

## ARTICLE

# Analyzing Translation Techniques and the Quality of Similes and Metaphors: A Study of Canonical Gospels in Diglot Bible (NIV-TB)

Agnes Emmie Kussemiarti<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Mangatur Rudolf Nababan<sup>3</sup>, Riyadi Santosa<sup>3</sup>, Djatmika<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Linguistics Department, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta 57126, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup>STBA LIA Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta 55283, Indonesia

<sup>3</sup>English Department, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta 57126, Indonesia

## ABSTRACT

This study reveals (1) the translation techniques employed in translating similes and metaphors from English to Indonesian in the canonical Gospel of *Diglot Bible* (NIV-TB), and (2) the impact of these techniques on the quality of translations. The data source is a *Diglot Bible* (NIV-TB), published by the Indonesian Bible Society (IBS) in 2009. The source text version is The Holy Bible, New International Version (NIV) 1978, while the target text is Alkitab Terjemahan Baru (TB) 1974. The languages involved were English as the source text and Indonesian as the target text. Five professional experts actively participated in a focus group discussion (FGD) to identify the translation techniques used and their impact on the quality of translation. A total of 54 instances of similes and metaphors were identified. The study results indicate that (1) the dominant translation technique used for translating similes and metaphors is established equivalent, whereas the seldom applied techniques were particularization, linguistic amplification, and linguistic compression. (2) The established equivalent, explication, paraphrase, addition, modulation, impication, transposition, generalization, adaptation, variation, particularization, linguistic amplification, linguistic compression, and compensation contributed to accuracy, acceptability, and readability of translations. Conversely, literal and discursive creation have resulted in lower accuracy, decreased acceptability, and moderate readability of translations. The implications of this study are particularly significant for Bible translators, advising against the use of literal and discursive creation techniques when translating similes and metaphors in the canonical Gospels. Literal and discursive creation was not applicable for translating similes and metaphors.

**Keywords:** Similes; Metaphors; Canonical Gospels; Translation Technique; Translation Quality; FGD

### \*CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Agnes Emmie Kussemiarti, Linguistics Department, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia; STBA LIA Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta 55283, Indonesia; Email: [emmiekussemiarti@gmail.com](mailto:emmiekussemiarti@gmail.com)

### ARTICLE INFO

Received: 17 April 2025 | Revised: 20 April 2025 | Accepted: 24 April 2025 | Published Online: 26 April 2025

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i5.9576>

### CITATION

Kussemiarti, A.E., Nababan, M.R., Santosa, R., et al., 2025. Analyzing Translation Techniques and the Quality of Similes and Metaphors: A Study of Canonical Gospels in Diglot Bible (NIV-TB). *Forum for Linguistic Studies*. 7(5): 312–326. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i5.9576>

### COPYRIGHT

Copyright © 2025 by the author(s). Published by Bilingual Publishing Group. This is an open access article under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

# 1. Introduction

Throughout the centuries, the Bible, recognized as one of human history's most widely read and translated texts, has profoundly shaped literary, cultural, and linguistic traditions. Since its original composition in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek has been translated into numerous languages, enabling a diverse audience to engage with its teachings. The translation of the Bible has significantly influenced the development of languages, literary practices, and even political ideologies, while also fostering religious and theological discourse, as stated by Pradhan <sup>[1]</sup>. In line with Pradhan, Dube also mentioned that the Bible is the most widely translated book in the world <sup>[2]</sup>.

Translating the Bible involves significant historical and linguistic challenges due to the substantial differences between ancient languages such as Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek, and modern languages. This task also requires effectively communicating meaning across diverse cultural and temporal contexts. Additionally, the Bible's intricate cultural and theological nuances demand careful attention, as some languages may lack direct equivalents for specific concepts. The historical challenges include several factors: (1) Lack of written traditions in certain languages: Many languages do not have a written tradition, necessitating that translators create a writing system before they can begin translating the Bible. (2) Cultural variations and context: The Bible's cultural and historical contexts may differ significantly from those of the target language's culture and period. Translators must ensure that the translated text is both understandable and relevant to the target audience while remaining true to the original text. (3) The impact of tradition and interpretation: Different denominations and religious groups have various interpretations of the Bible. Translators must navigate these differing interpretations and strive to produce a translation acceptable to a wide range of readers. (4) The influence of existing translations: Existing translations in other languages can impact the translation process into a new language. Translators need to be aware of these influences and make independent decisions regarding their translation approach. (5) The ongoing evolution of language: Languages are constantly evolving, and translators must consider how to keep their translations current with the changing language while stay-

ing faithful to the original text.

