RETAINING STYLE WITHOUT HARMING FIDELITY:
A CASE OF TRANSLATING PAULINE METAPHORS
By:

Dwi Aji Prajoko

Lecturer in IKIP PGRI Madiun;

Post graduate student of Linguistics Department, UNS

Email: dwiaji.prajoko@gmail

ABSTRACT

The objectives of this study are to legitimize the retention of metaphors in the translation when they do not harm meaning and dynamic fidelity, to assess renderings on the basis of their fidelity, and to suggest alternative renderings for the ones violating the fidelity. This study shows surprising findings. Applying Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) metaphorical concepts on Pauline metaphors, the researcher finds that many English and Indonesian metaphors have the same metaphorical concepts. This potentially makes the retention of the metaphors in the rendering meaningful or natural due to its match with the dynamic fidelity. The context of the meaningful metaphors, then, must be analyzed to determine the accuracy or meaning fidelity. This study echoes the notion that style is as important as meaning (Mahmkjer, 2004; Shi, 2006:10), even though Nida and Taber (1969) strongly suggest that meaning must be the top priority when it is in tension with style in their translation. To the translators, this study suggests not hastily discarding metaphors in the translation, replacing them with non-metaphors and, therefore, missing the significance of metaphors.

Key words: metaphor, translation, fidelity

A. INTRODUCTION

Literal inexpressibility, compactness, and vividness mark the significance of metaphors, since literal language in a certain context is insufficient. In this case, metaphors explain the unknown, the undigested, or the unnamed phenomena in the light of the familiar or the existing terms. Moreover, the compact ways of transferring chunk of experience from the well-known vehicle to the less well-known topic make metaphor more economic and, therefore, memorable. Methodologically, metaphors also use vivid representation through their concrete imagery, so

that they are not only memorable but also emotional.[1] These features are proposed by Ortony (1975) and supported fully by Mooij (1976:16) and partially by Paivio (1979:164), Wallace (1982), De Waard and Nida (1986:21), Katz (1989:496), and Del Corro (1991:116). The significance of metaphors makes them very important to be retained or adapted in the rendering. The problem is that how to do that without harming the fidelity.

B. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

1. Metaphors and Their Significance

A metaphor can be defined as a figure of speech in which certain marked characteristics from the domain of the topic are seen in terms of certain marked characteristics from that of the vehicle.[2] In terms of scope, metaphors exclude similes but include all personifications since a personification is a special case of metaphor (Lakoff and Johnson 1980; Newmark 1988:104). However, the domain is not limited to the personification of abstraction, but it covers the attribution of human forms and qualities to all non-human entities (Moeliono, 1982:176).[3] Further, terminologically speaking, Richard's (1936) classical terms, namely *topic/tenor*, *vehicle*, and *ground,* are preferred for they are widely known.

Metaphors are characterized by analogy or similarity (Mooij 1976; Ortony 1979; Miller 1979). This is the result of the mapping of the vehicle onto the topic. From the point of view of the norms of literal language, metaphors are characterized by semantic violation (Mac Cormac 1985; Steinhart and Kittay 1994) and pragmatic violation (Steinhart and Kittay, 1994). Semantic violation is to violate the rules of selectional restrictions. And pragmatic violation means disobeying the maxim(s) of co-operative principles (Grice, 1975:45–7). Metaphors extremely violate the maxim of quality. Even if they are true, still they disobey the maxim of relevance. The maxim of quality is flouted in, for instance, *I am the gate* (TEV, John 10:9). Even if a

---

[1] This emotional tension is also caused by the conceptual recognition of the semantic anomaly of a metaphor (Mac Cormac, 1985:34), since it is strictly observed and deliberately done (Baker, 1992:14).

[2] This is concluded from the narrower definitions of metaphor (Steinheart and Kittay 1994; Crystal 1994).

[3] *Encarta Encyclopedia* (Microsoft, 1999) records that personification in the history of religion is known as anthropomorphism referring to the depiction of God in a human image, with human traits, bodily form, and emotions.

metaphor is true such as in *you are not my sheep* (TEV, John 10:26), it violates the maxim of relevance.

A metaphor is so significant that the purpose of metaphor is not merely referential but also pragmatic (Newmark (1988:104). The referential purpose is "to describe a mental process or state, a concept, a person, an object, a quality or an action more comprehensively and concisely than is possible in literal or physical language" and the pragmatic purpose is "to appeal to the senses, to interest, to clarify 'graphically', to please, to delight, to surprise." Similarly, the purpose of Biblical metaphor is not merely to clarify and illustrate a teaching point. It is also to catch and hold the attention of the hearer, and to arouse a certain emotional response in the hearer (Barnwell, l980:101). It can be seen that the first purpose is referential, and the last two are pragmatic. Thus, metaphors is not only seen traditionally, namely as "a rhetorical device, which functions mainly as the aesthetic device" (Qiyun Zhang 2008:84) in order to "give people much more pleasure (Anderson 2008:134).

2. Metaphorical Concepts

This study chooses the system-based criteria offered by Lakoff and Johnson (1980:9, 55) in determining whether metaphors are alive or dead. They argue that a metaphor is alive if it is organized in a coherent system. The metaphor in question must widely interact with other metaphors because of the similar base of the metaphorical concepts. Expressions such as *spend the time*, *have enough of time* and *thank you for the time* are live metaphors since they are based on the metaphorical concept TIME IS MONEY which also generates myriad metaphors such as *budget/cost the time*, *use/use up the time*, *run out of time*, *give/lose time*, et cetera. By contrast, the isolated and unsystematic metaphors such as *the foot of mountain* and *the eye of needle* are dead since they are understood in terms of marginal metaphorical concepts like A MOUNTAIN IS A PERSON or A NEEDLE IS A PERSON. Since this study uses live metaphors, metaphorical concepts are very helpful in data finding. Metaphorical concepts are also used to determine the meaningfulness or the naturalness of the renderings.

