Cahiers de Traduction

Volume32 Issue 02/ Juin2026 pp 182- 193

دفاتر الترجمة
Cahiers de Traduction

ISSN 1111- 4606
EISSN 2602-6023

Teaching specialised languages to foreign learners and translation apprentices: between the restriction of standardisation and the communicative needs.

تدريس اللغات المتخصصة للمتعلمين الأجانب والمتدربين في الترجمة: بين قيود التوحيد القياسي والاحتياجات التواصلية.

Hanifi Mustapha[1],
University of Mascara, mustapha.hanifi@univ-mascara.dz

Received:16/03/2026 ***Accepted: 07/06/2026*** ***Published 10/06/2026***

Abstract:

The qualifier "specialisation" linked with the term "language" might initially suggest that it is something different, distant, and separate from the general concept of language; this could result in a specific standard teaching strategy that goes beyond the usual content in general language teaching. This perception of specialised languages may lead to a shift toward the strict standardisation of their terminology, which will be considered as entities independent of general language. This will give rise to a principle—adopted to some extent by those involved in teaching specialised languages—that reaches the point of limiting the focus to terminology as the predominant and prevailing feature of all types of specialised languages. But can such a restrictive perception of specialised languages respond to functional and educational data primarily related to the context of foreign learners and translation trainees? Can we limit ourselves to terminology and focus on it as an educational subject? And can we indeed teach specialised languages in isolation from the general framework represented by general language, especially when it comes to important elements related to communicative and cognitive tasks primarily?

Keywords: translation, specialised language, term, general language, communicative tasks.

الملخص:

قد توحي صفة "التخصص" الملازمة لمصطلح اللغة، للوهلة الأولى، بأنها أمر مختلف و بعيد و مميز بشدة عن مفهوم اللغة العام. الأمر الذي قد ينجم عنه نمط تدرسي معياري خاص يتجاوز المحتوى المعهود في تدريس اللغة عامة. وقد ينجم عن هذا

[1] ***Hanifi Mustapha : حنيفي مصطفى***

التصور للغات المتخصصة، انزياح نحو التقييس الصارم لمصطلحاتها التي ستعتبر على أنها كيانات مستقلة بالضرورة عن اللغة العامة، وهو ما سيولد مبدأ– معتمد بشكل أو بآخر عند القائمين على تدريس اللغات المتخصصة عامة– يصل إلى حد الاقتصار على المصطلح كونه السمة القارة و الغالبة على لغات التخصصات بكل أنواعها. ولكن هل يمكن لتصور مقيد كهذا للغات التخصص أن يتجاوب مع معطيات وظيفية و تكوينية تتعلق في الأساس بسياق المتعلمين الأجانب و المتدربين في الترجمة ؟ هل يمكن الاقتصار فقط على المصطلح والتركيز عليه كمادة تعليمية؟ و هل يمكن بالفعل ان نتناول تدريس اللغات المتخصصة بمعزل عن الحاضنة العامة المتمثلة بالضرورة في اللغة العامة خاصة إذا تعلق الأمر بعناصر مهمة تتعلق بمهام تواصلية وإدراكية بالدرجة الأولى؟

كلمات مفتاحية: الترجمة، اللغة المتخصصة، المصطلح، اللغة العامة، مهام تواصلية

Introduction

By its very nature, translation becomes a crucial tool for disseminating science, technology, and knowledge across all disciplines. In fact, many nations around the world are providing material and logistical support to improve learning foreign languages and, in particular, to develop skilled translators who can adapt to various fields in order to achieve development and prosperity. In order to prepare apprentice translators who want to work as professionals, specialised languages should always be important. The goal of professional training for translators should not only be to impart the fundamental ideas and theories that are directly related to translation but also to instil the know-how background that is, the toolkit required for the translator's actual success—whose work may take many different forms and cover a wide range of fields. In fact, "specialised languages" constitute the major part of this "know-how."

