

Meaning analyses and Dynamic Equivalence

Zilolakhon Sheraliyeva

the 4rd course student of Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages, the faculty of English language and literature

Annotation: Translation is an interlingual and intercultural communication, in which correspondence at the level of formal and meaningful structures does not necessarily lead to a successful communication: a secondary communication or even a communication breakdown may occur due to distinct historical-cultural contexts. Such recognition led Nida to put forward Dynamic Equivalence, which brings the receptor to the centre of the communication. The concept triggered the focus shift from the form of the message to the response of the receptor. Further, its theoretical basis went beyond applying the research results of linguistics to the practice of translation; it founded a linguistic theory of translation for researchers and provided a practical manual of translation for translators.

Key words: deep structure, dynamic equivalence, kernel, receptor response.

Introduction.

Meaning analysis and dynamic equivalence are two important concepts in the field of translation.

Meaning analysis involves a deep understanding of the source text to grasp the intended meaning, nuances, cultural references, and context. Translators analyze the text at various levels to ensure that the translated version accurately conveys the original message while taking into account the cultural and social factors that may affect interpretation.

Dynamic equivalence, on the other hand, is a translation approach that focuses on conveying the dynamic impact of the source text on the target audience. This means that the translator aims to capture the overall effect of the original text, including its tone, style, and cultural references, rather than producing a word-for-word translation. The goal is to ensure that the translated text has the same impact and effect on the target audience as the original text had on its audience. [1]

In practice, meaning analysis and dynamic equivalence often go hand in hand, as translators strive to understand the meaning of the source text and then use dynamic equivalence to convey that meaning effectively in the target language and culture.

Main part:

With dynamic equivalence, texts are rendered into the target language using words and structures that make more sense to their audience than a word for word translation. The vocabulary, grammar structure and idioms of the source text will not be preserved. The aim is to maintain the intended meaning and elicit the intended emotional response by utilising grammar and vocabulary that feels more natural in the target language.

In his book *Toward a Science of Translating*, published in 1964, the American linguist Eugene Nida coined new terminology to describe different approaches to translation. Nida was specifically

exploring contrasting approaches to translating the Bible. But his theories of “dynamic equivalence” and “formal equivalence” are relevant to all translations. [2]

Nida sparked a scholarly debate that continues to this day. His theories highlighted the relative merits of literal translation and that undertaken with the culture and emotional response of the target audience in mind.[3]

When the structure and grammar of the target language vary greatly from that of the source, readers may struggle to understand a translation unless the words have been altered or rearranged. A literal translation with the original syntax preserved can be incredibly difficult to read.

What are the benefits of dynamic equivalence?

A target audience may not be familiar with the source culture and so will require references to be explained or idioms to be localised. In many cases, it is vital to consider not just what is explicitly stated in the source text but also what is implied.[4] Dynamic equivalence empowers a translator to read between the words and to recreate them in a way that enables the target audience to better appreciate the nuances of the original. Such nuances may be lost if a more formal approach is adopted.

As dynamic equivalence allows a translator greater flexibility of expression, the potential does exist for them to apply personal bias to their outputs. The depth of their linguistic and cultural knowledge will impact the quality of their translations. Should they misunderstand the meanings of any words or aspects of the target culture, they may unintentionally create outputs that do not accurately reflect the sense and intended impact of the source material.[5]

Conclusion.

Nida put forward “dynamic equivalence” to emphasize the dynamic equivalence of meanings. The dynamic meaning has exerted strong influence upon translation studies. It holds that since the meaning is unstable and dynamic the translator should play a dynamic role in understanding and interpreting the original meaning correctly and properly both from language context and non-language context so as to reach the dynamic equivalence of meanings in translation. To speak concretely, the meaning seized from the original text and produced in the translated text is the result of translator’s specific interaction with the original text. In translation, the translator should fully reflect the messages and notions of the original ethnic culture based on his own preexisted ideology and pre-knowledge of the culture information in the target language so as to make the translated works more readable and acceptable. Furthermore, as an active and dynamic part in translation, the translator should also have his own translation purpose and intended readers on which his translation strategies and approaches will decide.

References:

1. Goodman J. The Exploration of Yunnan. Kunming: Yunnan People’s Publishing House.
2. Linli Chen. (2010). On Integrated Translation Approach of English Idioms. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, Vol. 1, No 3, May 2010.
3. Linli Chen. (2009). On Literal Translation of English Idioms. *English Language Teaching*, Vol.2, No.2 June 2009.
4. Liying Song. (2007). *Indigenous Ethnic Groups in Yunnan*. Kunming: Yunnan University Press.
5. Newmark, P.P. (1982). *Approaches to Translation*. Pergamon. Oxford.