3. Fidelity

According to Nida and Taber (1969:12–3), "Translating consists in reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source language message, first in terms of

meaning and secondly in terms of style." Methodology of the Dynamic translation is clearly summarized in the definition. The first is to reproduce in the receptor language the closest to the original meaning and the most natural to the original style, and the second is to give priority on preserving the original meaning in the rendering rather than retaining the original style, only if they are in tension (Nida 1964:166; Nida and Taber 1969:12). The last mention is to remind translators not to overemphasize on the meaning correspondence, so that the original style is slightly neglected (Nida, 1976:72–3).

The concept of fidelity proposed by Beekman and Callow (1974) agrees to the new concept of *faithful translation*, which is the same as the closest natural equivalence (Nida, 1964). Fidelity[4] is a quality of being faithful that is attributed to a translation. A rendering having fidelity, then, is called a faithful rendering. By definition, a faithful rendering is "a translation which transfers the meaning and the dynamics of the original text." Compared to the Dynamic translation that sees translation as a process, a faithful translation sees it as a product. However, the output of the process, namely the closest natural equivalence, is the same as fidelity.[5] Since fidelity and the closest natural equivalence are identical, fidelity also deals with the highest degree of accuracy.

Retaining the meaning of the original in the rendering results in meaning fidelity. The meaning of the original metaphor can be traced by observing certain properties of the topic analogous to that of the vehicle. In this case, a given property-matching model of similarity and the context—both the linguistic and the extra-linguistic—can be used to find the meaning. Meaning fidelity is accredited if the original meaning is transferred into the receptor language. A rendering unnecessarily violating meaning fidelity obtains low level of fidelity since the Dynamic translation gives priority on meaning fidelity rather than on dynamic fidelity.

Retaining the dynamics of the original in the rendering results in dynamic fidelity. The dynamics of the metaphor in question is determined by its meaningfulness. In this study, the meaningfulness is judged by the use of the same metaphorical concepts (Lakoff and Johnson,

---

[4] Fidelity does not mean "exactness in reproducing" (*Webster's New Dictionary and Thesaurus,* 1990:213) since fidelity, according to the dynamic translation, deals with reproducing the highest degree of accuracy.

[5] Fidelity and the closest natural equivalence are the same because they are not only the output of the same methodology, but also, theoretically, influenced by transformation and communication theories.

1980). A rendering that unnecessarily reduces the original dynamics obtains mid level of fidelity. Thus, only a rendering keeping in the rendering both the meaning and the dynamics of the original in their highest degree of accuracy obtains high level of fidelity.

C. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

1. The Data Collection

First, library research has been needed to study the theory of metaphors. Then, the definition and the features of metaphors are used as a guideline for the data finding. Since the required data are live metaphors, the next step is to exclude dead metaphors by applying the metaphorical concepts. The source text is from *Good News Bible: The Bible in Today's English Version* published by the American Bible Society in 1979. This Bible is commonly called the *Today's English Version* (TEV) or *Good News Bible* (GNB). The target text is from the *Alkitab Kabar Baik dalam Bahasa Indonesia Sehari-hari* published by the LAI in 1993. This Bible is commonly called the *Today's Indonesian Version* (TIV) or the *Bahasa Indonesia Sehari-hari* (BIS).

2. The Data Corpus

This study takes 27 units as the corpus of data.[6] Each unit may consist of a phrase, a clause, or clauses containing metaphors. The data corpus are taken from Paul's Letters within the *New Testament*.

3. The Data Analysis

A conceptual model is used to analyze the data. This study neither adopts Nida's (1964) nor Nida and Taber's (1969) techniques of evaluating the closest natural equivalence, namely the equal responses between the original and the translation readers because, according to Gunarwan (1997), the target readers of the highly qualified renderings may significantly give different responses with that of the original readers. Besides, in the case of Bible translation, the original readers of the Bible can be a subject of dispute (Sterk, 1990:111). Equivalence, in this context, means faithful to the meaning and the dynamics of the original. Meaning fidelity is determined

---

[6] Beekman and Callow (1974:127) say that the *New Testament* contains several hundred metaphors and similes. This study does not take the whole data but only Pauline Letters. This study does not include similes and dead metaphors either. Last but not least, some Greek metaphors have been converted into similes or, maybe, have been abandoned in the *Today's English Version* (TEV).

by comparing the meaning of the rendering to the meaning of the original; dynamic fidelity is sought by comparing the naturalness/meaningfulness of both the original and the rendering.

First, the metaphor of the source language must be analyzed its dynamics. In this phase, this study describes the meaningfulness of the topic-vehicle relationship of the original metaphor that must be based on the known metaphorical concept. For example, the topic *you* spoken in terms of *sheep* in *you are not my sheep* (TEV, John 10:26) is meaningful because it is based on the known metaphorical concept PERSONS ARE ANIMALS. This study, then, analyzes whether or not the metaphorical concept of the original metaphor is known in the receptor language. If the answer is positive, the original metaphor can be transferred meaningfully into the receptor language such as "kalian bukanlah domba-domba-Ku." If the answer is negative, the original metaphor must be translated with a metaphor based on another metaphorical concept meaningful to the receptor language. However, these two strategies are justified only if they do not violate the meaning fidelity. If the condition is not fulfilled, it is recommended to translate into non-metaphor.

The meaning of the original must be analyzed too. In this phase, Searle's (1979) property-matching principles of similarity and/or linguitic and extra-linguistic contexts help find certain properties of the topic analogous to that of the vehicle. However, the most important is the context.[7] If the meaning of the metaphor can be traced through the linguistic context, the retention of the original metaphor does not flout the meaning fidelity. However, if the meaning of the original metaphor depends on the extra-linguistic context, the translator must consider whether or not the extra-linguistic context is shared. The shared extra-linguistic context guarantees the retention of the original metaphor. The unshared extra-linguistic context allows to adapt the original metaphor to the receptor language, supplying a linguistic context to the translated metaphor, or converting the metaphor into a non-metaphor: a simile, a simile combined with sense, or sense.

The significance of metaphors requires the translation from metaphor to metaphor. However, this translation strategy is taken only if any fidelity principle is not flouted. The scale

---

[7]Only one of six Searle's similarity principles, namely the widened rule of restriction, is context-free. Other similarities based on the salient-defining characteristic, the well known property, the belief, the association, and the condition are relatively contextual. Besides, the principles cannot cover all phenomena.

of priority in metaphor-to-metaphor translation is the transfer, the adaptation, the transfer with additional context, and the adaptation with additional context. However, if metaphor-to-metaphor translation is not possible, the scale of priority is to convert the original metaphor to a simile, to a simile combined with sense, and to sense.