The general discussion of the significance of specialised languages and their functions in specialised translation training, however, does not include a consensus on how to teach them to specialised translation trainees. Teachers and trainers do not have a harmony on what should be taught. Additionally, there is a discernible tendency to concentrate pedagogical efforts on teaching only terminological elements; this is likely due to terms' important role as identifying components of the "field" and their crucial place within specialised languages. However, can terminological data be promising and meet the expectations of future translators? Can they

be adequate tools to adjust to the methodological restrictions in each translation-related field? Are there other aspects that need to be covered in training?

Such an aggressive penchant for the terminological tradition in teaching specialised languages could be comprehensible if we retraced its history. This way could help us to shed light on why current teachers still consider "specialised languages" to be terminologies.

1. Teaching specialised language under the terminological tradition:

The early research on specialised languages had a systemic perspective; it tended to qualify them as "subsystems" (ISO 1087, 1990), or vocabularies annexed to the common language. So, the general conception of this research did not grant the status of "languages" to these "vocabularies with limited uses". In addition, they supported the "demarcation" and compartmentalisation of the common language from the limited "subsystems" of verbalised concepts (Gautier, 2014).

Indeed, most theorists limited the concept of specialised languages to the terminological component, which is, according to them, the sole defining norm of a specialised discourse. The strictly normative tendency believed in the existence of a (specialized) discourse "purified of anything considered as negative to transparent communication" (Condamines, 2005, p. 42). Unambiguity, also, was strongly shared among the schools of "classical terminology" (Gautier, 2014).

The foundations on which the standardising research of specialised languages – terminologies – are based have been strongly criticised (Liczner, 2016). Attempts to systematise these languages have not been tolerated by a large number of linguists.

Lerat, Gaudin and Gautier – regardless of their different approaches – have all tried to replace the dominant conceptual and abstract trend in this research with another more open perspective.

1.1 Specialized languages: a liable domain to Wüster's perspective:

Wüsterian theory (WÜSTERIAN THERUM) was undoubtedly popular throughout the world, especially in northern and central European nations (Toma, 2016). This is probably because it was established as a new field that regulated scientific and technical terminology. The goal of the Austrian engineer Eugen Wüster's 1931 thesis, "International Linguistic Standardisation in Technology, Particularly in Electrical Engineering", was to standardise and purify all technical (or specialised) communications. The foundations of a pre-Saussurean idealism that prioritizes the concept over the word are actually represented by the revolutionary theory at the time (Liczner, 2016). In actuality, this idea forms the foundation of a rigorous, standardising terminology that served as a theoretical framework for teaching specialised languages and directed earlier research in the field.

Wüster's perspective seems to be a suitable response to the problems of technical communication, especially with the diversification of science. As a result, the concern of some linguists, terminologists, and didacticians was to find standards for mastering, controlling, and delimiting the vocabulary that was

relevant to each particular field of study. Through his innovative concept, which made him the father of modern terminology (Condamine, 2005), the Austrian linguist has tried to shape standardised systems of specialised communication. The General Theory of Terminology (GTT) is centred on three theoretical principles. These important elements in "Wüsterian" terminology are presented, according to Temmerman, Femke, & Luyten (1990), as follows:

1/ Onomasiology, the basis of "lexical" units according to the Wüster tradition, gives importance to the concept regardless of the word. By adopting the principle of onomasiology, the GTT places itself on the opposite side of general lexicology and makes terminology an almost different discipline whose content (terms) must be treated differently from the word. The term being "considered as the label affixed to a 'unit of thought' that it designates, [...] [it] would be distinguished from the Saussurean sign whose two faces [signifier and signified] belong to the general linguistics." (Thoiron, P & Béjoint, H 2003, pp.3-4)

E. Wüster, by his vision, not only challenges lexicology but also the principle of the uniqueness between signifier and signified in Saussurian linguistics (modern) by giving primacy to the concept (signified) over the word (signifier).

2/ Standardisation: Wüster, one of the researchers fascinated by the idea of an artificial language, which could be universal and govern all technical and professional exchanges, had certainly experienced the failure of all attempts to create an "international" language serving as a "model" for optimal communication. However, the Austrian terminologist has never lost his resolve for clarity, precision and standardisation even within natural languages (Evers, 2010). For him, the term is the only guarantor of better communication within an international community of specialists. And it is for this reason that terms must be managed by a standardisation body (or bodies). The Viennese attitude of strict modelling – in the true sense of the word – does not only aim at generating and organising terms but also imposes them in the communities of specialists. Wüster therefore places his terminology in the extreme trend of standardisation: prescriptive standardisation.

