

## TRANSLATION OF NEW SOCIOLOGICAL TERMINOLOGY: CHALLENGES AND SOLUTIONS

*N. V. Runova<sup>1</sup>, T. V. Furmenkova<sup>1</sup>, N. Yu. Linevich<sup>1</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University  
14 A. Nevskogo str., Kaliningrad, 236016, Russia  
Submitted on September 19, 2020  
doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2021-2-6

*Rapid development of concepts in modern sociology leads to the emergence of a large number of neological terms. Currently, the academic language of Russian sociology sees an active expansion of foreign language terminology and translated terms reflecting changes in the English-language social picture of the world. However, the lack of consistency in intra-lingual and inter-lingual translation of new terms may complicate the understanding of this terminology by representatives of multilingual academic schools. This study aims to analyse modern English sociological terms and translated borrowings in Russian, to explore their form and conceptual content in two languages, the degree of their conventionality in the scientific thesaurus of multilingual sociological schools and the possibility of an adequate transfer of terminological meaning from English into Russian. The authors view the sociological term as a cognitive, linguistic and cultural phenomenon, and study its synchronic and diachronic variability. The article is an attempt to illuminate the problem from a purely linguistic and translation point of view and to point out the need for combining efforts to systematise and harmonise the English and Russian terminologies of sociology.*

**Keywords:** *sociological term, sociological concepts, sociological nomenclature, neologisms, translation*

### 1. Introduction

The rapid change in the social sphere and the sociological picture of the world is a characteristic feature of our time. Today we are witnessing the rapid development of the categorical-conceptual apparatus of sociology (Chernetsky, 2015), which is expressed in a constant increase in neological terms. According to statistics, a new direction in science may entail replenishment of the special vocabulary stock with at least one hundred new concepts. Against the background of “trends of accelerating and increasingly complex dynamics within Russian sociology” (Kravchenko, 2019, p. 34), there is a constant exchange and mutual enrichment of ideas between Russian and foreign (English-speaking) experts, which is accompanied by the active penetration of English terminology into the Russian terminological thesaurus. The emergence and consolidation of a new term in the recipient language is impossible without high-quality translation, which can provide adequate perception of the word by the language system through its speakers.



Over the past two decades, the systematization of new terminology has been carried out through compiling the dictionaries of the latest sociological terminology edited by S. A. Kravchenko (Kravchenko, 2000; 2002; 2003; 2004; 2011; 2012; 2013; Dictionary of the latest sociological terminology with English equivalents, 2019). A tremendous amount of work has been done to capture the new research tools: dictionary entries give an idea of the dynamics of the conceptual apparatus of sociology, reflect the nuances of the author-coined terms, describe the terms of disciplines related to sociology, and reveal terminological ambiguity. However, a number of problems still remain unresolved, among which the following can be highlighted: conceptual instability of terms, terminological synonymy, arbitrary variation of forms, sound dissonance of terms in the recipient language as a result of tracing, as well as obvious translation errors when transferring the conceptual content of the original term. The purpose of this study is to highlight these issues and offer recommendations for overcoming the challenges.

## **2. Conceptual and linguistic nature of a sociological term and its modern representation**

The nature of the term as a special linguistic unit is a complex unity of language, cognition and communication (Cabr e, 1999; Faber Ben itez, 2009, p. 112–114). The linguistic understanding of the term proceeds from the idea that it is “given to us in the form of a unit of language”, which “is a natural linguistic substrate (basis) of the term” (Leichik, 2007, p. 27). The term is formalized and functions according to the laws of natural language. The cognitive component of a term is the content, scope and structure of the concept that it conveys. The close interaction of these two instances can be traced in the definitions of the term given by scholars of domestic and foreign terminological schools: “Term is a linguistic unit which conveys conceptual meaning within the framework of specialized knowledge texts” (Faber, Ben itez, 2009, p. 112–114). “A term is a nominative special lexical unit (word or phrase), adopted for the exact naming of concepts” (Grinev-Grinevich, 2008, p. 30). The communicative aspect of a terminological unit is expressed in the fact that it is designed to record, accumulate and transmit professional information, to participate in creating texts of various communicative purposes (Leichik, 2007, p. 66–69; Sager, 1990, p. 99–128). In this sense, the terminology of different branches of knowledge has different specifics based on how close the connection of a particular science with related disciplines is, what is the dynamics of its development, and how open it is to interact with other scientific schools.

A specific feature of sociological discourse is the reflection of methodological pluralism: the application of various scientific approaches and the use of various scientific thesauri lead to the destruction of a single cognitive space, within which it is possible to achieve mutual understanding and adequate interpretation of new terminology. Moreover, “in Russian sociology, there is still no scientific language adequate for understanding and explaining Russian social specifics, which is why when studying it, many researchers are forced to use exclusively the language of Western academic science,



which was formed in a different cognitive environment for examining other sociocultural realities" (Lubsky, 2015, p. 131). Thus, cultural context is not only a defining feature of social science discourse, but also a source of cognitive dissonance within it.

Sociological terminology has the same contradictory character. On the one hand, the formed terminological core with its conventional uses testifies to the maturity of this terminology. On the other hand, it is a young system in its making, which is characterized by hypothetical terms, polysemy and synonymy, as well as terminological ambiguity, i.e. the lack of a consensus among experts on the definition of some concepts (Maikova, 2016, p. 172–173).