After analyzing the dynamics and the meaning of the original metaphor and determining how to translate it, this study, then, analyzes and categorizes fidelity of the rendering into three levels, that is, the high, the mid, and the low level fidelity.[8] The high level of fidelity is a quality of rendering that keeps the meaning and the dynamics of the original in their highest degree of accuracy. The mid level of fidelity is a quality of any rendering that unnecessarily reduces the dynamics of the original. The reduction of the dynamics is allowed only if it is for the sake of meaning fidelity. Finally, the low level of fidelity is a quality of any rendering that unnecessarily loses the meaning of the original. The minimal distortion of the original meaning is still accepted if the keeping of the didactic reference in the rendering is in conflict with the keeping of the historical reference, so that the latter must be sacrificed for the previously mentioned. Alternative renderings are given especially for those that do not obtain the high level of fidelity.

D. ANALYSIS

Fidelity of the TIV is subjectively evaluated after either the dynamics or the meaning of a given metaphor has been identified. A rendering that keeps the meaning and the dynamics of the original in their highest degree of proximity obtains high level of fidelity. Unnecessarily reducing the dynamics of the original makes the rendering belong to mid level of fidelity. A rendering classified as low level of fidelity is caused by unnecessarily distorting the meaning of the original. This judgment relies on the principle in which the meaning fidelity is more important than the dynamic fidelity.

1. High Level of Fidelity

To obtain high level of fidelity, a rendering must retain the meaning and the dynamics of the original in the highest degree of nearness. The following renderings are classified as having high level of fidelity due to the right transfer, right adaptation, and necessary supply of the additional context.

---

[8] This writer owes Moeliono the classification. He suggests categorizing fidelity into three levels: high, mid, and low level of fidelity. However, the theoretical responsibility of the classification is this writer's.

a. Right Transfer

It is recommended to transfer the original metaphor that can be meaningfully and faithfully rendered. Here, the transfer means translating from metaphor to metaphor in which the rendering keeps the original vehicle regardless the changes of syntactic. The following renderings belong to the classification.

01.	I Cor 3:11	For God has already placed *Jesus Christ as the one and only foundation, and no other foundation can be laid.*	Sebab Allah sendiri sudah menempatkan Jesus Kristus sebagai satu-satunya pondasi untuk gedung itu; tidak ada pondasi yang lain.

Indonesians also talk about persons in terms of parts of a building such as "tentara yang kuat adalah tiang negara" [Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia (KBBI), strong armies are poles of a state], "Amin Rais sebagai pasak reformasi" (Amin Rais as the peg of the reform), "anak sulungnyalah yang menopang hidupnya sekeluarga" (KBBI, it is the eldest brother who props up the whole family). The basis of all is the metaphorical concept PERSONS ARE IMPORTANT PARTS OF A BUILDING. Since *Jesus Christ as the one and only foundation* is based on the same metaphorical concept, the metaphor can be retained meaningfully in the rendering. Besides, the meaningfulness is also supported by the familiarity of *foundation* as the vehicle.

Fortunately, the literal meaning of *foundation* is the same with that of Indonesian word "pondasi" (foundation), namely the solid base put down to build a house on. The similarity is important since the metaphorical meaning is based on the salient defining characteristic of it. This implicates that retaining the metaphor does not flout the meaning fidelity.

The metaphor, therefore, can be retained in the rendering without violating either the meaning or the dynamic fidelity. The TIV, therefore, assigns the high level of fidelity for retaining it.

| 02. | I Cor 7:9 | But if you cannot restrain your desires, go ahead and marry—it is better to marry then to *burn with passion*. | Tetapi jika saudara tidak dapat menahan nafsu, Saudara hendaknya kawin. Sebab lebih baik saudara kawin daripada nafsu saudara berkobar-kobar. |

The metaphor *burn with passion* derives from the metaphorical concept EMOTIONS ARE INFLAMMABLE. This supports many metaphorical expressions such as "api semangat/kemarahan/ kecemburuan/asmara" (fire of spirit/anger/jealousy/love), "menyulut kecemburuan/kemarahan" (kindle jealousy/anger), "terbakar semangatnya/kecemburuannya/kemarahannya/gairahnya/nafsunya" (one's spirit/jealousy/anger/desire/passion burns), "gairahnya/kemarahannya/semangatnya/nafsunya/ dendamnya berapi-api/membara/berkobar-kobar/menyala-nyala" (one's spirit/anger/desire/passion/ revenge flares up violently), "memadamkan semangat/kemarahan" (extinguish spirit/anger). Thus, *burn with passion* can be meaningfully retained in the rendering. Moreover, the TIV shows that the meaning of the original can be kept by translating the metaphor into "nafsu berkobar-kobar" (passion flares up) since they are metaphors of the same types. According to *Webster's New Dictionary and Thesaurus* (1998) and KBBI, both mean terribly having sexual passion. Fortunately, the ground help reveals it, that is, a state in which you *cannot restrain your desires*. Finally, for translating the metaphor into "nafsu berkobar-kobar," the TIV keeps not only the original meaning but also the dynamics. Hence, the rendering obtains the high level of fidelity.

b. Right Adaptation

Right adaptation means translating from metaphor to metaphor in which the rendering correctly adapts the vehicle of the original to the receptor language. The vehicles can be partially or totally adapted. The adaptation can be substitutes for transfer or compulsory. The latter mentioned is recommended if the retention of the original metaphor will cause any problem of fidelity.

| 03. | I Cor 3:2 | *I had to feed you milk, not solid food*, because you were not ready for it. | Dahulu saya hanya memberikan kepadamu makanan bayi, bukan makanan orang dewasa, sebab kalian belum cukup kuat untuk itu. |

The metaphor is based on the metaphorical concept AN EXPERIENCE/KNOWLEDGE/ EDUCATION IS FOOD. This originates Indonesian expressions such as "haus pengetahuan" (thirst for knowledge), "mengenyam pendidikan" (taste education), "makan sekolahan" (eat school), "kenyang pengalaman," (full of experience), "pengalaman manis/pahit" (sweet/bitter experience). One can feed or be fed with experience/knowledge/education since they are food. The food can be liquid or solid. Accordingly, *I had to feed you milk, not solid food, because you were not ready for it* can be retained in the rendering meaningfully.

