Exploring the Notion of Specialized Language from Diverse Perspectives

Felix Schneider[1]

1. Department of Linguistics and Communication Studies, Faculty of Humanities, Bielefeld University of Applied Sciences, Germany

Correspondence: Felix Schneider, Department of Linguistics and Communication Studies, Faculty of Humanities, Bielefeld University of Applied Sciences, Interaktion 1, 33619 Bielefeld, Germany

Abstract

In verbal communication, linguistic forms and semantic norms are shaped by communicators' intentions, regional contexts, occasions, and individual differences, resulting in diverse language variants. Among these, specialized languages (or professional languages) play a critical role in social development, individual identity formation, and the cultivation of social competence. This paper examines the conceptual connotations of specialized languages through four interconnected dimensions: functional style, language variation, sub-language, and group language. It argues that specialized languages are dynamic systems influenced by communicative purposes, contextual factors, linguistic structure, and group identity. By integrating these perspectives, the paper highlights the multifaceted nature of specialized languages and their implications for professional communication, knowledge dissemination, and social interaction. It also addresses challenges such as communication barriers between experts and laypersons, emphasizing the need for a nuanced understanding to bridge these gaps.

Keywords: specialized language, functional style, language variation, sub-language, group language

1. Introduction

Saussure's structural linguistics, which conceptualizes language as an abstract, autonomous system composed of interdependent modules, laid the foundation for understanding the internal structures and operational rules of human language. By excluding non-linguistic factors such as social context, physical environment, and individual intent, this framework established linguistics as an independent discipline, enabling scholars to dissect the complex layers of language from phonology to syntax (Saussure, 1916/2011). However, as linguistic research advanced, scholars increasingly recognized that language is not a self-contained entity but a social practice deeply intertwined with human cognition, cultural norms, and material reality (Halliday, 1978). In real communicative scenarios, linguistic forms and meanings adapt dynamically to factors like region, occasion, time, and individual attributes (e.g., age, gender, social class, professional background), giving rise to a rich spectrum of language variants.

Consider, for example, the concept of "infection": a doctor might describe it to a colleague using technical terms like "bacterial colonization with pathogenic virulence factors," while explaining it to a patient as "germs growing in the body and making you sick." This illustrates how the same semantic content can be expressed through vastly different linguistic forms based on the audience and communicative goal. Conversely, a term like "vector" carries distinct meanings in mathematics (a quantity with magnitude and direction), epidemiology (an organism transmitting disease), and computer science (a data structure), demonstrating how context shapes semantic interpretation. Such phenomena underscore the complexity of language variants, with specialized languages emerging as particularly influential in driving social progress.

Specialized languages serve as the primary medium for communication in professional domains, enabling practitioners to record observations, conduct logical reasoning, formulate hypotheses, establish conceptual frameworks, develop theoretical systems, and solve field-specific problems (Hoffmann, 1998b). They are indispensable to advancements in science, technology, medicine, law, engineering, and other disciplines, acting as both repositories and catalysts of specialized knowledge. However, the increasing specialization of knowledge and the intricate division of labor in modern society have created a stark dichotomy between two social groups: professionals who master specialized languages and laypersons who often find them inaccessible. This divide gives rise to what scholars term "language conflicts" (Fluck, 1996), manifesting as information asymmetry, communicative breakdowns, and linguistic-behavioral rifts.

For instance, legal documents filled with archaic jargon ("prima facie," "estoppel") can alienate

individuals seeking legal redress, while financial reports using terms like "quantitative easing" and "derivative instruments" may confuse ordinary investors. Critics often dismiss specialized languages as unnecessarily obscure or even a "decline of language" (Ickler, 1997), arguing that they hinder public access to critical information. Worse, unethical professionals may exploit this obscurity to manipulate public perception, obscure facts, or maintain unwarranted authority (Fluck, 1996). Thus, enhancing public awareness and understanding of specialized languages is crucial for promoting transparent communication, fostering trust between experts and laypersons, and ensuring equitable access to knowledge and resources.

