

## **МЕЖКУЛЬТУРНЫЙ СРАВНИТЕЛЬНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ ТЕРМИНОЛОГИИ МИГРАЦИИ**

**А.Ю. Широких**

В статье исследуется англо-русская терминология миграции. Проведен обзор существующих исследований миграционного дискурса и сделан вывод о необходимости межкультурного сопоставления двух терминологических систем. Автор дает определения семантических полей внутри миграционной терминологии и описывает различия в семантике используемых терминов. Выделены структурные и культурно обусловленные лакуны. Структурные несоответствия в основном вызваны отличиями в используемых словообразовательных моделях. Культурно-обусловленные лакуны происходят от использования заимствованных слов, контекстуальных значений терминов, обилия дуплетов и синонимов, стилистических различий, техник семантического сужения в значении терминов, метафоризации и использовании имен собственных. Среди особенностей исследованных терминологических систем отмечено многокомпонентность русскоязычных терминологических единиц и широкий спектр синонимичных англоязычных терминов. Приводится анализ методов перевода и сделан вывод о качественных переводческих практиках как основе успешности миграционных процессов.

**КЛЮЧЕВЫЕ СЛОВА:** терминология миграции, культурные и структурные лакуны, методы перевода, словообразование, функциональность, контекст, заимствования, семантика, стилистика, сравнительный анализ

**ШИРОКИХ** Анна Юрьевна – кандидат филологических наук, доцент, доцент Департамента языковой подготовки Финансового университета при Правительстве РФ. [ashirokih@mail.ru](mailto:ashirokih@mail.ru)

Цитирование: Широких А.Ю. Межкультурный сравнительный анализ терминологии миграции [Электронный ресурс] // Мир лингвистики и

коммуникации: электронный научный журнал. – 2019, № 2. – С. 144–156.

Режим доступа: [http:// www. tverlingua.ru](http://www.tverlingua.ru)

## **CROSS-CULTURAL COMPARISONS IN TERMINOLOGY FOR MIGRATION**

**Anna Yu. Shirokikh**

The article investigates the linguistic proximity of English-Russian terminology for migration. The existing research in migration discourse is overviewed and the conclusion that there is a need for cross-cultural comparison of the two terminological systems is made. Starting with a definition of semantic subfields within migration domain, the author proceeds to describe semantic differences in English-Russian terminologies. Structural and cultural lacunas are singled out. Structural mismatches are mainly caused by distinct derivational models, while cultural lacunas take roots in the use of loanwords, contextual meanings of terms, abundance of doublets and synonyms, stylistic differences, semantic narrowing, metaphorization and the use of proper names. The author states that there are some peculiar features of the two terminological systems – wordiness of terminological units in Russian and a wide range of synonymous terms in English. A breakdown of available translation techniques is given and the necessity for qualitative translation practices is stipulated.

**KEY WORDS:** terminology for migration, cultural and structural lacunas, translation techniques, derivation, functionality, context, loanwords, semantics, stylistics, comparative analysis

**SHIROKIKH Anna Yu.** – PhD in Philology, associate professor of the Department of language studies of Financial University under the Government of the RF. [ashirokih@mail.ru](mailto:ashirokih@mail.ru); [ayshirokih@fa.ru](mailto:ayshirokih@fa.ru)

Citation: Shirokikh A.Yu. Cross-cultural comparisons in terminology for migration // World of linguistics and communication: electronic scientific journal. – 2019, № 2. – P. 144–156. Access mode: [www.tverlingua.ru](http://www.tverlingua.ru)

According to the United Nation's reports, "more than 250 million people currently live in a country in which they were not born" (UNHCR Global Trends, 2017). Moreover, in recent years, migrants' outflows increased by 70%. Statistics for 2017 show that Russia's role in migration processes is quite significant – on the one hand, the country is an origin of many migrants (10,635,994 people left Russia in 2017), on the other hand, Russia takes the fourth place as a popular destination for migrants from other countries (11,651,509 people) (United Nations Report, 2017). The issue of linguistic distance and proximity may influence migrants' economic success (Adserà, Pytliková, 2015) and that is why it is important to investigate potential cultural language gaps in migrants' communication.