The meaning of the metaphor can be understood since the topic and the ground are stated or can be reasoned from the cotext. The ground is stated, namely *because you were not ready for it*. The topic and ground can also be reasoned from the previous verse, namely *I had to talk to you as though you belonged to this world, as children in the Christian faith* (I Cor 3:1). Accordingly, *I had to talk to you as though I had to feed you milk, not solid food, because you were not ready for it* means "I had to talk to you as though I had to feed you milk, not solid food, because you were not ready for difficult teaching." Thus, the available cotext makes the metaphor faithfully retainable in the rendering.

The metaphor can be retained faithfully and meaningfully in the rendering. Even though the TIV adapts the receptor language, the TIV still assigns the high level of fidelity. The TIV renders *milk* into "makanan bayi" (infant's food) and *solid food* into "makanan orang dewasa" (adult's food). In so doing, the TIV seems to be afraid of making readers highlight different property of *milk,* so that the adaptation is a clue to the intended meaning. Such a worry is not necessary because the cotext have already made the meaning clear. The TIV, however, does not violate any fidelity at all since *milk* and *solid food* are not historical references, so that they are allowed to get needy adaptation in the rendering.

04.	Eph 3:17A	… and I pray that *Christ will make his home in your hearts* through faith.	Semoga karena kalian percaya kepada Kristus, Kristus tinggal di dalam hatimu

The metaphor *Christ will make his home in your hearts* derives from the metaphorical concept HEARTS ARE CONTAINERS. Many Indonesian and Javanese expressions are under such a metaphorical concept such as "ia tinggal di hatiku" (s/he lives in my heart), "ia tersimpan di hatiku" (s/he is saved in my heart), "sudah tidak punya tempat lagi di hatinya" (having no more place in her/his heart) ati segara (Jav, sea-like heart), "atine sumpek" (Jav, her/his heart is crowded), et cetera. Accordingly, the metaphor can be retained in the rendering meaningfully.

The expression *make his home* indicates that "the dwelling is more or less permanent one" (Bratcher and Nida, 1982:85). Accordingly, the TIV keeps the meaning fidelity because of rendering it with "tinggal" (to stay) instead of, for instance, "singgah" (to stop in). Besides, such a translation does not defect the dynamic fidelity. Accordingly, the TIV obtains the high level of fidelity for slightly adapting the metaphor to the receptor language.

c. Necessary Supply of the Additional Context

Necessary supply of the additional context means making explicit some implicit information. This addition to metaphor-to-metaphor translation is required only if the retention or the adaptation potentially obscures the meaning of the original metaphor. The following metaphors are translated correctly due to adding the necessary context.

05.	Eph 2:20	*You, too, are built upon the foundation laid by the apostles and prophets, the cornerstone being Christ Jesus himself.*	Kalian pun dibangun diatas dasar yang diletakkan rasul-rasul dan nabi-nabi, dengan Kristus Yesus sebagai batu yang terutama.

The two features of the building metaphor, i.e. *foundation* and *cornerstone*, can be retained meaningfully in the rendering since they are based on the shared metaphorical concept PERSONS ARE BUILDINGS which also bears Indonesian expressions. The metaphorical concept calls forth expressions such as "membangun diri" (building oneself), "membangun bangsa" (building people), "membangun manusia seutuhnya" (building person completely), "wong rusak/bubrah" (Jav, damaged people). Furthermore, the meaning of the vehicle *foundation*

is perceived perfectly by Indonesians, therefore, the vehicle can be retained in the rendering without violating the meaning fidelity. By contrast, even though retaining *cornerstone* is meaningful because of a part of a building metaphor, it can be misleading in terms of meaning. According to *Webster's New Dictionary and Thesaurus* (1990), cornerstone is "the stone that unites the two walls of a building at a corner; the principal stone, especially the corner of the foundation of a building." However, the vehicle *cornerstone* in the metaphor is to highlight the "principal stone of a building" and to hide other property. In this case, the meaning component of *cornerstone* can be rendered by analytical redistribution. Accordingly, *cornerstone* can be rendered into "batu utama/pokok" (the principal stone) rather than "batu penjuru" (cornerstone). This agrees to the following figurative cotext, namely *one who holds the whole building together*. In the TEV, the *foundation* is transferred but the *cornerstone* is rendered into "batu terutama." The faithful rendering obtains the high level of fidelity.

2. Mid Level of Fidelity

Unnecessarily reducing the dynamics of the original makes the rendering belong to mid level of fidelity. The following renderings are justified as having the mid level of fidelity for unnecessarily supplying the additional context, converting the metaphor to a simile or sense, and omitting the vehicles.

a. Unnecessary Supply of the Additional Context

To appreciate the compactness of the original metaphor, context is supplied only when the meaning obvious for the original readers is obscure in the receptor language. Supplying the context is not required if the chance of either the original or target readers in understanding the metaphor based on the existing context are relatively the same. In this case, translating metaphor has nothing to do with simplifying the original text, but producing the text that is readily understood.

| 06. | Eph 6:13–7 | *So put on God's armor now! Then the evil day comes, you will be able to resist the enemy attacks; and after fighting to the end, you will still hold your ground. So stand ready with truth as a belt tight around your waist, with righteousness as your breastplate, and as your shoes the readiness to announce the good news of peace. At all times carry faith as a shield; for with it you will be able to put out all the burning arrows shot by the Evil One. And accept salvation as a helmet, and the word of God as the sword which the spirit gives you.* | Sebab itu, sekarang, pakailah seluruh perlengkapan perang Allah, supaya pada hari yang jahat kalian sanggup melawan serangan-serangan musuh. Dan supaya setelah kalian berjuang sampai akhir kalian masih gagah perkasa. Hendaklah kalian siap siaga. Pakailah kesetiaan pada Allah sebagai ikat pinggang, dan ketulusan sebagai baju besimu. Hendaklah kerelaan memberitakan Kabar Baik yang membawa sejahtera menjadi sepatumu. Setiap waktu pakailah percayamu kepada Tuhan sebagai senjata penangkis; dengan iman itu kalian dapat memadamkan semua anak panah berapi dari si jahat. Ambillah keselamatan sebagai topi baja, dan perkataan Allah sebagai pedang dari Roh Allah. |