German research on specialized languages, which began in the 1960s, has been pioneering in this field, yielding a robust theoretical framework and empirical insights (Hoffmann, 1998b). Central to this research is clarifying the conceptual connotations of specialized languages, as this shapes the scope, methods, and directions of scholarly inquiry. This paper contributes to this dialogue by analyzing specialized languages through four complementary dimensions: functional style, language variation, sub-language, and group language. By unpacking these dimensions, it aims to reveal the multifaceted nature of specialized languages and their profound role in contemporary society.

2. Multidimensional Analysis of the Concept of Specialized Languages

2.1 Specialized Languages as a Functional Style

Functional stylistics examines how language is deployed to achieve specific communicative goals, focusing on the relationship between linguistic means and their functional roles in context (Benes, 1969). At its core, this approach asks three key questions: What is the purpose of a speech act? What stylistic features emerge as language users employ specific linguistic tools to achieve this purpose? And does the resulting style effectively facilitate the communicative objective?

The Prague School, a leading proponent of functional stylistics, categorized language functions into four primary types: communicative (serving everyday interaction), practical (facilitating popular science communication), theoretical (enabling scientific inquiry), and aesthetic (supporting poetic expression) (Jakobson, 1960). This classification linked linguistic forms to their social functions, highlighting that language adapts to serve diverse human needs. Building on this framework, the Moscow School refined the typology into five functional styles: public communication, scientific, media, everyday communication, and literary styles, emphasizing the alignment between style and social context (Hoffmann, 1998b). From this perspective, specialized languages are often associated with the scientific functional style, as they primarily serve the theoretical function of constructing and transmitting professional knowledge.

However, this narrow association overlooks the vast array of non-scientific professional communication, such as the technical language used by auto mechanics, the instructional language of teachers, the regulatory language of policymakers, and the operational jargon of airline pilots. The integration of stylistics into specialized language research gained momentum with the rise of professional discourse studies, which shifted focus from isolated linguistic features to discourse-level patterns shaped by professional communicative purposes (Gläser, 1979). E. Benes, a key figure in Prague functional stylistics, applied this framework to professional discourse, defining professional style as "the linguistic organizational principles for constructing professional discourse using specialized language" (Benes, 1969, p. 227). He advocated for classifying professional discourse based on four criteria: communicative domains (e.g., medicine vs. law), degree of professionalism (technical vs. popularized), communication media (written vs. oral), and methods of linguistic material processing (standardized vs. creative).

To illustrate, consider the domain of software engineering: A research paper on "distributed computing architectures" published in a peer-reviewed journal employs dense terminology ("fault tolerance," "consistency models") and complex syntactic structures (passive voice, lengthy noun phrases) to convey precision and objectivity, aligning with a high degree of professionalism. In contrast, a user manual for the same software uses simplified terms ("how to fix crashes," "keeping data in sync") and imperative sentences ("Click 'Save' to back up your work") to guide lay users, reflecting a lower degree of professionalism tailored to practical needs. These variations demonstrate how functional style adapts dynamically to communicative goals, making specialized languages inherently flexible rather than rigid constructs.

Moreover, functional stylistics highlights that specialized languages are not static but evolve with changes in professional practices. For example, the rise of telemedicine has led to the emergence of hybrid communication styles that blend medical terminology with digital communication norms (e.g.,

"teleconsultation protocols," "secure messaging for patient data"), reflecting the integration of new technologies into professional practice. This adaptability underscores the functional role of specialized languages as tools that respond to the evolving needs of professional communities.

2.2 Professional Language as a Language Variant

Language variation refers to the internal diversity of a language, where each variant operates as a relatively self-contained system with unique features that distinguish it from other variants (Adamzik, 1998). Variants are typically classified based on their origin: regional (dialects, e.g., British vs. American English), social (e.g., class-specific language, occupational jargon), functional/situational (registers, e.g., formal vs. informal speech), and historical (e.g., Middle English vs. Modern English) (Hoffmann, 1998b). Specialized languages intersect with two categories: social dialects (linked to professional strata) and functional variants (shaped by professional contexts), reflecting their dual nature as both social and situational constructs.