Being the first on the list of widely used languages, English "can constitute an immigration pull factor on its own." Communicative functions, semantic fields and subject-specific terminology (Pickett, 1989; Jiménez, 2006; Swales, 1990; Varó, 2006) characterize English migration discourse. Economic issues are more and more investigated in relation to multilingualism and "transcreation", i.e. a translation technique used to express implicit meanings behind the literal one (Katan, 2014; House, 2001; Mooij, Hofstede, 2011). It has been made clear that a wrong decoding of a verbal message leads to a failure not only in communication, but, consequently, in economic terms.

Definitions for people who are in the process of migrating are profoundly researched in different discursive contexts, e.g. the legal status of *refugees*, *asylum seekers*, *immigrants*, *emigrants* and *migrants* (Triandafyllidou et al., 2014). Migrants are categorized on their spatial and temporal behaviors, for example, long-term, circular and temporary types of migration (Aksakal, Schmidt-Verkerk, 2015; Pitkänen, Carrera, 2014). Terms used for defining migrants can cause ambiguous perceptions. Pace&Severance's (2016) and Paspalanova's (2008) papers investigated the usage of the terms *illegal migrant*, *undocumented migrant*, *irregular migrant* and *alien*. Torkington&Ribeiro (2019: 24) state that for adequate social representation, it is necessary to introduce "a shared communicative and

interpretive framework” worldwide. The linguistic concept of ‘otherness’ (Chovanec, 2019) is expressed through terminological use of words that are to be understood in the same way by people of different nations.

The point under investigation in this paper is the use of subject-specific terminology for defining migration processes, which is a state language domain. The hypothesis is that despite the trend of unification of worldwide terminology for migration processes, there are still some structural and cultural gaps when English and Russian terminologies for migration are compared. As these differences are expressed on the state discourse level, they may hamper migrants’ communicative success, the validity of their social status and, in the end, provoke cultural bias.

Terminology for migration is a broad semantic field, but if we have a closer look, a further hierarchy of semantic notions within the field can be viewed:

<i>Semantic subfield</i>	<i>Example</i>
People involved in migration	<i>displaced person</i>
Residential places	<i>domicile</i>
Temporality of migration	<i>short-term migration</i>
Purposes of migration	<i>poverty migrant</i>
Regulation of migration	<i>adjustment of status</i>
Document for entry legalization	<i>green card</i>
Migration behavior	<i>naturalization</i>
Labour organization of migrants	<i>state of employment</i>
General Legal terms	<i>custody</i>
Philosophical issues	<i>xenophobia</i>

Cabré (1999) believes that terminology represents the highest the degree of specialization of a text. The higher terminological density is, the more specialized a text becomes. Terminological density is not distributed equally within a text, as terms can be broken down into several groups in accord with their stylistics (Dubuc, Lauriston, 1997). We can classify migration terminological units as:

–technical terms (*visa, repatriation, remittances*);

- semi-technical terms (*discrimination, identity document, application*);
- neologisms (terms not recorded in a dictionary yet, e.g. *bankruptcy tourism*);
- compounds and derivatives that emerge from word formation processes (*consul - consular protection*).

When translating subject-specific texts, it is noticeable that the status of lexis is higher than the value of grammar due to the increased and conceptually important role of terminology in subject-specific domains (Lewis, 1997: 135-137).

According to Cook (2012: 88), translation is more about accuracy than fluency. The idea that verbal expression in two languages may correspond one-to-one is completely erroneous (Malmkjær, 1998: 6). Scott&Pavlenko (2008) focus attention on cross-linguistic comparisons and the concepts of preference and avoidance in translation, stating that a culturally specific view may be reflected in the choice of certain words. Thus, translation challenges are connected with the notion of non-equivalence (Troufanova, Inozemtzeva, 2015: 244) that may be caused by:

- culture-specific semantic elements,
- absence of lexical correspondence,
- semantical complexity of a term,
- and grammar-linked problems.

All these reasons lead to lacunas in translation.

Equivalence can be easily achieved if we can find a word or phrase, which completely coincides with the word in the source language, e.g., *country of origin / страна происхождения, inhumane treatment / бесчеловечное обращение, next of kin / ближайший родственник, burden of proof / бремя доказательства*.

However, there are some cases of untranslatability (absence of one-to-one correspondence between languages):

- structural “lacunas” that refer to linguistic features that exist within one given culture, but not in the other one,

– and cultural lacunas, i.e. a failure stemming from the lack of a relevant phenomenon or notion in the target culture.