Suggested rendering: […] Setiap waktu pakailah perisai iman; dengan perisai itu kalian dapat memadamkan semua anak panah berapi dari si jahat. […]

The metaphorical concept GOODNESS IS A WAR INSTRUMENT produces the armor metaphor and Indonesian expressions: "sanjata pitulungan" (Jav, weapon of help), "benteng iman" (forth of faith), "benteng keadilan dan kebenaran" (fort of justice and truth), "perisai iman" (shield of faith), "pedang keadilan" (sword of justice). Analogously, the armor metaphor can be retained meaningfully in the rendering.

The general ground of the armour metaphor is based on its defining characteristic, namely to protect and to fight against any enemy. Fortunately, it is stated clearly in the cotext, namely *Then the evil day comes, you will be able to resist the enemy attacks; and after fighting to the end, you will still hold your ground*. The general vehicle and ground are then followed by specic topics and more specific vehicles, and one specific ground. To be exactly, see the figure 1 and 2. In the figure 1, the collection of the specific topics are mapped by the general vehicle accompanied with the general ground. In the figure 2, all specific vehicles have their topics. But

the specific ground stated explicitly is only the one between *faith* and *shield*, namely *to put out all the burning arrows shot by the Evil One*.

Collection of Specific Topics (=General Topic)	General Vehicle	General Ground
Truth, righteousness, readiness to announce the good news of peace, faith, salvation, and words of God	God's armour	When the evil day comes, you will be able to resist the enemy attacks; and after fighting to the end, you will still hold your ground.

Figure 1: The General Topic, Vehicle, and Ground in Eph 6:13–7

Topic	Vehicle	Ground
Truth	A belt tight around your waist[9]	Implied
Righteousness	Breastplate	Implied
Readiness to announce the good news of peace	Shoes	Implied
Faith	Shield	To put out all the burning arrows shot by the Evil One
Salvation	Helmet	Implied
Words of God	Sword	Implied

Figure 2: The Specific Topics, Vehicles, and Ground in Eph 6:13–7

Nobody can guarantee that either the original or the target readers will fully understand all specific grounds that are impicit. Thus, it is unnecessary to simplify the metaphor by making explicit all implicit information. The most important is that the essence of didactic fidelity can be hold since the collection of the specific topics mapped by the general vehicle are accompanied clearly by the general ground.

The metaphor must be transferred. Otherwise, the rendering violates the original meaning, the dynamics or both. The TIV slightly reduces the dynamics of the original for

---

[9] Put in isolation *a belt tight around your waist* may be similar to Indonesian expression "mengencangkan ikat pinggang" that figuratively means to economize. But Indonesian readers will not misunderstand that since the expression is in the context of armour.

rendering *shield* into "senjata penangkis" (weapon of defense) instead of "perisai" (shield). In so doing, the TIV uses the analytical redistribution of "perisai" in order to make the function of "perisai" obvious. However, this is unnecessary since the general function of "perisai" is already obvious for Indonesian readers. Specifically, it is stated clearly in the cotext, namely *to put out all the burning arrows shot by the Evil One*. Accordingly, the TIV achieves the mid level of fidelity.

b. Unnecessary Conversion to Simile

Metaphor-to-simile conversion must be based on the strong reason that metaphor-to-metaphor translation defects any fidelity. Otherwise, the renderings ignores the meaningfulness of the original expressed in the metaphorical forms in which one of their features, namely semantic violation, is important to arouse emotional tension. The renderings belonging to this classification range from partial to total conversion. The partial conversion may happen to the datum consisting of more than one metaphorical clauses.

07.	I Cor 4:13	*We are no more than this world's garbage*; *we are the scums of the earth* to this very moment.	Kami tidak lebih dari sampah dunia ini; sampai saat ini kami masih dianggap seperti kotoran bumi

Suggested rendering: Kami tidak lebih dari sampah dunia ini; bahkan sampai saat ini pun kami hanyalah kotoran bumi.

Indonesians often talk about persons in terms of unclean things such as "debu" (dust), "kotoran" (scums), "sampah" (garbage), "kecoa" (cockroach), "tikus" (rats), et cetera to mean that they have low values. This is based on the metaphorical concept PERSONS ARE DIRTY THINGS. Because of having the same basis, the Biblical metaphor can be meaningfully rendered by transferring it. The retention also keeps the meaning fidelity since the original metaphor is also taken to mean to have very low values. The TIV has done the best for rendering *world's garbage* into "sampah dunia" (garbage of the world). The rendering cannot be replaced by "sampah masyarakat" (garbage of society) although "sampah dunia" and "sampah masyarakat" are equivalent terms (KBBI). This is because the rendering is repeated with the phrase with similar meaning and form, i.e. "kotoran bumi" as the rendering of *scums of the earth*. Unluckily,

the TIV converts the metaphor of the second clause into a simile, so that this reduces the dynamics of the original. This makes the rendering obtain mid level of fidelity only.

08. I Cor 3:9a   … *you are God's field*   … kalian seperti ladang Allah.

Suggested rendering: … kalian lah ladang Allah.

