.). 1998. *Discours professionnels en français* [Nordeuropäische Beiträge aus den Human – und Gesellschaftswissenschaften Bd., 16]. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Hoffmann, L., H. Kalverkämper, and H. E. Wiegand. 1999. *Fachsprachen/Languages for Special Purposes*, 2 vols. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- D'Iribarne, P. 2009. *L'Épreuve des différences*. Paris: Le Seuil.
- Keller, R. 2003 [1990]. *Sprachwandel. Von der unsichtbaren Hand in der Sprache*, 3 überarbeitete und erweiterte Auflage. Tübingen: Francke Verlag.
- Kocourek, R. 1991 [1982]. *La langue française de la technique et de la science. Vers une linguistique de la langue savante*, Wiesbaden: Otto Brandstetter Verlag.
- Lurquin, G. 1998. *Dictionnaire Elsevier des constituants grecs et latins, affixes grecs et latins, mots et racines utilisés en allemand, anglais, espagnol, français, italien et néerlandais*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Onysko, A., and E. Winter-Froemel. 2011. "Necessary loans – luxury loans? Exploring the pragmatic dimension of borrowing." *Journal of Pragmatics* 43: 1550–1567.
doi: 10.1016/j.pragma.2010.12.004
- Phal, A. 1971 *Vocabulaire général d'orientation scientifique*. Paris: CREDIF/Didier.
- Pöckl, W. 1999. "Die französischen Fachsprachen im 20. Jahrhundert und ihre Erforschung: eine Übersicht." In *Fachsprachen/Languages for Special Purposes*, ed. by L. Hoffmann, H. Kalverkämper, and H. E. Wiegand, 1491–1503. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Quemada, B. 1955. *Introduction à l'étude du vocabulaire médical (1600–1710)*, coll. Annales littéraires de l'Université de Besançon. Paris: Belles Lettres.
- Raus, R. 2013. *La terminologie multilingue : la traduction des termes de l'égalité homme/femme dans le discours international*. Louvain-la-Neuve: De Boeck.

- Tutin, A. (ed.). 2007. "Lexique des écrits scientifiques." *Revue Française de Linguistique Appliquée* 12 (2). <http://www.cairn.info/revue-francaise-de-linguistique-appliquee-2007-2.htm>. Accessed 13 July 2017.
- Webster, J. (ed.). 2004. *The Language of Science*, The Collected Works of M. A. K. Halliday. London, New York: Continuum.

Reviewer's address

John Humbley
CLILLAC-ARP UE 3967
Université Paris-Diderot, Sorbonne-Paris-Cité
Case 7002
75205 Paris CEDEX 13
France
humbley@eila.univ-paris-diderot.fr