3/ Bi-univocity: It is clear that the standardisation, clarity, and precision advocated by E. Wüster imply a principle of bi-univocity which, according to him, eliminates ambiguity arising from synonymy, homonymy, and polysemy. These "phenomena" are, according to him, harmful to specialized communication (Evers, 2010).

Nevertheless, Wüster admits that the goal of total bi-univocity, which requires a single concept to correspond to a single term, could not simply be achieved given that the number of concepts in specialised fields is much greater than that for each concept to be assigned its referring term (Wüster, 1991). He substitutes it with a less demanding principle which is univocity.

However, E. Wüster's ideas for a general theory of terminology and the language of specialisation, after having been agreed upon for years, have been challenged by a number of researchers and terminologists – particularly French-speaking ones: we are currently talking about a move beyond the terminological whole (Gautier, 2014) towards other components that are not very obvious but important for the whole of a language of specialisation which now has manifestations that go beyond vocabulary

according to the hypothesis of Kocourek (1991). And even the elementary principle of the Viennese school, in this case onomasiology, has been relativised given that the concept does not always exist before the term it designates. In France and Canada, criticism focused, in particular, on the "Wüsterian" belief in purely prescriptive standardisation, strongly recommended for the compartmentalisation of terms by separate domains and specialities; polysemy and synonymy were simply excluded from classical terminology theory.

This approach, long seen as a guarantee of "communicative effectiveness", no longer seems promising in the new perspectives on teaching specialised languages.

Also, the method Wüster devised to study and classify terms—the sole defining criteria of a technical language, according to him—has been criticised for categorically neglecting the evolution of the language (and its words) over time. In fact, one could not have such a clear idea about a word or term without researching its history and roots. Recent critiques have, in fact, deplored the purely synchronic approach with which Eugène Wüster treats his terminology. (Picton, 2009)

The result of these critiques, based on the inadequacies of early theoretical research on the term and specialised language in particular, is represented by alternative approaches that distance themselves from "Wüsterian ideas".

A variety of fresh viewpoints, regardless of theoretical principles, strive to widen the scope of research within "specialised languages". Gaudin (1993; 2002), Guespin (1995), and Guilbert (1965; 1975) established socio-terminology (the Rouen school), whereas Temmerman (2000a; 2000b) presented sociocognitive terminology and textual terminology.

The difference between the approaches above can only confirm the plurality of dimensions integrated in the study of terminology in its emancipated version of "Wüsterenism". However, they share common links: These new theoretical proposals, so distinct from the terminological phenomenon, substitute all indispensable prescriptive norms in classical terminology with a certain description (diachrony) adapted to their own purposes. They are getting closer and closer to linguistics (Picton, 2009) by integrating the rectified notion of "specialised language", going beyond the classical terminological framework towards other defining elements. They resort to corpus linguistics, capable of elucidating the syntactic, semantic and stylistic characteristics of specialised languages (Vicente, 2009), and adopt a discursive approach in the analysis of the real statements in which the terms appear. Finally, theories of "new" terminology share an interest in synonymy (Dury & Lervad, 2008) and polysemy, which are important in the study of linguistic variations of terms (Dury, 1997).

Recent research in terminology, in fact, places great emphasis on the language in which the concept (term) is constructed (Gaudin, 2002). Terminologist-linguists emphasise the intrinsic role that specialised discourse analysis can play in terminology studies (Gaudin, 1995). In short, the movement toward specialised language is undeniably evolving to the point that even terminology is becoming a related discipline.

In conclusion, research that sought to reduce the notion of "specialised language" to simple *nomenclatures* (terms) belonging to a certain discipline has not considered the importance of the linguistic

phenomenon itself. The first researchers, faithful to the theory of classical terminology, focused their interest only on one element of the specialised language to the detriment of the other elements, which would deserve a total integration in the research.