Many modern English terms recorded in the dictionaries of the new sociological vocabulary can be classified as terminoids, which are characterized by unstable conceptual content. This results in the inaccuracy of their meaning, contextual dependence, and often variation in form. According to S. V. Grinev-Grinevich, "terminoids are usually recorded in descriptive dictionaries indicating different points of view on their content" (Grinev-Grinevich, 2008, p. 44). Here is an example from "The Dictionary of the latest sociological terminology with English equivalents": *quantified self* – quantitative measurement of oneself – according to V. Mosco, opportunities for quantifying "self" is now almost ubiquitous... The term is sometimes used to simply account for a growing tendency to focus on quantifying bodily actions. It is also used in the dramatic meaning of reducing the amount of "I" to the amount that turns personal identity into something more than static reading due to qualitative, subjective and other non-quantifiable dimensions of life (Kravchenko, 2019, p. 42). This dictionary entry is characterized by a vague description, even if the dictionary is of an encyclopedic nature.

A special kind of terminoids are pre-terms, which name new, well-formed concepts, but they often do not meet the requirement of conciseness. An example of a descriptive pre-term is the following: *European Union as community of fate* – a metaphor used by A. Giddens to describe the current situation in the EU (Kravchenko, 2019, p. 34–35).

A huge layer of neologisms is represented by the author's coined terms, which is quite explicable: the newest concepts are introduced into scientific use by individual authors or by small groups of like-minded people. Such terms are called individual. According to V. M. Leichik, "as soon as the theory in which they appear becomes generally accepted, they become a social phenomenon. Otherwise, such terms remain occasional" (Leichik, 2007, p. 95). At this stage in the development of sociological terminology, they certainly fall into the category of author's occasional (coined) words that have some signs of terminoids. Their further consolidation in the terminology system depends on how well the theories behind them are accepted, which, as a rule, is revealed in diachrony. In the dictionaries by S. A. Kravchenko, "the introduction of new terms happens while the methodology and the quality of sociological thinking of its author is disclosed" (Kravchenko, 2019, p. 4). The list of these authors includes the prominent sociologists M. Castells, Z. Bauman, U. Beck, J. Urri, W. Vanderburg, J. Alexander, R. Braidotti, A. Giddens, H. Marcuse, V. Mosco, C. Perrow, E. Fromm, A. R. Radcliffe-Brown and many others. The terms *national network safety* and *network security*



(Kravchenko, 2011, p. 33) can serve as a clear example of the meaningful discrepancy of the term among different authors. The first term was originally introduced in Russian by S. A. Kravchenko, and then translated into English, the emergence of the second occurred in the reverse order. As a result, two practically identical terms appeared in the Russian language (*network security*) with a difference in one definition of “national”. However, their identity is manifested only in the linguistic shell. Conceptually, we have two different terms, the second of which, moreover, is polysemantic, i.e. internally splits into two meanings: 1) *national network safety* – according to S. A. Kravchenko, it is the state of protection of the country’s national interests, due to the functional self-sufficiency of each security link... 2) *network security* is, 1) according to J. Urri. Uri, is a security model based on social networks, allowing to identify those who are considered a source of threat; and 2) according to A. Crawford, it is a form of security relatively autonomous from national states, which is acquiring a global character. Thus, the concept “network” in the adjective “network” receives a completely different interpretation: in the first term it means the national security system with all its links (military-political, informational, social), and in the second – a social network, which, on the contrary, does not focus on much narrower national but rather on wider global interests. The coexistence of such lexemes, similar in form, but different in content, indicates a violation of certain requirements for the term: meaning-wise, it breaches the consistency of its semantics (here the lexical and terminological meanings confront to a certain extent), form-wise, it denies motivation, i.e. semantic transparency, which makes it possible to form an idea of the concept being transmitted. The elimination of such contradictions can be facilitated by the concept harmonization and the term harmonization within the framework of the standardization process, which can reduce or eliminate differences between concepts, as well as unify the form of their expression (see <http://docs.cntd.ru/document/1200104389>).

Another important feature of the terminology in sociology is a close connection with common vocabulary, the correlation in form with the words of everyday language. With all the apparent clarity of meaning, such lexical units tend to “increment” new author’s “immediate” meanings, developing a polysemy: *waste* – garbage, according to Z. Bauman, is the main product of the consumer lifestyle (Kravchenko, 2019, p. 65).

In general, the terminology of the social sciences and humanities can be characterized by the following features: it has a close connection with the terminology systems of related disciplines, it is marked with semantic branching, it lacks uniformity, unstable in meanings, it has some certain emotional and subjective-evaluative connotation, it depends on the context, it is stylistically marked, it has limited and inefficient forms (Bursina, 2014, p. 9).

## 2. Development of new Russian terms in translation

Translation of terms can be seen as a compromise activity at the intersection of translation and terminographic work (Cabré, 1999, p. 115). In view of the interlingual asymmetry of terminological systems, translation of terms goes beyond the search for lexical equivalents and includes the stages of



terminographic work: analysis of the conceptual content of a term, definitions of terms, determining the degree of equivalence of conceptual systems and individual concepts within these systems (Achkasov, Kazakova, 2018, p. 104). However, a huge role in this process is assigned to the “technical” side of reproducing a term in another language, i.e. translation methods. The form in which the new lexical formation will appear in the target language largely determines its further functioning in the terminological system.