Meanwhile, the historical challenges encompass several factors: (1) Absence of written traditions in certain languages: numerous languages do not possess a written tradition, necessitating that translators establish a writing system before initiating the translation of the Bible. (2) Cultural variations and context: The Bible's cultural and historical backdrop may significantly differ from that of the target language's culture and era. Translators are tasked with ensuring that the translated text is both comprehensible and pertinent to the target audience, while also remaining true to the original text. (3) The impact of tradition and interpretation: various denominations and religious factions hold differing interpretations of the Bible. Translators must navigate these diverse interpretations and endeavor to produce a translation acceptable to a broad spectrum of readers. (4) The effect of pre-existing translations: translations already available in other languages can affect the translation process into a new language. Translators need to be cognizant of these influences and make independent decisions regarding their translation approach. (5) The continuous development of language: languages are in a state of constant evolution, and translators must take into account how to keep their translations current with the evolving language while remaining faithful to the original text. In summary, translating the Bible is a complex process that requires a high level of expertise in linguistics, history, theology, and cultural understanding. Translators must navigate a multitude of challenges to create translations that are accurate, meaningful, and accessible to diverse audiences. Additionally statement by Fields that the translation of the Bible is a multifaceted endeavor that requires proficiency in at least two distinct languages <sup>[3]</sup>. The original text may be derived from Old Testament Hebrew, Aramaic, or New Testament Greek, while the target language for this discussion will primarily be English, with occasional mentions of translations into significantly different, non-Indo-European languages.

We analyzed similes and metaphors in the fourth canonical Gospel (Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John). The fourth canonical Gospel is a central teaching of the Christian faith and is considered the good news. It consists of four narratives about the life, teachings, death, and resurrection of Jesus, as retold by his apostles, namely: Mat-

thew, Mark, Luke, and John. Similes and metaphors in parables are used by Jesus to demonstrate that Jesus fully understands the diversity of the ins and outs of human life. Jesus speaks and teaches according to the language and culture of the people of that time. Jesus uses the form of similes and metaphors so that His message can be clearly and simply understood by the listener. Jesus did not merely tell a story; He conveyed them effectively through similes and metaphors within parables. Parables are not only limited to literary works or imaginative poetry but are also widely used in the thoughts and texts of the Gospel. Through the expression of similes and metaphors in the Gospel, humans can interpret concepts of reality, particularly in religious life, including their ways of thinking, spiritual experiences, and daily religious practices. This is, as stated by Lakoff & Mark <sup>[4]</sup>, that human conceptualization is essentially metaphorical.

Through similes and metaphors, religious concepts can be more concretely illustrated. For example, the concept of 'heaven' in the English source language is analogous to the concept of 'mustard seed' and is realized with the metaphorical expression 'mustard seed' in Luke 13:18–21. God teaches about prayer found in the Gospel of Luke in the Metaphors 'a friend at midnight (Luke 11:5–8), 'the persistent widow' (Luke 18:1–8), and 'the Pharisee' (Luke 18:9–14). The Word of God is indeed not always easily understood by humans, as God's thoughts are far different from what humans think. For the Word of God to be understood, to settle in the heart, and then be expressed in the actions of everyday human life, Jesus used various simple and easily understandable methods, which are similes and metaphors in the parables of the New Testament. Jesus often used complex similes and metaphors, in the form of stories taken from everyday life, to convey a truth, especially about the Kingdom of God, so that the message was easier to grasp.