The metaphor *you are God's field* derives from the metaphorical concept PERSONS ARE FIELD. This makes the retention of the original metaphor meaningful, since the metaphorical concept is the basis of many Indonesian expressions such as "perempuan itu mengandung benihnya" (the woman is having pregnant with his seed), "kekerasan sudah tertanam dalam dirinya" (violence has been planted in him), "ia telah memagari dirinya" (s/he has fenced her/himself), "istrinya sangat subur" (his wife is very fertile), "hidupnya sangat gersang dari kasih sayang orangtua" (her/his life is very barren from parental love), et cetera. The metaphor can also be transferred faithfully, since the ground can be reasoned from the previous verse in which the workers, Paul and Apollos say, "For we are partners together for God" (I Cor 3:9a). Thus, if the ground of metaphor is stated directly after the vehicle, the metaphor will be "You are also God's field on which God is working" (Ellingworth and Hatton, 1985:74). Thus, the TIV unnecessarily converts the metaphor into a simile. This makes the rendering obtain the mid level of fidelity for reducing the dynamics of the original.

c. Unnecessary Conversion to the Sense

Converting the original metaphor to sense is badly needed whenever translating metaphor to metaphor or simile causes any problem of fidelity. If this is not the case, the conversion will not yield a good translation for weakening the dynamic fidelity or even distorting the meaning fidelity.[10] The dynamic fidelity is reduced due to denying the significance of metaphor, namely compactness or vividness. The following renderings belonging to this classification range from partial to total conversion.

---

[10] Converting to sense is likely to flout the meaning fidelity especially for metaphors whose meanings and forms are inseparable.

| 09. | II Cor 9:10 | *And God, who supplies seed for the sower and bread to eat, will also supply you with all the seed you need and will make it grow and produce a rich harvest from your generosity.* | Allah juga menyediakan benih untuk si penabur dan makanan untuk kita. Ia juga akan menyediakan dan memperbanyak apa yang kalian tabur, supaya hasil kemurahan hatimu itu bertambah juga. |

Suggested rendering: Allah yang menyediakan benih bagi petani dan makanan bagi kita menyediakan juga benih yang kalian perlukan dan menumbuhkannya serta memberikan panen besar karena kalian murah hati.

Paul speaks of resource in terms of *seed*. In such a plant-life-system, multiplying the resource can be spoken in terms of *making the seed grow and produce a rich harvest*. Accordingly, the metaphor means God gives the resource you need and multiplies it since you are generous/cheerful givers. This comprehension is made possible because the previous verses say "… for God loves the one who gives gladly. And God is able to give you more than you need, so that you will always have all you need for yourselves and more than enough for every good cause" (TEV, II Cor 9:7–8). Thus, the retention of the metaphor in the rendering is faithful since the cotext can torpedo the unnecessary ambiguity.

In an agricultural country like Indonesia, a plant-life system is so familiar that it is used in many metaphorical expressions. They are "menanamkan uang/modal/saham" (to plant the money/capital/share), bunga uang (flower of money), pertumbuhan ekonomi (KBBI, growth of economy), pokok perusahaan itu lima juta rupiah (KBBI, the trunk of the firm is five million rupiahs), "perhiasannya merimbun" (KBBI, her jewelry becomes dense). All of these are based on the metaphorical concept RESOURCES ARE PLANTS. Accordingly, the retention of the metaphor in the rendering is still meaningful since speaking resources in terms of seed shares the metaphorical concept.

The TIV significantly reduces the dynamics of the original for converting the vehicle *grow* and *a rich harvest* into sense. This means that the TIV ignores that the metaphor can be retained meaningfully and faithfully.

| 10. | I Tim | *Run your best in the race of faith, and win* | Berjuanglah sungguh-sungguh untuk hidup sebagai orang Kristen supaya engkau merebut |

6:12   *eternal life for yourself.*   hadiah hidup sejati dan kekal.

Suggested rendering: Berjuanglah sebagai orang beriman seperti pelari yang baik dalam perlombaan, dan menangkanlah hidup kekal kalian sendiri.

It is very meaningful to speak faith in terms of defense instruments such as "perisai iman" (shield of faith), "benteng iman" (fort of faith) or in another protective instrument such as "pagar iman" (fence of faith). However, *run your best in the race of faith* sounds strange because of speaking faith in terms of compatible subject. However, *win eternal life* can be retained meaningfully in the rendering since it is based on the shared metaphorical concept LIFE IS A GAMBLING that organizes expressions such as "mempertaruhkan hidupnya" (to bet on her/his life), "mengadu nasib" (to bet on one's fate), "ia memegang kartu mati" (s/he holds dead cards) et cetera.

Run your best in the race of faith must be converted into a simile, since the retention can make people misunderstand that as many faithful Christians are against each other in order to be the best. By contrast, *win eternal life* can be retained in the rendering. The word *win* can be classified as a universal metaphor since, in all over the world, the result of winning of any game/race/gambling is the same, that is, to get the prize. In this case, the prize is eternal life. Therefore, *win the eternal life* can be rendered either by retaining it, i.e. "memenangkan hidup kekal" (win the eternal life) or adapting it, i.e. "merebut hadiah hidup kekal" (to seize the prize of the eternal life).

The retention and the adaptation of the metaphor in the rendering cannot generate the dynamic and meaning fidelity. The athletic imagery, however, can be hold in the form of simile by adding some literal and figurative contexts. Such a strategy makes the rendering more dynamic than the sense conversion does. After all, the TIV weakens the dynamics of the athletic imagery for rendering *run your best in the race of faith* into "Berjuanglah sungguh-sungguh untuk hidup sebagai orang Kristen." Therefore, the rendering assigns mid level of fidelity.

d. Unnecessary Omission of the Vehicles

The vehicle omission in metaphor translation happens only when it is redundant in the receptor language, so that the act does not bother any fidelity. The following renderings, however, discard the vehicles that are not redundant. As a result, the dynamics of the original is reduced in the translation.

11.	Rom 1:21	Instead, their thoughts have become complete nonsense, and *their empty minds are filled with darkness*.	Sebaliknya manusia memikirkan yang bukan-bukan; hati mereka sudah menjadi gelap.

Suggested rendering: Sebaliknya manusia memikirkan yang bukan-bukan; pikirannya yang kosong menjadi gelap.