According to the standard specified in the Practical Guide to Social Terminology, neologisation takes three main vectors: “neologism defines a new term (unedited form), a new meaning of an already existing linguistic form or a term borrowed from another field of knowledge. In each language, neologisms are created according to their own rules, which must be followed” (<http://docs.cntd.ru/document/1200104389>). The academic style of the modern Russian language is characterized by a huge number of English-language borrowings due to the influx of new concepts and ideas. Some of them survive well through time and get fixed in the terminological system. According to S.N. Mayorova-Shcheglova, those that meet specific requirements will best take root in the language of sociology. The requirements include laconic form, use of Russian word-building elements (prefixes, suffixes), the absence of negative meaningful associations from other spheres of life, ease of pronunciation, the presence of complete or partial Russian equivalents (Mayorova-Shcheglova, 2011, p. 100–101). All this can serve as a guide for the creation of new sociological terms in translation.

The analysis of dictionaries of the new sociological terms revealed a wide variety of ways English terms transfer into Russian. Translation-wise, they can be divided into literal and functional translation. Among the methods of literal translation, transcription and transliteration take a significant place: (Eng.) **downshifting** – (Rus.) **дауншифтинг** (*daunshifting*), (Eng.) **domicide** – (Rus.) **домицид** (*domicid*) (Kravchenko, 2011, p. 92; 2019, p. 32). At the same time, a tendency towards variability of the phonetic forms of the term is noted, which indicates the unstable behavior of the borrowed terminology in Russian context. Thus, the term **tribalism** has two phonovariants – (Rus.) **трибализм** (*tribalizm*) и **трайбализм** (*traibalizm*) (Kravchenko, 2019, p. 121). Of course, this is explained by the fact that the source for the majority of the new terminological units are articles and reports of sociological fora and the latest foreign works on sociology, which have not had time to get tested by time for successful survival. (The most striking example of such a tendency, borrowed from Wikipedia, can serve as five (!) Russian variants of the English term **survivalism** – **сурвивализм** (*survivalizm*), **сервайвализм** (*servaivalizm*), **сурвайвализм** (*survaivalizm*), **выживализм** (*vyzhivalizm*), **выживальничество** (*vyzhival'nichestvo*). Such variants are called ‘complex’, because they include phonetic, grammatical and lexical variations (the latter are called ‘multilingual doublets’). These discrepancies in terms of the expression of new terms, as well as the tendency to include redundant variants in the dictionary reflecting the occasional use of foreign language terms, can cause significant difficulties in the work of a translator using such dictionaries. The final choice of the variant should result from active analytical work.



Another common way of introducing translated Russian sociological terms is full and partial tracing: (Eng.) **kentavr-problem** – (Rus.) **кентавр-проблема** (*kentavr-problema*) (Kravchenko, 2011, p. 147). It seems not entirely natural for the target language to use incorporation tracing – the formation of complex compound lexemes with hyphenated spelling: (Eng.) **self-as-player** – (Rus.) **самоидентификация-как-игрока** (*samoidentifikacija-kak-igroka*); **self-as-performer** – **самоидентификация-как-исполнителя** (*samoidentifikacija-kak-isponitelja*); **self-as-character** – **самоидентификация-как-характер** (*samoidentifikacija-kak-harakter*) (Kravchenko, 2011, p. 147). Such constructions are more often used by modern Russian-speaking authors in fiction as a stylistic device, but they are perceived by the Russian-speaking community as a foreign element. It would be more natural to leave them without a hyphen.

Functional translation is presented in the following ways: a) full equivalents: **path dependence** – **зависимость от колеи** (*zavisimost' ot kolei*) (Kravchenko, 2011, p. 116); b) partial equivalents: **healthism** – **здоровая жизнь** (*zdrovaja zhizn'*) (Kravchenko, 2011, p. 114); c) lexical addition: **throwaway society** – **общество одноразовых/выбрасываемых предметов** (*obshchestvo odnorazovyh/vybrasyvaemyh predmetov*) (Kravchenko, 2011, p. 224); d) functional analogue: **folk theories** – **спонтанная социология** (*spontannaja sociologija*) (Kravchenko, 2004, p. 311); e) modulation: **culture accumulation** – **культурное обогащение** (*kul'turnoje obogashchenije*) (Kravchenko, 2004, p. 248). There are also hybrid terms formed as a result of mixed types of translation: **simulmatics** – **модельматика** (*model'matika*) – equivalent and transliteration (Kravchenko, 2011, p. 197).