The study of similes and metaphors in the translation of the Bible investigates the treatment of these figurative expressions across various translation methodologies. Certain research efforts concentrate on recognizing and evaluating the types of similes and metaphors present in particular biblical texts, such as the Book of Revelation, Psalms, and Hosea, or the Song of Songs. For example, one study analyzed the Book of Revelation and found

34 figurative languages, including 5 metaphors and 29 similes, as investigated by Maria & Bram <sup>[5]</sup>. The research findings have found numerous similes and metaphors, such as "the day of the Lord will come like a thief in the night" (Revelation 16:15) and "I am the alpha and the omega" (Revelation 1:8). Another study investigated the Book of Psalms conducted by Resi & Adrallisman <sup>[6]</sup>. Studies on the Book of Psalms have identified metaphors like "the Lord is my shepherd" (Psalm 23) and similes like "He shall be like a tree planted by the waters" (Psalm 1). Analysis of Hosea 14 demonstrates how metaphors and similes are used to express a covenant relationship between Yahweh and Israel, and how these figures of speech can convey a sense of hope and judgment as explored by Oestreich <sup>[7]</sup>. Meanwhile, a study on similes used to describe women and men in the Song of Songs analyzes their underlying metaphors reported by Toar & Bram <sup>[8]</sup>. Research on the Song of Songs explores the use of similes and metaphors to describe the love and connection between the bride and bridegroom, often interpreted as a symbol of God's love for humanity.

Additional study by Fields analyzes the translation of biblical live and dead metaphors and similes, and other idioms <sup>[2]</sup>. The findings are that the translation method is the most telling to handle fixed idioms, such as similes and dead metaphors, but the struggle is with Bible translators. There are both linguistic and theological reasons for this. Another study about the contradiction of types of figurative languages (simile, metaphor, and paradox) found in Matthew was conducted by Lao <sup>[9]</sup>. The findings show three different types of figurative language used in Kupang Malay, Indonesian, and the English Bible. They are metaphors, similes, and paradoxes. Changes of figurative language are caused by each language's characteristics. Meanwhile, Situmorang & Sihotang examine the translation of metaphors from English to Toba Batak <sup>[10]</sup>, utilizing data sourced from the Old Testament Bible. The objective of the article is to investigate the methods of translating and adapting metaphors into the Toba Batak language. The findings indicate that the majority of metaphors are translated metaphorically; however, there are instances where the translation diverges to accommodate the cultural context of the Toba Batak language. This underscores the linguistic and cultural difficulties encountered when trans-

lating metaphors between languages that possess distinct cultural references and religious interpretations.

Metaphor in biblical translation is also analyzed by Tebbit<sup>[11]</sup>. He investigated the translation of metaphorical concepts in the fourth Gospel in modern Italian Bibles. Then, a study that deals with similes and metaphors was also reported by Koa<sup>[12]</sup>. The data of that study was taken from the New Testament Holy Bible, especially in the fourth Gospel. This study is focused on the translation of the parables from metaphor to metaphor and simile to simile, which are translated from English into Indonesian. The English text is The New King James Version, New Testament 1979 by Thomas Nelson, Inc., and the Indonesian text, Perjanjian Baru, Terjemahan Baru, 1974. Indonesian version translated by Konperensi Wali Gereja Indonesia. The result of this research shows that in the Gospels, the writer found two categories of figures of speech that are used by Jesus Christ in His preaching. They are the parables that use metaphor and the parables that use simile. This current study focuses on translation techniques and quality of similes and metaphors in the fourth canonical Gospels; on the other hand, a study focused on translation techniques and quality of the Bible has also been conducted by Krisifu et al.<sup>[13]</sup>, but their data source is a Bible Storybook on "The Creation" from English into Indonesian. The findings show 12 translation techniques frequently used. Another study also explored the translation method found in the New Testament Bible of Mark's Gospel. Swarniti identified 7 translation methods found in the data source were word for word translation, literal translation, faithful translation, semantic translation, free translation, idiomatic translation, and communicative translation<sup>[14]</sup>.