Thus, structural lacunas occur largely due to the lack of correspondence between derivational devices used in the source and target languages. These mismatches can be grouped as:

– Functional purposes of parts of speech – absence of the attributive function of nouns in Russian (*residence permit* / *вид на жительство*, *migration regulation* / *правовое регулирование миграции*, *migration tourism* / *миграционный туризм*).

– Availability of unique derivational models in the source language and their absence in the target language – conversion, i.e. words pertaining the same form, but representing a different part of speech. For example, *transients* means professional or skilled workers who move from one country to another often as employees of international or joint venture companies. The word is translated as *непостоянные трудящиеся*, though the meaning is blurred – it may mean those who happen to be out of work due to their personal traits of character.

– Compound adjectives expressing contrastive ideas commonly used in English but absent in Russian (*urban-rural migrants* / *мигранты из городов в сельскую местность*, *rural-urban migrants* / *мигранты из сельской местности в города*, *rural-rural migrants* / *мигранты из сельской местности в сельскую местность*).

– Use of prefixes – absence or different functional usage of corresponding prefixes in the target language (*overstay* / *пребывание сверх разрешенного срока*; *denationalization* / *лишение гражданства*);

Cultural lacunas can be caused by:

– English loanwords from Latin and French that are calked in Russian (*массовая высылка* / *expulsion en masse*; *массовый выезд* / *exodus*; *хабеас корпус* / *habeas corpus*; *лессе-пассе* / *laissez-passer*; *де факто* / *de facto*; *де юре* / *de jure*; *добросовестный* / *bona fide*; *недобросовестный* / *mala fide*).

– Contextual meaning and “les faux amis” (translator’s false friends), i.e. words similar in form, different in contextual meaning. For instance, *visitor* is translated as *гость* into Russian, though there is an equivalent word *визитёр* in Russian and an equivalent word *guest* in English, however, in terminology for migration they cannot be used interchangeably since *визитёр* lacks connotation of a welcome visit and the spirit of hospitality. The same semantic discrepancy between the two languages can be seen in *гражданин* translated as either *national* or *citizen*, depending on the context.

– Douplets or etymological twins that are words of the same root, but slightly different in meaning. For example, *border* / *boundary* stand for just one Russian word *граница*.

– Synonyms tend to be more in English and each of them has specific connotations, probably caused by a more historically profound system of governmental controls developed in English-speaking countries. Compare: *законное действие* / *lawful action*; *законный мигрант* / *documented migrant*; *законная миграция* / *regular migration*. Another example: *иностранец* / *alien*; *иностраный гражданин* / *foreigner*; *иностранное население* / *migrant stock*.

– In Russian migration documents some terms for ancient migration processes still exist, e.g. *кочевник* / *nomad*, defined as an individual who migrates from place to place, often searching for water, food, or grazing land.

– Stylistically peculiar features of terminology, e.g. *smuggling* is translated in terminology for migration as *незаконный ввоз* in the written modes of communication, though the word *контрабанда* may be widely used in publicist style or oral genres of speech.

– Semantic narrowing – when a word with a general meaning is applied to something more specific. Unequal range of meanings in the source and target languages is explicit in *orderly migration* that is translated as *организованная миграция*. In English *orderly* also means *neat*, *calm* and *organized*.

– Metaphors. According to Lakoff and Johnson (1980) and their conceptual metaphor theory, a metaphor is not only a property of language but it is

additionally a property of thought, i.e. it is a cognitive phenomenon and operates at the level of thinking. The mental picture of migration processes is not the same for the two nations: *watch list* / *черный список*, *uprooted people* / *выселенные люди*, *green card* / *вид на жительство*, *human trafficking* / *торговля людьми*.

– Translation of proper names usually requires some knowledge of the background, e.g. *Dublin Convention* / *Дублинская конвенция* (an agreement between EU States determining which Member State of the European Union is responsible for examining an application for asylum lodged in one of the contracting States); *Schengen Agreement* / *Шенгенское соглашение* (Intergovernmental agreement signed in 1985 to create a European free-movement zone without controls at internal land, water and airport frontiers).

It is also worth mentioning that Russian translations are lengthy and wordily, count for more words within a terminological unit. Thus, *instrument* will be translated into Russian as *нормативно-правовой документ* in order to explicit the meaning of the term.