Recent terminology research has placed a strong emphasis on the language in which the notion (term) is produced (Gaudin, 2002). Terminologist-linguists emphasise the importance of specialised discourse analysis in terminology studies (Gaudin, 1995). In short, the trend towards specialised language is undeniable, to the point where terminology is becoming a linked discipline.

In conclusion, studies that attempted to reduce the concept of "specialised language" to basic nomenclatures, relating to a specific discipline, ignored the significance of the linguistic phenomenon itself. The first studies, adhering to the principle of classical terminology, concentrated their attention solely on one part of the specialised language at the expense of the other elements, which deserved to be fully integrated into the inquiry.

2. The Teaching of Specialized Languages: From the Need for Standardisation to the Necessity of Communication:

The unfailing progress in the field of technical and professional language teaching has contributed to overcoming the terminological tradition (L'Homme, 1990). Teaching technical French to foreign engineering students, for example, is no longer a matter of organised teaching of terms. Accordingly, the teaching of specialised languages, for the benefit of apprentice translators, can no longer focus on the technical words encompassing each discipline.

The didactic interest in specialised languages is, therefore, no longer purely terminological. As a result, the teaching envisioned as meeting Wüster's standardising commitments cannot respond to the new formative context, which takes as its task the communicative aspect of specialised languages.

In this sense, applied linguistics, in general, is gradually taking on the mission of research in specialised fields; it attempts to propose global communicative solutions for specialised languages. The reason that consolidates this new trend is often cited by teachers of specialised languages themselves: a survey conducted in 1995 by Aimée Blois, then a teacher of specialised English at the IUT Toulouse 3, among former engineering students in mechanical engineering, demonstrated the importance of undergoing training in a specialised language that goes beyond the terminological framework to other linguistic elements (lexicological and syntactic) that are decisive in professional communication. The students, when asked about the usefulness of learning the specialised language, responded as follows:

"...highly specialized terms can hardly be taught at school; they are learned on the job" (an engineer in the Automation Department at the Toulouse Study and Research Center).

"Desirable, but difficult because there are many specialties, and you often miss them" (an after-sales service technician at Alsthom).

"Desirable, but there are too many specialties... and that's not the biggest problem" (an ENSA engineer from the Systems Design office at SNIAS).

"Desirable, but which specialty should you choose before choosing your company?" (A quality control manager at SNIAS).

"Desirable if the candidate knows where they'll be going after graduation" (An Arts et Métiers engineer at SNIAS).

"Useless, because you don't know what specialty you'll end up working in" (a senior technician in the After-Sales Service at SNIAS).

"Useless, because of the large number of specialties available in the workplace" (an agent in the Translation and Research Management department in a thermal and nuclear power plant construction industry).

"Useless, the diversity of specialties makes it something of an illusion" (a senior technician in an electromechanical construction laboratory). (Blois: 1995)

The answers of these former students interviewed confirm a profound terminological education, the dogma that has long led people to believe that technical languages can only be specialised and separate vocabularies. The traditional educational model has, in fact, left its mark on these students, faced with the professional world; their terminological baggage, well limited to the needs of their own specialities, was far from meeting new professional demands.

Working life isn't always at the whim of students who have just completed their studies or an apprentice translator who wants to start a professional career. In reality, one doesn't often choose the field in which one wants to work: the professional context could be, in itself, a speciality entirely different from the individual's own or an intersection of specialities more or less different from their initial field. This is evident from the reactions of former students above.

The investigation conducted by the French professor—as well as others with the same relationship—is part of recent research in the field of specialised language teaching, which seeks to give more space to corpus linguistics, variation linguistics, natural language processing (NLP), and phraseology in order to, at the very least, propose solutions to didactic problems concerning specialised languages. A cursory reading of the responses given to Aimée Blois's questioning would suffice to conclude that it is essential to develop a concept of LSP teaching that takes into account the professional context; that the teaching of technical languages requires revaluation through the integration of elements other than terms; and that it is essential to provide apprentice translators with a language that lies at the boundary between all areas of specialisation. Aimée B. rightly spoke of a kind of "borderline" vocabulary shared—or supposed to be—by all sectors of professional and academic life. Moreover, she calls it "transversal vocabulary".