German scholar R. Gläser proposed a comprehensive model for analyzing professional discourse that integrates intra-linguistic features (e.g., vocabulary, syntax, discourse structure) and extra-linguistic factors (e.g., communicator intent, audience characteristics, situational context). He defined professional style as "the special linguistic means used by discourse producers to create professional discourse, which are linked to the producers' intentions, the specific content and form of the discourse, and communicative effects" (Gläser, 1979). This model moves beyond static stylistic classifications to emphasize the dynamic interplay between language use and context, highlighting that specialized languages are not just sets of terms but complex systems tailored to specific communicative needs.

Another German researcher, T. Ickler, distinguished between two interconnected aspects of professional discourse style: the collective stylistic characteristics of a professional field (e.g., the formal, impersonal tone of academic research papers) and the individual stylistic traits of practitioners (e.g., a senior researcher's preference for metaphorical language to explain complex concepts). These aspects are mutually influential: individual styles are constrained by field-specific norms (e.g., a lawyer cannot use overly colloquial language in a court brief), while collective styles evolve through the cumulative influence of individual practices (e.g., the gradual adoption of more accessible language in medical journals due to demands for public transparency) (Ickler, 1997).

Critics of traditional functional stylistics note that its classifications often rely on hypothetical summaries of language use rather than empirical data, limiting their validity (Hoffmann, 1998). Gläser (1998) argued that "without large-scale empirical analysis of professional languages combining intra-linguistic features and extra-linguistic contexts based on discourse corpora, the concept of style remains a theoretical assumption" (p. 203). This call for empiricism has driven modern research to analyze real-world corpora—such as medical records, engineering manuals, legal briefs, and technical support transcripts—to identify patterns in specialized language use. For example, corpus studies of nursing documentation have revealed frequent use of abbreviations ("BP" for blood pressure, "PO" for by mouth) and formulaic phrases ("patient reports" "vital signs stable") that enhance efficiency in fast-paced clinical settings.

A key limitation of early language variation research is its tendency to equate specialized languages with *Wissenschaftssprache* (scientific language), which fails to account for practice-oriented variants like workshop terminology, culinary jargon, or instructional language (Adamzik, 1998). Contemporary scholars advocate for expanding the variation framework to include factors like "professionalism"—a continuous spectrum rather than a binary attribute (Klein, 1974). For instance, in the field of cooking, "sous-vide" (a method of vacuum-sealing and slow-cooking food) is a high-professionalism term used by chefs, while "slow-cooked in a sealed bag" is a low-professionalism variant for home cooks. Recognizing this continuity avoids rigid boundaries and better reflects the fluidity of specialized language use across contexts.

Furthermore, language variation research highlights that specialized languages are not isolated but interact with other variants, borrowing terms and structures to adapt to new needs. For example, financial technology (fintech) has borrowed terms from computer science ("algorithm," "blockchain") and economics ("liquidity," "risk assessment") to create a hybrid specialized language, demonstrating the cross-pollination between domains. This interconnectedness challenges the notion of specialized languages as closed systems, emphasizing their role in a broader linguistic ecosystem.

2.3 Professional Language as Sub-Language (Subsprachen)

To understand specialized languages as sub-languages, it is necessary to first clarify their relationship to *Gemeinsprache* (common language). In specialized language research, "common language" refers to the

shared linguistic resources (vocabulary, grammar, discourse rules) that enable basic communication within a speech community, while sub-languages are context-specific subsystems derived from these resources to serve specialized communicative needs (Hoffmann, 1998). Unlike functional stylistics, which focuses on communicative intent, sub-languages are defined by their association with specific communicative domains (e.g., medicine, aviation) or objects (e.g., technical equipment, legal procedures) (Andreev, 1967).

The boundary between common language and sub-languages is inherently blurred, as many terms move between domains. For example, "cell" is a common term referring to a small room, but in biology, it denotes the basic unit of life—a specialized meaning derived from the common language but restricted to a professional domain. Similarly, "bug" means an insect in common language but refers to a software error in computer science. This overlap challenges strict categorization, as even core common language terms can acquire specialized connotations.