The metaphorical concept MINDS ARE CONTAINERS organizes Indonesian expressions such as "pikirannya penuh dengan rencana jahat" (her/his mind is full of evil plan), "pikirannya/otaknya kosong" (her/his brain/mind is empty), "pikiran-nya/otaknya tidak ada isinya" (her/his brain/mind contains nothing), "membebani pikirannya" (to become burden of her/his mind), et cetera. Accordingly, the metaphor can be transferred meaningfully because the basis of *empty minds is filled with darkness* is under the same metaphorical concept. This is even enforced by the universality of the vehicle *darkness* (Bratcher and Nida, 1982:129). The universality also makes the retention of it not violate the meaning fidelity. Besides, the retention of *empty minds* in the rendering also adheres to the meaning fidelity since the ground explicitly states that *empty* refers to *complete nonsense*, so that it can be restated like "people's minds are complete nonsense like empty containers." The metaphor *empty minds are filled with darkness* is cause-and-effect, namely people's senselessness (empty mind) causing their ignorance (darkness of mind). In other words, "failure to perceive God's power and deity with the 'mind' brings a darkening of the mind" (Meyer, 1988:1136). The TIV violates the dynamic fidelity due to discarding the vehicle *empty*. This excludes the cause from the cause-and-effect metaphor. The rendering, therefore, gets the mid level of fidelity.

3. Low Level of Fidelity

A rendering classified as low level of fidelity is caused by unnecessarily distorting the meaning of the original. The following renderings are justified as having low level of fidelity.

a. Incomplete Conversion to the Sense

Converting the original metaphor to sense may reduce the dynamic fidelity (see Unnecessary Conversion to the Sense). Further, the incomplete conversion yields the renderings losing some meaning components of the original metaphor. Naturally, this is caused by the inseparable bond between the meaning and the form of the original metaphor. Nevertheless, the translator's carelessness is more reasonable.

12.	Rom 13:14	But *take up the weapons of the Lord Jesus Christ*	Biarlah Tuhan Yesus Kristus yang menentukan apa yang harus kalian lakukan.

Suggested rendering: Hunuslah Tuhan Yesus Kristus sebagai senjatamu.

The metaphor *take up the weapons of the Lord Jesus Christ* derives from the metaphorical concept PERSONS ARE INSTRUMENTS. This systemizes expressions such as "suaminya bisa menjadi senjata untuk menghadapi ruwetnya aturan birokrasi" (her husband can be a weapon for facing the complicated procedure of bureaucracy), "dia lah kunci keberhasilan perusahaan itu" (s/he is a key of the company success), "ia sekedar sekrup kecil dari mesin besar Orde Baru" (s/he was just a little screw in a big machine of the *Orde Baru*), "ia bukan manusia lagi tetapi mesin" (s/he is not a person anymore but a machine), "mahasiswa adalah lokomotif demokrasi" (students are the locomotives of democracy). Analogously, *take up the weapons of the Lord Jesus Christ* can also be meaningfully retained in the rendering.

The rendering "hunuslah Tuhan Yesus Kristus sebagai senjatamu" (unsheathe Lord Jesus Christ as your weapon) guarantees the retention of the original meaning. It does not only retain the notion that the weapons are the Lord Jesus Christ but also the notion that the addressees are required to be active and ready for any danger by figuratively taking up weapons. Accordingly, the rendering can adapt the metaphor to keep the meaning fidelity.

The metaphor can be meaningfully and faithfully retained with slight adaptation in the rendering. Unfortunately, the TIV converts the metaphor into the sense. In so doing, the rendering omits the extra meaning implicated from the weapon metaphor, that is, a command to the addressees to be active and ready for any danger. The missing meaning is so significant that the rendering obtains the low level of fidelity.

b. Omission of the Important Vehicles

Due to its redundancy, any metaphor can be omitted without harming any fidelity. The vehicle omission in the following renderings, however, makes the loss of meaning happen, since the vehicles carry meaning. They are not redundant.

| 13. | I Cor 3:6 | *I planted the seed, Apollos watered the plant, but it was God who made the plant grow*. | Saya menanam dan Apolos menyiram dan Allah sendirilah yang membuat tanamannya tumbuh. |

Suggested rendering: Saya menanam benihnya, Apolos menyirami tanamannya, tetapi Allah sendirilah yang membuat tanamannya tumbuh.

The contextual metaphor *I planted the seed, Apollos watered the plant, but it was God who made the plant grow* does not violate the maxim of quality. However, the maxim of relevance is flouted since Paul's remark is not a relevant answer to the quarrelling people who partly took sides with Paul and partly with Apollos. Metaphorically, the context informs that *plant* and *seed* are used to talk about the gospel. Thus, a question of dynamic fidelity is whether the metaphorical concept IDEAS ARE PLANTS is meaningful or not. Fortunately, the metaphorical concept originates some conventional expressions such as "ndhedher kabecikan" (Jav, plant goodness), "menanam benih kebencian" (plant the seed of hatred), "menumbuhkan patriotisme" (grow patriotism), "memupuk persahabatan" (fertilize friendship), "gagasannya berkembang" (one's ideas flower) "ngundhuh wohing panggawe" (Jav, harvest the fruits of deeds), et cetera. This even gives birth to new expressions in social and political discourse such as "rumput toleransi sudah mengering" (the grass of tolerance has been dry), "demokrasi adalah bunga wangi di taman Indonesia" (democracy is a fragrant flower in the Indonesian garden). For

that reason, the metaphorical plants are meaningful to Indonesian speakers, so that they can be retained in the rendering.

Retaining the metaphor in the rendering also does not obscure the intended meaning since either the original or the target readers have equal advantages to understand the metaphor. The first advantage is the universality of the flora metaphor based on an agricultural process, i.e. the growth of plants. Planting the seed and watering the plant represent two things similar with respect to the goal, namely to grow plant, but different in terms of time. The contrast between Paul who plants the seed and Apollos who waters the plant on the one hand and God who grows the plant on the other hand is to compare the men's impotence in front of God's power. The second advantage is that both the original and the target readers have a better understanding if only they read further the linguistic context. The context informs that Paul had come, taught, and established the church in Corinth in which Apollos came to the church later (I Cor 4:15; Acts 18:1–7). Paul's act is metaphorically expressed as *planting seed* and Apollos' as *watering the plant*.

The TIV assigns the low level of fidelity because it unnecessarily discards the vehicle *seeds* and *plant* in the rendering. Nevertheless, it still holds the the dynamic fidelity for retaining the most parts of the meaningful metaphor.