Another feature noticeable in comparative analysis of the two terminologies for migration is that the range of synonymous terms in English is wider and more comprehensive. For example, seven terms in English mean a kind of exile from a country, and each of them has its own shade in meaning in line with the legal stipulations:

1. *Expulsion* / *Высылка* (an act by an authority of the State with the intention and with the effect of securing the removal of a person or persons (aliens or stateless persons) against their will from the territory of that State).

2. *Deportation* / *Депортация* (the act of a State in the exercise of its sovereignty in removing an alien from its territory to a certain place after refusal of admission or termination of permission to remain).

3. *Repatriation* / *Репатриация* (return of eligible persons to the country of origin)

4. *Return* / *возвращение* (coming back to the country of previous residence)



5. *Resettlement* / *Переселение* (the relocation and integration of people (refugees, internally displaced persons, etc.) into another geographical area and environment, usually in a third country).

6. *Refoulement* / *Рефулмент* (the return by a State of an individual to the territory of another State in which his/her life or liberty would be threatened).

7. *Extradition* / *Экстрадиция* (The formal surrender, generally based on treaty or other reciprocal arrangements, by one State to another of an individual accused or convicted of an offence).

As you can see from the list above, original Russian words are used just twice (*высылка* и *переселение*), the other terms represent transliterations from English. It means that the Russian terminology for migration has to borrow not only words, but also concepts from a different legal system.

Lacunae in terminology translation are generally covered by a number of techniques such as explicatory translation, transcription and transliteration, calques and lexical transformations (substitution (specification, generalization, differentiation and modulation), compensation techniques and metaphorical transformations) (Shirokikh (2), 2018: 255).

An explicatory translation reveals a lacuna meaning in full; however, it is not always convenient as it takes a lot of text space, for example: *local remedies* / *внутренние средства правовой защиты*, *border officials* / *должностные лица, осуществляющие контроль на границе*.

Transcriptions and transliteration (the two in most cases are interchangeable notions at the present stage of international cooperation) represent a large and conceptually significant group: *quota* / *квота*, *quarantine* / *карантин*, *xenophobia* / *ксенофобия*.

Calques or word-for-word (root-to-root) translations are also quite common: *short-term migrant* / *кратковременный мигрант*, *private international law* / *международное частное право*.

There are four kinds of lexical transformations:

– Differentiation of the word meaning: *safe haven* / *нейтрализованные зоны, minor* / *несовершеннолетний*.

– Generalization of the word meaning: *treaty* / *международный договор, due process* / *надлежащая правовая процедура*.

– Modulations (logical development of an idea): *stateless person* / *лицо без гражданства, alien* / *иностранец*.

– Specifications: *respondent* / *ответчик в гражданском процессе, servitude* / *подневольное состояние*.

More and more researchers accentuate the economic value of translation, especially translation in subject-specific domains. The position of the consumer of translation has changed both in qualitative and quantitative terms. It means that translation is no less an art than it is an economic instrument, a facilitator of wealth growth and an indicator of a social status. The socializing role of translation can be seen in the principle of proper organization of activities, the principle of reflection, expression and transformation. Qualitative translation practices not only organize reality in accordance with the rules of language, but also solve cross-language communicative tasks, stimulating international understanding (Shirokikh (1), 2018: 153).

The comparative analysis conducted in this paper demonstrates that despite the common view of English as a shared verbal system of international exchange of workforce and labor markets, the English terminology for migration is still socially and culturally distinct from the Russian migration terminology. Probably, pre-migration exposure to English should include comparative techniques so that there are no linguistic barriers transferring skills to the new market.

### ***References***

Adserà, A., Pytliková, M. (2019) *International migration: The impact of linguistic proximity on preferred destinations*. VOX CEPR Policy Portal [Electronic resource] // URL: <https://voxeu.org/article/language-and-migration>, Date of access 28.04.2019.

Aksakal, M., Schmidt-Verkerk, K. (2015) *Conceptual framework on temporary migration: report on conceptual clarifications for the EURA-NET project*, University of Tampere.

Cabré, M.T. (1999) *Terminology. Theory, methods and applications*, Amsterdam, John Ben-jamins Publishing Company, 558 p.

Chovanec, J. (2019) *Multimodal storytelling in the news: Sequenced images as ideological scripts of othering*. *Discourse, Context & Media* № 28, pp. 8–18.