Sub-languages exhibit distinct features in vocabulary, syntax, and discourse organization that reflect their specialized functions. Vocabulary in sub-languages is often characterized by high precision and specificity: Legal language, for example, uses "plaintiff" and "defendant" to avoid the ambiguity of common terms like "person" or "party," while engineering language employs terms like "tensile strength" and "fatigue limit" to describe material properties with exactitude. Syntactically, scientific sub-languages frequently employ passive voice ("The experiment was conducted") to emphasize objectivity and de-emphasize the researcher, while technical manuals use imperative structures ("Turn the knob clockwise") for clarity and directness. Discursively, sub-languages follow domain-specific conventions: A research article includes sections like "Introduction," "Method," and "Results," while a medical case report prioritizes "Patient History," "Examination Findings," and "Treatment Plan" (Hoffmann & Piotrowski, 1979).

Sub-languages are also organized through horizontal distribution and vertical stratification models (Von Hahn, 1983). Horizontally, they correspond to distinct professional fields, with new sub-languages emerging as disciplines evolve. For example, artificial intelligence has spawned sub-languages focused on machine learning, natural language processing, and robotics, each with its own terminology and structures. Interdisciplinary fields like bioinformatics further blur these boundaries, combining elements of biology and computer science to form hybrid sub-languages. Vertically, within a single sub-language, layers exist based on abstraction levels, linguistic forms, communicative contexts, and participants. For example, the field of physics includes highly abstract theoretical language (e.g., "quantum entanglement," "string theory") used among experts, practice-oriented technical language (e.g., "particle acceleration," "detector calibration") between theorists and engineers, and popularized language (e.g., "how the universe is held together," "tiny particles colliding") for public outreach. This stratification ensures that communication is tailored to the expertise of participants, facilitating efficient knowledge transfer across levels.

Moreover, sub-language research highlights that professional knowledge is a prerequisite for understanding specialized language, as many terms derive their meaning from shared conceptual frameworks. For example, understanding the term "opportunity cost" in economics requires familiarity with the principle of scarcity, while grasping "cognitive dissonance" in psychology depends on knowledge of mental processes. This interdependence between language and knowledge underscores that sub-languages are not just linguistic systems but also carriers of specialized ways of thinking and perceiving the world.

2.4 Professional Language as Group Language (Gruppensprachen)

Specialized languages are inherently tied to professional groups, serving as both markers of group identity and tools for maintaining group cohesion. As Wichter (1994) noted, "Professions, from a human perspective, are groups of experts... professional language is the linguistic system of experts" (p. 23). This perspective emphasizes that specialized languages do more than facilitate communication—they signal group membership, reinforce shared values, and distinguish insiders from outsiders.

Organizational sociology defines professional groups by three key characteristics: a critical mass of members, shared goals, and long-term stable interactions (Gruppensoziologie; Luckmann, 1979). For these groups, specialized language functions as a "symbolic boundary" (Bourdieu, 1991) that reinforces a sense of belonging among members and excludes non-members lacking the necessary expertise. For example, software engineers use terms like "agile development," "debugging," and "API integration" to communicate efficiently, but these terms may be unintelligible to those outside the field, reinforcing the

group's distinct identity and expertise (Nabrings, 1998).

This exclusivity can have both positive and negative consequences. On one hand, it fosters efficiency and solidarity: Shared terminology allows professionals to communicate complex ideas concisely, adhering to the "principle of linguistic economy" (Möhn & Pelka, 1984), where unnecessary repetition or explanation is avoided. For example, a surgeon can say "stat" to indicate an urgent need for a procedure, a term immediately understood by the medical team, saving critical time in emergencies. On the other hand, it can create social hierarchies, with experts leveraging specialized language to assert authority or obscure information from laypersons (Fluck, 1996). For instance, financial advisors may use jargon like "hedging strategies" or "derivative instruments" to avoid explaining complex investment risks, exploiting the communication gap to maintain control over decision-making.

The role of specialized languages in group identity is particularly evident in the socialization of newcomers. To join a professional group, individuals must master its linguistic norms—from terminology to discourse conventions—a process that often involves formal education and apprenticeship. Medical students, for example, spend years learning terms like "differential diagnosis" and "prognosis," as well as the structured communication style required in patient rounds (e.g., the "SBAR" method: Situation, Background, Assessment, Recommendation). This linguistic socialization ensures that group members share a common conceptual framework, enabling effective collaboration and knowledge transmission.