Foreign language borrowings entail deviations from the grammatical norms of the Russian language. In the English academic language of sociology, especially in the author's terminology, there is a tendency to use abstract plural nouns, which is traced in Russian: **silences** – **молчания** (*molchanija*), **mobilities** – **мобильности** (*mobil'nosti*), **risk-solidarities** – **риск-солидарности** (*risk-solidarnosti*) (Kravchenko, 2011, p. 195, 201, 282). Rendering some English abstract nouns violates one of the pragmatic requirements for the term, i. e. its euphony. As a result, such Russian terms can number up to seven syllables and contain several difficult to pronounce consonants in a row: **governmentality** – **гавернментальность** (*gavernmental'nost'*) (cf. also derivatives of **гавернментальное общество** (*gavernmental'noje obshchestvo*), **гавернментальная рациональность** (*gavernmental'naja racional'nost'*), **informational city** – **информациональный город** (*informacional'nyj gorod*) (Kravchenko, 2011, p. 64, 220, 269, 81). The euphony of the term also lies in the fact that it should not evoke unwanted associations, such as **mondialisation** – **мондиализация** (*mondializacija*) (Kravchenko, 2011, p. 201) or **heroinism** – **героинизм/героиномания** (*geroinizm/geroinomanija*) (Kravchenko, 2004, p. 75). The latter term means "adoration of heroes" and "cult of heroes of the past", but it has a strong association with drugs in the Russian translation. In such dialexemes, there is an interlingual asymmetry of the content plane, which consists in the mismatch of the volume of meanings, stylistic, emotional-evaluative connotations, in various denotative correlations, etc. This linguistic phenomenon is also known in translation theory under the name of "false friends of the translator."



The analyzed group of terms can also include an environmental term which has entered the usage. Its incorporation into the language of sociology is evidenced by its systematic and derivational ability: **environmentology** – **инвайронментология** (*invaironmentologija*), **environpolitics** – **инвайронментальная политика** (*invaironmental'naja politika*), **paleoenvironment** – **палеинвайронмент** (*paleinvaironment*) (Kravchenko, 2004, p. 136, 297, 273). However, being fixed in the Russian language, it still shows variability of form: in the 2019 dictionary (Kravchenko, 2014, p. 12), the term *environmental refugees* is used without one letter "n" (the same tendency is observed in sociological Internet articles). Initially, when creating these terms in Russian, it should have been better to turn to a more laconic root "eco".

#### 4. Terminological synonymy: good or evil?

Synonymy in terms is one of the most urgent issues in terminology and is associated with the redundancy of a concept naming means (Grinev-Grinevich, 2008, p. 102). According to the researcher, the terminological synonym and the variant are similar in the sense that they serve to name one concept, therefore, synonymy and variability can be considered as equivalent concepts.

The analysis showed that terminological synonymy develops in two ways: 1) several Russian equivalents correspond to one English term (**reciprocity** – **реципрокация/реципрокность** (*reciprokacija/reciproknost'*)) and vice versa: 2) several English synonyms are translated into one Russian equivalent (**negationism/negativism/nihilism** – **нигилизм** (*nigilizm*)). As part of our research, we will touch upon the problem of synonymy only in Russian terminology. So, most examples are morphological variants of the source English term: **participatory demography** – **партиципаторная демократия** (*participatornaja demokratija*) (complete tracing of a foreign language suffix), **партиципативная демократия** (*participationaja demokratija*) (half tracing with a Russian suffix – iv) (Kravchenko, 2004, p. 98). In modern academic discourse, several more variants of this adjective are actively used, with the replacement of the Russian voiceless hard (ц) (*ts*), followed by (ы) (*y*), by a softer (palatalized) consonant (с) – **партисипативный** и **партисипаторный** (*partisipativnyj/partisipatornyj*). Thus, in diachrony, there is not a reduction in the morphovariants of the term, but their obvious increase. It should be noted that in terms of content, they are absolute synonyms. Such an inconsistent picture indicates the absence of a centralized terminological work to streamline the terminology of sociology.

Among other variants of terms, some quite natural for the Russian language can be found: **decentring** – **децентризм/ацентризм** (*decentrizm/acentrizm*) (Kravchenko, 2011, p. 99), where there is a variability of Latin prefixes, which are equivalent and productive in the Russian language; as well as multilingual doublets such as dissemination – **рассеивание/диссеминация**, the simultaneous use of which is quite acceptable.

All of the above assumes that synonymy hinders the construction of a coherent system of concepts in the sociological branch, therefore, its abolition is a striving for the unity of the interpretation of basic concepts. Even



when trying to normalize the emerging terminology, i.e. fixation in the system of terminoids, it is necessary to avoid their variability, so as not to seriously damage the development of this field of knowledge.

### 5. Transformation of translated terms in diachronic aspect

An analysis of the dictionaries of the new sociological terminology made it possible to trace how the form and meaning of borrowings changed over a decade, i.e. follow their diachronic variation. Rita Temmerman, in particular, focuses it in her work, and connects the lack of uniqueness of the term with the development of concepts and categories, because most of them have a flexible intension and extension (Temmerman, 2000, p. 130). Diachronic analysis is also important because “when developing terminology, it should be possible to revise the selected options and adjust the implemented terminology depending on the reaction of target users and, as a rule, taking into account the evolution of word usage” (<http://docs.cntd.ru/document/1200104389>).

The diachronic variability of the terms of sociology is expressed in two planes: the plane of content and the plane of expressing concepts. The change in the conceptual content of the term occurs through the development of polysemy – mainly, the expansion of meaning. A striking example is the term *alcoholism*, the former meanings of which are (1) a chronic disease caused by alcohol abuse; 2) social anomie, expressed in massive alcohol abuse; 3) personal and behavioral characteristics of an individual who abuses alcohol (Kravchenko, 2004, p. 22). Recently a narrow author-coined meaning was added defining “the deformation of social time with the effect the past that is slipping away, suspending the present, experiencing the future as the future accomplished” (Kravchenko, 2011, p. 16). The concept of **underclass**, which is transliterated into Russian as **андеркласс** (*anderklass*), has also expanded strongly in author's interpretation: cf. one definition in the dictionary of 2004 (a discriminated ethnic group compactly living in the ghetto – (Kravchenko, 2004, p. 29)) versus six author's definitions in the dictionary of 2019 (Kravchenko, 2019, p. 8–9). This term is distinguished by the instability of meaning at the present stage of development: in the definition, the authors (both Russian and foreign) point to various reasons for the development of such a social class (adherence to certain value orientations, discrimination in relation to integration into society, failure to perform a function in the social whole, behavior, social passivity and negative self-identification). These blurred boundaries between the author's definitions certifies to the need for both intra-lingual and inter-lingual unification of such terms.