This vocabulary of a common nature is far from being considered "terminological". It is present in all types of professional communication (Pecman, 2005). This is in line with what James Coady said at a conference on reading strategies in foreign languages:

"Why bother to teach technical vocabulary? Technical vocabulary typically is defined in the text.

The purpose of the text is to explain hydraulics or something: students rarely have trouble with technical terms. What they have trouble with are what is called academic vocabulary or sub-technical terms, like „hypothesis", „process", „account", etc. that are not defined in the text because they are not technical terms [...]. They do not recognize them, they are not sure what they mean and they occur very often in scientific and various types of academic texts because they are the negotiating words that we use. „A substantial amount of critical analysis was necessary for the following results": if they do not know one or two of those words, there is not much in that sentence to tell them what it means. There is an area of vocabulary here that may be worth teaching ». (Coady, s.d, cited in Blois,1995)

For J. Coady, terms are generally designed to be easily identified and understood. Therefore, they are not, in his opinion, really a source of difficulty. What can be difficult for foreign learners of a specialised language is the presence of "words of low specialisation or technicality. "Coady insists that teaching these "secondary" words is advantageous in the learning of specialised languages. This, then, is an element beyond the strictly terminological framework long dedicated to the teaching of LSPs.

Attempts are therefore being made to broaden the fields of investigation into specialised languages by focusing on their common component, which exists within them by nature. A specialised language is, in fact, simply a natural language conveying specialised knowledge (Lerat, 1995). It may therefore be difficult to separate it, at will, from its common character. Moreover, in France, one of the studies that focused on the teaching of vocabulary (or general scientific language) (VGOS) – still within the framework of specialised language learning – was that of André Phal in 1971. For him, VGOS is the basic vocabulary for scientific expression. It is an intermediate vocabulary between usual (common) vocabulary and the vocabulary of different specialities (Lemay, 2003). Following Michéa's model, A. Phal led a team of researchers at the Centre for Research and Study for the Diffusion of French (CREDIF) whose mission was to classify and define this vocabulary, which is:

"- "general", both because it is part of the general lexicon of the language and because it is common to all specialities considered from a speculative point of view;

"– "of scientific orientation," both because the meaning of the words that constitute it is oriented by the specialized contexts in which they are used and because it provides someone who has mastered it with the essential linguistic background necessary for those who wish to pursue scientific or technical studies." (Phal, 1976, p. 9)

André Phal based his work on a corpus composed of written texts on mathematics, physical sciences, and natural sciences. He and his team identified common vocabulary by filtering based on the "frequency and dispersion" of the words that made up their chosen corpus (Lemay, 2003).

General scientific vocabulary, whether common or transversal, is attracting increasing attention from researchers in the teaching of specialised languages, especially with the development of computerised means of automatic identification and identification. Recently, several research projects in the "*transdisciplinary lexicon*" have used natural language processing (NLP). Mojca Pécman, professor and researcher, starting from the postulate of the existence of a language that "transcends" disciplines, has made

extensive use of the progress made in the means of natural language processing to identify and classify phraseologies – part of the common scientific language. Phraseology, as a field "on the border between lexicology and syntax" (Pecman: 2005), has not aroused, in France, according to Pécman, an interest similar to that of terminology, which led him to exploit it based on a corpus composed of several texts on biology, physics and chemistry. Moreover, conventional formulas, which have been greatly underestimated in previous research on specialised languages, have long been a source of difficulty for foreign learners. Mojca Pécman's attempt falls within the framework of the construction of dictionaries – or thesauruses – for scientific and academic phraseology. This is, therefore, another element that will undoubtedly be added to the broader notion of specialised language.

In the didactic context of translation, which is supposed to be professionalising, often limiting oneself to teaching based on lists of "technical" words from one field or another could not help the learner gain an idea of the importance of specialised language nor of its essential elements for professional communication. For a teacher or trainer, it is always preferable to provide working methods and mechanisms rather than transmitting consummate knowledge whose content may be contradicted by the realism of the professional world; the testimony of Aimée Blois (1995) is proof of this.