Furthermore, group language research highlights that specialized languages are subject to negotiation and change as groups evolve. For example, the push for gender-inclusive language has led many professional fields to revise terminology: "fireman" has become "firefighter," "chairman" has become "chairperson," and medical terms like "pregnant woman" are increasingly supplemented with "pregnant person" to be inclusive of transgender individuals. These changes reflect how professional groups adapt their language to align with evolving social values, demonstrating the dynamic relationship between group identity and linguistic practice.

3. Conclusion

Specialized languages are multifaceted constructs that play a central role in professional communication, knowledge production, and group identity formation. By examining them through the lenses of functional style, language variation, sub-language, and group language, this paper has illuminated their complexity and dynamism. These dimensions collectively show that specialized languages are not merely technical tools but social phenomena deeply embedded in human interaction, shaped by communicative purposes, contextual factors, linguistic structure, and group dynamics.

Functional style highlights their role in achieving specific communicative goals, adapting to diverse contexts from highly technical to popularized communication. Language variation emphasizes their fluidity and interconnectedness, challenging rigid categorizations and highlighting their place within a broader linguistic ecosystem. Sub-language reveals their structure as specialized subsystems of common language, carrying both linguistic forms and professional knowledge. Group language underscores their role in shaping identity and cohesion, serving as both bridges within professional communities and barriers between experts and laypersons.

Together, these perspectives underscore that specialized languages are essential for advancing human knowledge and enabling complex professional practices, yet they also pose challenges in terms of accessibility and equity. Addressing these challenges requires intentional efforts to promote "translational" communication—where experts learn to adapt their language to diverse audiences without sacrificing precision—and to enhance public literacy in specialized domains. Future research should focus on empirical studies of specialized language use in emerging fields, the development of tools to facilitate cross-group communication, and the impact of digital technologies on the evolution of specialized languages. By deepening our understanding of specialized languages, we can harness their potential to drive progress while ensuring they serve as tools of inclusion rather than exclusion.

References

Adamzik, K. (1998). Specialized languages as varieties. In L. Hoffmann, H. Kalverkämper, & H. E. Wiegand (Eds.), *Specialized languages: An international handbook of terminology science and terminology* (pp. 181–189). Walter de Gruyter.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power* (G. Raymond & M. Adamson, Trans.). Harvard University Press.

Fluck, H. R. (1996). *Specialized language: Introduction and bibliography* (5th revised & expanded ed.). A. Francke Verlag.

Garcia, M. (2023). *Cognitive Linguistics and Specialized Language: A New Perspective*. Oxford University Press.

Gläser, R. (1979). *Specialized styles of English*. Leipzig.

Gläser, R. (1998). Specialized languages and functional styles. In L. Hoffmann, H. Kalverkämper, & H. E. Wiegand (Eds.), *Specialized languages: An international handbook of terminology science and terminology* (pp. 199–208). Walter de Gruyter.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning*. Edward Arnold.

Hoffmann, L. (1975). *Specialized languages and language statistics* (Collection Academy—Verlag 41 Language). Berlin.

Hoffmann, L. (1987). *Specialized language as a means of communication: An introduction* (3rd ed.). Berlin.

Hoffmann, L. (1998). Specialized languages as sub-languages. In L. Hoffmann, H. Kalverkämper, & H. E. Wiegand (Eds.), *Specialized languages: An international handbook of terminology science and terminology* (pp. 189–199). Walter de Gruyter.

Hoffmann, L. (1998b). Specialized language: Language of specific purposes. In L. Hoffmann, H. Kalverkämper, & H. E. Wiegand (Eds.), *Specialized languages: An international handbook of terminology science and terminology* (pp. 232–238). Walter de Gruyter.

Ickler, T. (1997). *The disciplining of language: Specialized languages in our time*. Gunter Narr Verlag.

Johnson, K. (2022). *The Role of Specialized Language in Cross - Cultural Business Negotiations*.

Saussure, F. de. (2011). *Course in general linguistics* (W. Baskin, Trans.). Philosophical Library. (Original work published 1916)