The formal expression of some terms in the Russian language has undergone no less significant changes. The form developed along two main vectors: simplification and complication. A more compact form was achieved in different ways: 1) the transition from descriptive translation to tracing: **phatic communication** – **коммуникация ради общения** (*komunikacija radi obshchenija*) – ‘communication for the sake of communication) (Kravchenko, 2004, p. 169) – **фатическая коммуникация** (*faticheska-*





ja komunikacija); 2) the transition from a descriptive translation to a full equivalent: **available population** (Kravchenko, 2004, p. 233) – **наличное население** (*nalichnoje naselenije*); 3) restructuring of the syntactic structure of the statement: **midlife crisis** – **кризис в середине жизни** (*krizis v seredine zhizni*) – ‘crisis in the middle of life (Kravchenko, 2004, p. 184) – **кризис среднего возраста** (*krizis srednego vozrasta*). It is also interesting to note the phenomenon of “domestication” of foreign terms in the process of development, which is quite rare for the modern Russian language as a transition from a borrowed form to a more natural Russian equivalent: **light pollution** – **световая поллюция** (*svetovaja pollucija*) (Kravchenko, 2004, p. 299) – **световое загрязнение** (*svetovoje zagrjaznenije*). In this case, it is explained by the persistent association of the word “pollution” with the physiological male phenomenon among the speakers of the Russian language. As for the complication of the form, it was noted only in terms that were initially dissonant and acquired a more natural sound: **twenty-statements test** – **двадцатиответный тест** (*dvadcatiotvetnyj test*) (Kravchenko, 2004, p. 444) – **тест двадцати высказываний** (*test dvadcati vyskazyvanij*).

Thus, these examples clearly showed the main trends in the development of the formal-meaningful structure of sociological terms, which are to be taken into account while systematizing terminology.

## 6. Translation Challenges

Apart from formal interpretation of the meaning, the main problem of translating the term lies in the adequate transmission of its conceptual content in the recipient language. The American sociologist Immanuel Wallerstein in his work "Concepts in the Social Sciences: Problems of Translation" outlined the basic postulates of the interlanguage transmission of sociological concepts: “In order to translate a concept well, the translator must know (a) the degree to which any concept is in fact shared (and by whom), both at the time of writing and at the time of translation, and (b) the variations of sharing-communities in each of the two languages. The translator should also be able to infer the author’s perception of the degree of sharing – that is, whether or not he is aware of or willing to acknowledge the legitimacy of debate over the concept itself” (Wallerstein, 1981, p. 88–98).

The analysis found a number of translation errors in the dictionaries of the new sociological terminology. So, the translation of the term **dataism** as **репрессия** (*repressija*) – ‘suppression seems to be quite controversial and unfounded (Kravchenko, 2019, p. 98). The term was first used by David Brooks in 2013 in The New York Times to describe the thinking or philosophy created by the new understanding of big data. In 2016, Yuval Noah Harari in his book “Homo Deus. A Brief History of Tomorrow” expanded this term by calling it an ideology or even a new form of religion in which “information flow” is the “highest value”. The conceptual content of the terms “**репрессия**” (*repressija*) – ‘suppression and “**dataism**” clearly do not coincide. In this regard, the transliterated version of “datatism” seems to be legitimate by analogy with the names of religions formed with the suffix -ism. Moreover, it can be considered quite well-established in the Russian lan-



guage, as indicated by its active use (see, for example, Yu. Kalenkov "Who professes datatism, and how robots became priests" (<https://te-st.ru/2019/11/20/who-professes-datism-and-how-robots-became-priests>) and derivational ability: datatist – a person preaching datatism.

Another example of a bad translation, in our opinion, is **touring poverty** – **бедность в контексте туризма** (*bednost' v kontekste turizma*) – 'poverty in the context of tourism – which is defined as a type of tourism that invites visitors to examine the living conditions of poor peoples (Kravchenko, 2019, p. 12). First, "poverty" cannot be viewed as a type of tourism (violation of the definition of the superordinate concept). Secondly, the Russian term does not convey the completeness of a foreign language concept. To understand all this, let's turn to the term "slum tourism", which has been known for a long time. It was first mentioned by the Oxford English Dictionary in 1884, describing the desire of wealthy Londoners to visit poor neighborhoods such as Whitechapel to entertain themselves by contemplating the lives of poor fellow citizens and imbuing with the spirit of the "real" city, its lower classes. At the end of the 19th century, the same phenomenon, described by the same term, was noted in the United States, where citizens with a fulfilled American dream began to get interested in how "others" live. Later, the phenomenon was noted in many other countries, embedded in international tourism, when travelers chose to visit the poorest neighborhoods of the third world countries as their main vacation entertainment. In the 1980s, black South Africans began arranging tours to poor districts of cities for their white fellow citizens and tourists, demonstrating poverty and terrible living conditions there. Such tours attracted a large number of foreign tourists who could personally get acquainted with such a phenomenon as apartheid. Of course, slum tourism itself has been openly criticized because it "turned poverty into entertainment," but the fact that, as an economic activity, it provided poor communities with jobs and some souvenir income should not be forgotten.