E. CONCLUSION

All of the 27 original metaphors have been traced to have the same metaphorical concepts with the Indonesian metaphors. The naturalness/meaningfulness of the renderings, therefore, can be grasped through defending metaphors in the translation. In the following turn, the co(n)text of the metaphors and the universality of the vehicles make the metaphors possible to be retained or adapted in the translation without harming meaning fidelity either.

Most renderings successfully retain and adapt the metaphors without violating any fidelity. Some renderings, however, reduce the significance of metaphors by unneccessarily supplying additional context, converting to simile, converting to the sense, and omitting of the vehicles. Since metaphor significance belongs to style, its violation gets mid level fidelity.

Finally, some omission of the important vehicles and incomplete conversion violate meaning fidelity which leads to the low fidelity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Bible Societies. 1984. *Good News Bible: The Bible in Today's English Version*. New York: American Bible Society.

Anderson, Judith H. 2005. *Translating Investments: Metaphor and the Dynamic of Cultural Change in Tudor-Stuart England*. New York: Fordham University Press

Baker, Mona. 1992. *In Other Words.* London and New York: Routledge.

Barnwell, Katherine G. L. 1980. *Introduction to Semantics and Translation with Special Reference to Bible Translation*. Horsely Green: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Beekman, John and John Callow. I974. *Translating the Word of God*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Bratcher, Robert Gand Eugene A. Nida. 1982. *A Translator's Handbook on Paul's Letter to the Ephesians*. London, New York, Stuttgart: United Bible Societies.

Chomsky, Noam. 1965. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax.* Cambridge: The MIT Press.

De Waard, Jan and Eugene A. Nida. 1986. *From One Language to Another: Functional Equivalence in Bible Translating*. Tennessee: Thomas Nelson.

Del Corro, Anicia. 1991. "The Use of Figurative Language." *The Bible Translator* 42. 1: 114–28.

Ellingworth, Paul and Howard A Hatton. 1994. *A Handbook on Paul's First Letter to the Corinthians* Second Edition. New York: United Bible Societies.

Gentzler, Edwin. 1993. *Contemporary Translation Theories*. London and New York: Routledge.

Gildea, Patricia and Sam Glucksberg. 1983. "On Understanding Metaphor: The Role of Context." *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 22. 5: 577–90.

Grice, H. Paul. 1975. "Logic and Conversation." In Peter Cole and Jerry L. Morgan (eds.). *Syntax and Semantics* Volume 3. 41–58. London: Academic Press.

Gunarwan, Asim. 1997. "Perpadanan Dinamis di dalam Penerjemahan Puisi: Kajian Empiris." In Bambang Kaswanti Purwo (ed.) *PELLBA 10.* 187–217. Jakarta: Kanisius.

Katz, Albert N. "On Choosing the Vehicles of Metaphors: Referential Concreteness, Semantic Distances, and Individual Differences." *Journal of Memory and Language* 28. 4: 486 99.

Koller, Werner. 1995. "The Concept of Equivalence and the Object of Translation Studies." *Target* 7. 2: 191–222.

Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Lembaga Alkitab Indonesia and Lembaga Biblika Indonesia. 1993. *Alkitab Kabar Baik dalam Bahasa Indonesia Sehari-hari.* Jakarta: Lembaga Alkitab Indonesia.

Lembaga Alkitab Indonesia. 1993. *Kabar Baik Untuk Anda Good News For You: Perjanjian Baru Bahasa Indonesia-Bahasa Inggris.* Jakarta: Lembaga Alkitab Indonesia.

Leon-Dufour, Xavier. 1990. *Ensiklopedi Perjanjian Baru*. Stefan Leks and A. S. Hadiwiyata

(trans). Yogyakarta: Kanisius.

Mac Cormac, Earl R. 1985. *A Cognitive Theory of Metaphor*. Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Malmkjaer, Kirsten.2004. "Translational Stylistic: Dulcken's Translation of Hans Christian Andersen" in *Language and Literature* 13.1: 13-24. London: SAGE Publication

McCune, Keith Michael. 1985. "The Internal Structure of Indonesian Roots Part 1." *Nusa: Linguistic Studies of Indonesian and Other Languages in Indonesia* 21–22: 87–121

Miller, George A. 1979. "Images and Models, Similes and Metaphors." In Ortony 1979: 202–50.

Moeliono, Anton M. 1989. "Diksi atau Pilihan Kata." ed. C. Ruddyanto. *Kembara Bahasa.* 173 9. Jakarta: Gramedia.

Mooij, J. A. A. 1976. *A Study of Metaphor*. Oxford: North-Holand Publishing.

Newmark, Peter. 1985. "The Translation of Metaphor." Wolf Paprotte and Rene Dirven (eds.) *The Ubiquity of Metaphor: Metaphor in Language and Thought*. 295–326. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.

Nida, Eugene A. 1964. *Toward A Science of Translating: with Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

---- and Charles Taber. 1969. *Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Ortony, Andrew. 1975. "Why metaphors are Necessary and Not Just Nice?" *Educational Theory*, 25: 45–53.

----. 1979. "The Role of Similarity in Similes and Metaphors." In Ortony 1979: 186–201.

Paivio, Allan. 1979. "Psychological Processes in the Comprehension of Metaphor." In Ortony 1979: 150–71.

Qiyun Zhang. 2008. "The Cognition and Image Preservation in the Translation of Metaphor from English to Chinese" in *Asian Social Science* 4. 8: 84-89

Richard, I. A. 1936. *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. London: Oxford University Press.

Searle, John R. 1979. "Metaphor." In Ortony 1979: 92–123.

Shi, Aiwei. 2004. "Style and Stylistic Accommodation in Translation" in *Translation Journals* 8. 3 accessed from http://www.translatum.gr/journal/4/style-in-translation.htm.

Steinhart, E. and E. F. Kittay. 1994. "Metaphor." In R. E. Asher and JMY Simpson (eds.) *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. 2452–6. Oxford: Pergamon.

Sterk, J.P. 1990. "Translating for Impact?" *The Bible Translator* 41. 1: 109–21.