Research on similes and metaphors in Bible translation has been widely documented, but less is known about it from the perspective of translation techniques and quality of similes and metaphors in the fourth canonical Gospels of the *diglot* Bible (NIV-TB). The purpose of this study is to fill the gap. The key questions in this current study were formulated:

1. What translation techniques are applied in translating similes and metaphors in the fourth canonical Gospels of the *diglot* Bible (NIV-TB)?
2. What is the impact of translation techniques applied on the quality of simile and metaphor translation in

the fourth canonical Gospels of the *diglot* Bible (NIV-TB)?

## 2. Materials and Methods

A *diglot* Bible is a bilingual edition that displays the scripture in two languages adjacent to one another. This arrangement enables readers to juxtapose translations and comprehend the texts in both languages at the same time. Diglot Bibles are beneficial for language learners, bilingual persons, and individuals seeking to enhance their grasp of biblical passages by examining them in various linguistic frameworks. Typical combinations feature translations in English alongside another language, such as Spanish, French, or Indonesian.

This current study used a *diglot* Bible (NIV-TB), published by the Indonesian Bible Society (IBS) in 2009. The source text version is The Holy Bible, New International Version (NIV) 1978. NIV is one of the most popular modern translations and places a high value on readability and clarity<sup>[1]</sup>. NIV is the most widely used contemporary Bible translation, recognized for its ideal combination of precision and clarity. More than 100 scholars globally collaborated for over ten years to produce a translation that remains faithful to the original texts while being accessible, culminating in its release in 1978. It is distinguished as one of the most well-rounded translations, with a slight preference for functional equivalence, rendering it appropriate for readers of all ages, literacy levels, and religious backgrounds. Many young people and scholars in Indonesia greatly appreciate the NIV version because of its fluid and natural translation style, while still striving to remain as close as possible to the original languages of the Bible. In terms of translation, the NIV successfully combines both formal and dynamic-functional translation approaches. In the English-speaking world, the NIV has become a highly regarded translation, achieving a very high level of readability. While the target text is Alkitab Terjemahan Baru (TB). TB, released in 1974, marks a notable improvement in the Indonesian Bible translation compared to its predecessors. Key enhancements of The TB compared with earlier versions include: (1) Modernized language: Utilizing contemporary Indonesian, the TB is more accessible to the general populace, whereas earlier translations often employed outdated language that posed comprehension challenges for modern readers. The TB's simpler sentence

structures further enhance readability and understanding. (2) Translation philosophy: adopting a dynamic equivalence approach, the TB prioritizes conveying the essence of the original texts over a literal translation, making the scriptures more relatable to Indonesian audiences. It integrates cultural references familiar to Indonesian readers, thereby increasing the text's relevance and impact. (3) Textual foundation: The TB is grounded in more recent and reliable biblical manuscripts than earlier versions, which frequently depended on less accurate texts, thus improving the translation's fidelity to the original scriptures. The collaborative effort of biblical scholars in the translation process has resulted in a more nuanced interpretation of the texts. (4) Denominational inclusivity: developed with contributions from various Christian denominations, the TB offers a more inclusive perspective that reflects a wider Christian viewpoint in Indonesia, unlike earlier translations that were often associated with specific denominations. (5) Structure and formatting: The TB presents a clear and organized layout, featuring headings and subheadings that aid in navigating the text, a significant improvement over earlier versions that lacked such structured formatting. Additionally, the inclusion of footnotes and cross-references in the TB provides readers with deeper insights into the text and its context. (6) Theological clarity: The TB strives to articulate theological concepts more clearly, facilitating easier understanding for readers. (7) Accessibility: The TB has been extensively disseminated and is offered in multiple formats, both print and digital, thereby reaching a broader audience compared to previous editions. In conclusion, the TB 1974 is distinguished by its contemporary language, dynamic translation methodology, academic foundation, inclusivity, and user-friendly layout. These improvements render it not only an important religious document but also a crucial cultural artifact that connects with the Indonesian Christian community and beyond. The NIV and TB versions of the Bible both exhibit high readability in Indonesia.