The term "touring poverty" was actively explored in G. Sarmiento's work "Touring Poverty", where the author refers to this growing phenomenon and analyzes its manifestations in the context of different countries. The Russian-language equivalent of the term sounds like "бедность в контексте туризма", which in itself hardly reflects the multidimensionality of this phenomenon. The definition for the term states that residents of these areas not only introduce tourists to everyday life, but also "produce material souvenirs and demonstration practices of poverty," while the main content of the term remains undisclosed. In our opinion, the "slum tourism" option would be the best choice, since in it the conceptual focus is shifted to the standard of living in the places visited by tourists, and not to poverty as an element of the "context" of tourism.

No less controversial is the term **hypermodern society**, which is defined in the dictionary of sociological terms in 2011 as a **гипермодное общество** (*gipermodnoje obshchestvo*) (Kravchenko, 2011, p. 221). A corpus analysis of both terms in English and Russian shows that their content is quite different. In English, hypermodern is, rather, something ultramodern, reflecting the high level of development in the modern society (compare Kravchenko,



2011, p. 226) the term postmodern society and its translation **постсовременное общество** (*postsovremennoje obschestvo*). It is technology and various media that give the development of society a hyper-speed and a hyper-character, making social contacts more and more intense. The main function of such a society is hyper-consumption, which captures more and more new spheres of public life, pushing each member of society to consume for their own pleasure, and not only in order to raise their social status. Hedonism and pleasure become the main guidelines, freeing from stereotypes, but, at the same time, depriving confidence in a certain value system: "And the hypermodern individual, while oriented towards pleasure and hedonism, is also filled with the kind of tension and anxiety that comes from living in a world which has been stripped of tradition and which faces an uncertain future. Individuals are gnawed by anxiety; fear has superimposed itself on their pleasures, and anguish on their liberation. Everything worries and alarms them, and there are no longer any beliefs systems to which they can turn for assurance. These are hypermodern times." (Lipovetsky, 2005).

The term included in the 2019's dictionary sounds like a "гипермодное" ("hyper-fashionable") society, which actualizes a completely different aspect of meaning – the tendency of society to acquire fashionable things and demonstrate its knowledge of the level of fashion development (for example, the modern concepts of "hyper-fashionable stylist", "hyper-fashionable area" have nothing to do with the rate of society development or its innovative nature).

Thus, we can conclude that the term **гипермодный** (*gipermodnyj*), given by the dictionary of new sociological terms as an equivalent to the term *hypermodern*, does not coincide with it in its actualized meaning and cannot be considered acceptable.

## Conclusion

The current stage in the development of sociological terminology is characterized by its flexibility and growth both conceptually and systemically. Fixing new concepts in a language and transferring them in another language results in a number of issues. The analysis showed that modern dictionaries of new sociological terminology fix terms characterized by conceptual and linguistic instability (variability). This instability is reflected in the translated versions of terms in the Russian language, which is expressed in the variability of forms and the distortion of the conceptual content of the original term.

To systematize terms in sociology and to avoid mistakes in the creation of new terms in the Russian language, it is necessary to collaborate with sociologists, terminologists and professional translators. At the initial stage, it can focus on normalizing the emerging terminology in order to streamline the system of new, emerging concepts. In the future, this activity should become centralized and systematic, include such aspects of terminological planning as the development, improvement (harmonization of terms and concepts) and the introduction of new terminology into the subject area of Russian sociology.



## References

Achkasov, A. and Kazakova, T., 2018. Terminology translation as a palliative concept. *Philological studies. Theoretical and practical issues*, 7–1 (85), pp. 102–106 (in Russ.).

Bursina, O., 2014. *Terminologiya sotsial'noi raboty: struktura, semantika i funktsionirovanie (na materiale angloyazychnoi literatury dlya sotsial'nykh rabotnikov)* [Terminology of social work: structure, semantics and functioning (the case of English-language publications for social workers)]. Ph. D. Saint Petersburg (in Russ.).

Cabr , M.T., 1999. *Terminology: theory, methods, and applications*. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia.

Chernetskii, Yu., 2015. Development of the system of basic sociological concepts in the late XX – early XXI centuries. *Sotsiologiya: teoriya, metody, marketing* [Sociology: theory, methodology, marketing], 2, pp. 96–111 (in Russ.).

Faber Ben tez, P., 2009. Cognitive shift in terminology and specialized translation. In: A. Vidal and J. Franco, eds. *Monographs in Translation and Interpreting. A (Self-) Critical Perspective of Translation Theories*. pp. 107–143.

Grinev-Grinevich, S., 2008. *Terminovedenie* [Terminological studies]. Moscow (in Russ.).

Kravchenko, S.A., 2002. *Sociologicheskij enciklopedicheskij anglo-russkij slovar'* [Sociological encyclopedic English-Russian dictionary]. Moscow (in Russ.).