In the field of specialized translation, a learner must acquire a language that allows them access to a multitude of fields; He must know that words like: accident, case, character, set, function, reaction, reduction, give, produce, and obtain… are, in fact, important and omnipresent elements in different scientific and technical fields although they are not terminologies. He must also know that the specialised language is, in short, only one aspect among several others of language in general.

3. Specialised languages, cognition, and linguistics: new horizons for learning translation:

Cognitive linguistics has significantly changed the way that specialised languages (LSP), like medical English or legal French, are taught. For instance, cognitive linguistics shows that technical terminology are not arbitrary. Also, "Conceptual metaphors" are employed in specialised professions to comprehend abstract concepts: the metaphor "The Market is a Living Organism" (growth, financial health, recovery), for example, is frequently employed in economics. By applying techniques to grasp conceptual complications teachers assist trainees in comprehending the field's conceptual structure of a language, rather of forcing students to memorise discrete word lists. Cognitive linguistics employs the principle of prototypes, in contrast to the traditional method where a word has a fixed definition. Certain ideas are more fundamental (prototypical) than others in a specific setting.

In addition , Teaching focuses on how experts in the field categorize the world, facilitating the acquisition of specific "lexis-grammar."

Grammar is not just a rule in specialized languages; it carries meaning (symbolic). The use of the passive voice in scientific reports, for example, is not merely a stylistic preference but a cognitive way of emphasising the object of the experience rather than the human. Teaching shows how grammatical

structures reflect the communication needs of the profession.

In such context of learning languages, the general approach adopt the exposure to real situations. Importance is given to Corpus analysis using databases of real texts to identify linguistic recurrences. Vocation is moving to simulation technique of learning: Placing the learner in a cognitive environment close to their future profession (through virtual reality or case studies).

CONCLUSION

Teaching a specialised language, whether to a foreign student or a translator apprentice, presupposes, in fact, a comprehensive definition of its concept: teachers are called upon to invest in the fact that the specialised language is, first and foremost, a language conveying knowledge relating to one or more domains, that it is, in fact, only a variety of language in general, and that it is never supposed to be far from the genius and architecture of the common language. Teachers of specialised languages must instil in their apprentices the community characteristics of LSPs; specialised languages share a vocabulary and syntactic mechanisms that are, rather, identical with the common language. In fact, the permeability between specialist languages proves that they are ultimately only one language grouping together human activities which are neither compartmentalised nor "compartmentalisable" (Lerat: 1995).

6. Bibliography list:

BLOIS, Aimée. (1995), « Vocabulaire spécifique ou transversal ? Un choix dans l‟enseignement des langues de spécialité ».*Cahiers de l'APLIUT*, volume 15, numéro 1, pp. 69-73

CONDAMINES,Anne. (2005), « linguistique de corpus et terminologie ». *Langage*, 157, pp.36-47.

DURY, Pascaline & LERVAD, Susanne. (2008), « La variation synonymique dans la terminologie de l‟énergie : approches synchronique et diachronique, deux études de cas ». *LSP & Professional communication*, vol.8, n°02.

EVERS, Vincent (2010) *Terminologie et Traduction* (mémoire de master en traduction) Université d‟Utrecht. Repéré à:http//dspace.Library.uu.nl/bitstream/handle/1876/44747.

GAUDIN, François (1993), *Pour une Socio-terminologie – Des problèmes sémantique aux pratiques institutionnelles*, publication de l‟université de Rouan (Rouan).

GAUDIN, François (2003), S*ocio terminologie – une approche sociolinguistique de la terminologie.* De Boeck- Duculot, Bruxelles.

GAUDIN, François. (1995), « champs, clôtures, et domaines : Des langues de spécialité à la culture scientifique ». *Méta*, Vol. XL, n°02, pp.229-238.

GAUTIER, Lerant (2014) « des langues de spécialité à la communication spécialisée : un nouveau paradigme de recherche à l‟intersection entre science du langage, info-com et science cognitives ? »*Etudes Interdisciplinaires en Sciences Humaines* (EISH), n°01, pp.225-245.