Cook, G. (2012) *Translation in language teaching* (2nd ed.), Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Dubuc, R., Lauriston, A. (1997) Terms and Contexts. In Wright, S.E. and Budin, G. (Eds.) // *Handbook of Terminology Management*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins Publishing, pp. 80-88.

House, J. (2001) Translation quality assessment: Linguistic description versus social evaluation // *Meta*, № 46(2), pp. 243–257.

Jiménez, S. F. (2011). La persuasión a través del metadiscurso interpersonal en el género Página Web Institucional de Promoción Turística en inglés y español. In M. V. Calvi, & G. Mapelli (Eds.) // *La lengua del turismo: Géneros discursivos y terminología*, Bern: Peter Lang., pp. 177–200.

Katan, D. (2014) Transcreation and the professions – Introduction // *Cultus: The Journal of Intercultural Mediation and Communication*, № 7, pp.10–19.

Lakoff, G., Johnson, M. (1980) *Metaphors We Live By*, University of Chicago, Chicago, 191 p.

Lewis, M. (1997) *Implementing the lexical approach: Putting theory into practice*, Hove, Language Teaching Publications, 223 p.

Malmkjær, K. (1998) *Translation & language teaching: Language teaching & translation*, Manchester, UK, St. Jerome Publishing, 157 p.

Mooij, M., Hofsted,e G. (2011) Cross-cultural consumer behavior: A review of research findings // *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, № 23 (3–4), pp. 181–192.

Pace, P., Severance, K. (2019) *Migration terminology matters. Forced Migration Review*, № 51, 2016. [Electronic resource] // URL: <http://www.fmreview.org/destination-europe.html>. Date of access 28.04.2019.

Paspalanova, M. (2008) Undocumented vs. illegal migrant: towards terminological coherence // *Migraciones Internacionales*, № 4 (3), pp. 79–90.

Pickett, D. (1989) The sleeping giant: Investigations in business English // *Language International*, № 1(1), pp. 5–11.

Pitkänen, P., Carrera, S. (2014) Transnational migration in transition: state of the art report on temporary migration. *Collected Working Papers from the EURA-NET project* [Electronic resource] // URL: [http://www.uta./edu/en/research/projects/aura-net/publications/State-of-the-art\\_EURANET.pdf](http://www.uta./edu/en/research/projects/aura-net/publications/State-of-the-art_EURANET.pdf). Date of access 28.04.2019.

Scott, J., Pavlenko, A. (2008) *Crosslinguistic influence in language and cognition*, New York/London, Routledge, 287 p.

Shirokikh, A.Yu. (2018) The Use of Corpora Parallel Texts as a Method of Translation Studies for Students of Non-Linguistic Specialization // *World of Linguistics and Communication*, № 1, 2018, pp. 137–155.

Shirokikh, A.Yu. (2018) Glossary Compilation: Cultural Implications, Learners' Autonomy, Mnemonics, Professional Development and Motivation // *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*, Vol. 8, №12, pp. 245–260.

Swales, J. (1990) *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*, New York, NY, Cambridge University Press, 260 p.

Torkington, K., Ribeiro, F.P. (2019) 'What are these people: migrants, immigrants, refugees?' Migration related terminology and representations in Portuguese digital press headlines // *Discourse, Context & Media*, № 27, pp. 22–31.

Triandafyllidou, A., Gropas, R., (2014) Vogel, D. *Introduction. In: Triandafyllidou, / A., Gropas, R. (Eds.) // European Immigration: A Sourcebook*, Second Edition, Ashgate, Farnham, pp. 1–13.

Troufanova, N., Inozemtzeva K. (2015) Issues on Business Vocabulary Acquisition by Russian Tertiary ESP Students // *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol 6, № 6, p.242–249.

*UNHCR Global Trends: Forced Displacement* (2019) [Electronic resource] // URL: <http://www.unhcr.org/globaltrends2017/>, Date of access 28.04.2019.

*United Nations, Trends in International Migrant Stock: The 2017 Revision* [Electronic resource] (2019) // URL: [https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/data/estimates2/docs/MigrationStockDocumentation\\_2017.pdf](https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/data/estimates2/docs/MigrationStockDocumentation_2017.pdf). Date of access 28.04.2019.

Varó, E.A. (2006) *Diccionario de términos de turismo y de ocio: Inglés-español; Spanish-English*, Barcelona, Ariel, 339 p.