Kravchenko, S.A., 2002. *Sociologicheskij enciklopedicheskij anglo-russkij slovar'* [Sociological encyclopedic English-Russian dictionary for special purposes]. Moscow (in Russ.).

Kravchenko, S.A., 2003. *Sociologicheskij enciklopedicheskij anglo-russkij slovar'* [Sociological encyclopedic English-Russian dictionary for beginners: 7 dictionaries]. Moscow (in Russ.).

Kravchenko, S.A., 2004. *Sociologicheskij enciklopedicheskij anglo-russkij slovar'* [Sociological encyclopedic English-Russian dictionary. More than 10000 entries]. Moscow (in Russ.).

Kravchenko, S.A., 2011. *Slovar' novejshej sociologicheskoy leksiki: teorii, ponyatiya, personalii (s anglijskimi ekvivalentami)* [Dictionary of the latest sociological terminology: theories, concepts, personalities (with English equivalents)]. Moscow (in Russ.).

Kravchenko, S.A., 2012. *Sociologicheskij tolkovyj anglo-russkij slovar'* [Sociological English-Russian dictionary]. Moscow (in Russ.).

Kravchenko, S.A., 2013. *Sociologicheskij tolkovyj russko-anglijskij slovar'* [Sociological Russian-English dictionary]. Moscow (in Russ.).

Kravchenko, S.A., 2019. The Complicated Dynamics of Russian Sociology: Effects of the “Vector of Time”. *Gumanitarii yuga Rossii* [Humanitarians of the South of Russia], 8(1), pp. 33–55 (in Russ.).

Kravchenko, S.A., ed., 2019. *Slovar' novejshej sociologicheskoy leksiki s anglijskimi ekvivalentami* [Dictionary of the latest sociological terminology with English equivalents]. Moscow (in Russ.).

Kravchenko, S., 2000. *The Encyclopedic English-Russian Sociological Dictionary*. Lewiston, New York.

Leichik, V., 2007. *Terminovedenie: predmet, metody, struktura* [Terminology: subject, methodology, structure]. Vol. 3. Moscow (in Russ.).

Lipovetsky, G., 2005. *Hypermodern Times*. Cambridge.

Lubskii, A., 2015. The specificity of sociological discourse in Russia. *Sotsial'no-gumanitarnye znaniya* [Social and humanitarian knowledge], 9, pp. 128–135 (in Russ.).



Maikova, T., 2016. The main criteria for selecting terminological vocabulary in the development of a lexicographic model of the English-language sociological terminology. *RUDN Bulletin, series Theory of language, Semiotics, Semantics*, 2, pp. 165–174 (in Russ.).

Maiorova-Shcheglova, S., 2011. *Sotsiologicheskij tezaurus: problema zaimstvovanij i neologizmov* [Sociological thesaurus: the problem of borrowings and neologisms]. Available at: <http://ecsocman.hse.ru/data/2011/10/21/1267240311/Maiorova.pdf> [Accessed 15 September 2020] (in Russ.).

*Nacional'nyj standart Rossijskoj Federacii. Prakticheskoe rukovodstvo po socioterminologii* [National standard of the Russian Federation. Practical guidelines for socio-terminology]. GOST P 55140-2012. ISO/TR 22134:2007 IDT. Available at: <http://docs.cntd.ru/document/1200104389> [Accessed 28 September 2020] (in Russ.).

Sager, J., 1990. *A Practical Course in Terminology Processing*. Amsterdam.

Temmerman, R., 2000. *Towards New Ways of Terminology Description: The Socio-cognitive Approach*. Amsterdam.

Wallerstein, I., 1981. Concepts in the social sciences: Problems of translation. In: M. Rose, ed. *Translation Spectrum: Essays in Theory and Practice*. Albany.

### The authors

*Dr Natalia V. Runova*, Associate Professor, Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University, Russia.

E-mail: [NRunova@kantiana.ru](mailto:NRunova@kantiana.ru)

*Dr Tatiana V. Furmenkova*, Associate Professor, Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University, Russia.

E-mail: [TFurmenkova@kantiana.ru](mailto:TFurmenkova@kantiana.ru)

*Natalia Yu. Linevich*, Senior Lecturer, Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University, Russia.

E-mail: [NLinevich@kantiana.ru](mailto:NLinevich@kantiana.ru)

### To cite this article:

Runova, N. V., Furmenkova, T. V., Linevich, N. Yu. 2021, Translation of new sociological terminology: challenges and solutions, *Slovo.ru: baltic accent*, Vol. 12, no. 2, p. 95–109. doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2021-2-6.

## ПЕРЕВОД НОВОЙ СОЦИОЛОГИЧЕСКОЙ ТЕРМИНОЛОГИИ: ПРОБЛЕМЫ И РЕШЕНИЯ

*Н. В. Рунова<sup>1</sup>, Т. В. Фурменкова<sup>1</sup>, Н. Ю. Линевич<sup>1</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> Балтийский федеральный университет им. И. Канта  
236016, Россия, Калининград, ул. Александра Невского, 14  
Поступила в редакцию 19.09.2020 г.  
doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2021-2-6

*Стремительное развитие понятийного аппарата современной социологии приводит к появлению большого числа неологических терминов. В настоящее время в научном языке российской социологии наблюдается активная экспансия иноязычной терминологии и создание переводных терминов, отражающих изменения в англоязычной*