GUESPIN, Louis, (1995) « la circulation terminologiques et les rapports entre science, technique, et production »*Meta, presse de l'Université de Montréal,* Vol.40, n°02 pp. 206-218.

GUILBERT, Louis (1965), *La Formation du Vocabulaire de l'Aviation.* Thèse du Doctorat des Lettres faculté des Lettres et Sciences Humaines, Université de Paris, Larousse, Paris.

GUILBERT, Louis (1975), *La créativité lexicale*, collection Langue et langage, Larousse Université, Paris

http// doczz.fr/doc/1893259.

KOCOUREK, Rostislav (1991), *La Langue Française de la Technique et de la Science : Vers une Linguistique de la Langue Savante* (*2eme Edition*) O. Brandstetter, Wiesbaden.

L'HOMME, M.C (1990) « y a-t-il une langue de spécialité ? Point de vue pratique et théorique. » *Les journées de linguistique.* Centre Interdisciplinaire de Recherche sur les Activités Langagières (CIRAL), n° spécial pp.105-112.

LEMAY, Chantal (2003), *Identification automatique du vocabulaire caractéristique du domaine de l'informatique fondée sur la comparaison de corpus*. (Mémoire de maitrise) université de Montréal. Repéré à : http://ville.montreal.qc.ca/pls/portal/docs/PAGE/…/DOCS/20170630.

LERAT, Pierre. (1995), *Les langues spécialisées.* Presses Universitaires de France, Paris.

LICZNER, Alexandra (2016), *Une contribution à l'amélioration des ressources thermographiques : Etude terminologique fondée sur un corpus de textes de spécialité du domaine du droit de l'internet* (thèse du doctorat) Université Lyon 02, repérée à :

PECMAN, Mojca (2005), « les apports possibles de la phraséologie à la didactique des langues étrangères » *Apprentissage des langues et systèmes d'information et de communication* (ALSIC) vol.8, n°02, pp.109-122.

PHAL, André (1969) « La recherche au CREDIF : La part du lexique commun dans les vocabulaires scientifiques et techniques. » *Langue française*, n°02 pp.37-81.

PHAL, André (1976), *Vocabulaire Général d'Orientation Scientifique (VGOS) : Part du Lexique Commun dans l'Expression Scientifique, Didier, Paris.*

PICTON, Aurelie (2009) *Diachronie en langue de spécialité. Définition d'une méthode linguistique outillée pour repérer l'évolution des connaissances en corpus. Un exemple appliqué au domaine spatial.* (Thèse du doctorat) Université de Toulouse 02. Repérée à : http//Researchgate.Net/publication/39064424.

TEMMERMAN, R (2000b) « Une théorie réaliste de terminologie : le socio-cognitivisme » *Terminologie Nouvelles,* n°21 pp.58-64.

TEMMERMAN, R. (2000), *Towards new ways of technical description: the socio-cognitive approach*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

TEMMERMAN, Rita ; FEMKE, Simonis & LUYTEN, Lucia. (1990), *Terminologie, een methode: inleiding tottheorie en praktijk van systematische terminographie*. Acco/Leuven/Amersfoort.

THOIRON, Philippe. & BÉJOINT, Henri. (2003) « La Terminologie, une question de termes ». *La Conférence Internationale de Terminologie* (CIT 2003), Lisbonne, Portugal, 11-13 décembre2003.

TOMA, Alice (2016) « Approche théorique pour terminologie discursive » *Diversité et Identité Culturelle en Europe* (DICE) Romanie Vol.13, n°01.

VICENTE, Garcia (2009) « la didactique du concept de la langue spécialisée : vers une approche traductologique de la question. » *Mutatis Mutandis*, vol.02, n°01.

VICENTE, Garcia (2009) « la didactique du concept de la langue spécialisée : vers une approche traductologique de la question. » *Mutatis Mutandis*, vol.02, n°01.

WUSTER, Eugène. (1991), *Einführung in die allgemeine Terminologielehre und terminologische Lexikographie.* Romanistischer Verlag. Bonn