социальной картине мира. Однако нехватка качественной переводной литературы и отсутствие внутриязыковой и межъязыковой унификации новых терминов негативно сказываются на взаимопонимании представителей разноязычных научных школ. Целью данного исследования является анализ современных английских социологических терминов и переводных заимствований в русском языке с точки зрения их формы и концептуального содержания в двух языках, степени их закреплённости в научном тезаурусе разноязычных социологических школ и возможности адекватной передачи терминологического значения с английского языка на русский. Социологический термин рассматривается как когнитивный, лингвистический и культурный феномен, анализируется его синхроническая и диахроническая вариативность. Предпринята попытка осветить проблему с сугубо лингвистической и переводческой точек зрения и указать на необходимость объединить усилия по систематизации и гармонизации англоязычной и русскоязычной терминологий социологии.

**Ключевые слова:** социологический термин, социологический концепт, терминологическая система социологии, неологизм, перевод

### Список литературы

Ачкасов А.В., Казакова Т.А. «Перевод» терминов как паллиативное понятие // Филологические науки. Вопросы теории и практики. 2018. №7—1 (85). С. 102—106.

Бурсина О.А. Терминология социальной работы: структура, семантика и функционирование (на материале англоязычной литературы для социальных работников) : автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук. СПб., 2014.

Гринев-Гриневиц С.В. Терминоведение. М., 2008.

Кравченко С.А. Социологический энциклопедический англо-русский словарь. М., 2002.

Кравченко С.А. Социологический энциклопедический англо-русский словарь // Англо-русский, русско-английский словарь для профессионалов: 17 словарей. М., 2002 (электронная версия).

Кравченко С.А. Социологический энциклопедический англо-русский словарь // Англо-русский, русско-английский словарь для начинающих: 7 словарей. М., 2003 (электронная версия).

Кравченко С.А. Социологический энциклопедический русско-английский словарь. М., 2004.

Кравченко С.А. Словарь новейшей социологической лексики: теории, понятия, персоналии (с английскими эквивалентами). М., 2011.

Кравченко С.А. Социологический толковый англо-русский словарь. М., 2012.

Кравченко С.А. Социологический толковый русско-английский словарь. М., 2013.

Кравченко С.А. Усложняющаяся динамика российской социологии: эффекты «стрелы времени» // Гуманитарий юга России. 2019. Т. 8, №1. С. 33—55.

Лейчик В.М. Терминоведение: предмет, методы, структура. М., 2007.

Лубский А.В. Специфика социологического дискурса в России // Социально-гуманитарные знания. 2015. №9. С. 128—135.

Майкова Т.А. Основные критерии отбора терминологической лексики при разработке лексикографической модели англоязычной терминологии социологии // Вестник РУДН. Сер.: Теория языка, Семиотика, Семантика. 2016. №2. С. 165—174.

Майорова-Щеглова С.Н. Социологический тезаурус: проблема заимствований и неологизмов. 2011. URL: <http://ecsocman.hse.ru/data/2011/10/21/1267240311/Maiorova.pdf> (дата обращения: 15.09.2020).



Национальный стандарт Российской Федерации. Практическое руководство по социотерминологии. ГОСТ Р 55140-2012. ISO/TR 22134:2007 Practical guidelines for socioterminology, IDT. URL: <http://docs.cntd.ru/document/1200104389> (дата обращения: 28.09.2020).

*Словарь* новейшей социологической лексики с английскими эквивалентами / под общ. ред. С. А. Кравченко. М., 2019.

Чернецкий Ю. А. Развитие системы основных понятий социологии в конце XX – начале XXI веков // Социология: теория, методы, маркетинг. 2015. №2. С. 96 – 111.

Cabré M. Terminology: theory, methods, and applications. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia, 1999.

Faber Benítez P. Cognitive shift in terminology and specialized translation // A (Self-) Critical Perspective of Translation Theories / ed. by A. Vidal, J. Franco. 2009. P. 107 – 143.

Kravchenko S. The Encyclopedic English-Russian Sociological Dictionary. N. Y., 2000.

Lipovetsky G. Hypermodern Times. Cambridge, 2005.

Sager C. A Practical Course in Terminology Processing. Amsterdam, 1990.

Temmerman R. Towards New Ways of Terminology Description: The Sociocognitive Approach. Amsterdam, 2000.

Wallerstein I. Concepts in the social sciences: Problems of translation // Translation Spectrum: Essays in Theory and Practice / ed. M. Gaddis Rose. Albany, 1981. P. 88 – 98.

### Об авторах

Наталья Васильевна Рунова, кандидат филологических наук, доцент, Балтийский федеральный университет им. И. Канта, Россия.

E-mail: NRunova@kantiana.ru

Татьяна Владимировна Фурменкова, кандидат филологических наук, доцент, Балтийский федеральный университет им. И. Канта, Россия.

E-mail: TFurmenkova@kantiana.ru

Наталья Юрьевна Линевич, старший преподаватель, Балтийский федеральный университет им. И. Канта, Россия.

E-mail: NLinevich@kantiana.ru

### Для цитирования:

Рунова Н. В., Фурменкова Т. В., Линевич Н. Ю. Перевод новой социологической терминологии: проблемы и решения // Слово.ру: балтийский акцент. 2021. Т. 12, №2. С. 95 – 109. doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2021-2-6.