This study employed both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. Qualitative due to the data collection technique was a focus group, and the data type is textual. Quantitative due to the data type is numerical data, deals with the percentage of translation techniques employed in similes and metaphor translation, and the score of transla-

tion quality. Similes and metaphors are the main focus of this study. A simile is a phenomenon that compares two opposite objects by using "like" or "as" in the sentence, as reported by Chanch<sup>[15]</sup>. "like" or "as" in English can be translated into "*seperti*", "*bagaikan*" or "*laksana*" in Indonesian. Meanwhile, metaphor, according to Kendenan<sup>[16]</sup>, is when language is used to refer to something different from what it was originally applied to or what it means to imply some likeness or establish a relationship between the two. There were 54 data points, consisting of 37 metaphor expressions and 17 simile expressions.

This study focuses on the translation techniques of similes and metaphors in the New Testament parables and examines the impact of these techniques on translation quality. The frameworks of Molina & Albir and Nababan et al. were utilized to analyze the data<sup>[17,18]</sup>. The framework of Molina & Albir is employed to investigate the translation techniques used by translators when dealing with simile and metaphor expressions<sup>[17]</sup>. Eighteen proposed translation techniques are as follows: (1) adaptation: modifying cultural elements from the source language to fit the target language, (2) amplification, which includes addition, explicitation, and paraphrasing: providing additional details in the target language that are absent in the source text, (3) borrowing—divided into pure borrowing and naturalized borrowing: directly incorporating words from the source text, (4) calque: translating a foreign word or phrase literally, (5) compensation: placing information or stylistic effects from the source text in a different location within the target text, (6) description: substituting a term or expression with a descriptive phrase, (7) discursive creation: generating an equivalence that is out of context, (8) established equivalent: using a term or expression recognized as equivalent in the target language according to dictionaries, (9) generalization: opting for a broader term in the target language, (10) linguistic amplification: adding linguistic components, (11) linguistic compression: condensing linguistic elements in the target text, (12) literal translation: performing a word-for-word translation, (13) modulation: altering the perspective, focus, or cognitive category in relation to the source text, (14) particularization: selecting a more specific or concrete term, (15) reduction, which includes implicitation and omission: eliminating certain information from the source text in the target text, (16) sub-



stitution: replacing linguistic elements with paralinguistic elements (such as intonation or gestures) or vice versa, (17) transposition: modifying a grammatical category, and (18) variation: altering linguistic or paralinguistic elements (intonation, gestures) that influence aspects of linguistic variation, such as changes in tone, style, social dialect, and geographical dialect.

The framework of Nababan et al. is utilized to analyze the impact of the translation techniques used on the quality of the translation <sup>[18]</sup>. A high-quality translation should meet three key criteria: accuracy, acceptability, and readability as proposed by Nababan et al. <sup>[18]</sup>. Accuracy refers to the degree of equivalence between the source text and the message conveyed in the target text. Acceptability, on the other hand, relates to how natural the text appears to readers of the target language, ensuring it aligns with the cultural norms and expectations of that audience. This aspect is crucial for evaluating translation quality, as discrepancies in norms and culture between the source and target texts can diminish the translation's acceptability. Read-

ability assesses whether the text is comprehensible to its readers, considering both the source and target texts. The evaluation of translation quality is based on these three instruments: accuracy, acceptability, and readability. The assessment framework comprises three components: the translation category, a scoring system ranging from 1 to 3 that indicates the quality of the translation (with higher scores denoting superior quality), and qualitative parameters describing the translation corresponding to each score. **Tables 1–3** illustrate the assessment tools for accuracy, acceptability, and readability proposed by Nababan et al. <sup>[18]</sup>.

Data were obtained by analyzing the similes and metaphors as the source text (ST) alongside the Indonesian translation serving as the target text (TT). This comparison aimed to identify the translation techniques utilized and assess their influence on the quality of the translation. A Focus Group Discussion (FGD) involves facilitating group conversations centered around a specific theme, as stated by Santosa <sup>[19]</sup>. The authors selected FGD as a method to enhance the research data temporarily gathered through

**Table 1.** The Accuracy Assessment Instrument.

Translation Category	Score	Qualitative Parameters
Accurate	3	The meaning of words, technical terms, phrases, clauses, sentences, or the texts of the source language is accurately transferred into the target text, with no meaning distortions.
Less accurate	2	Most of the meanings of words, technical terms, phrases, clauses, sentences, or the texts of the source language have been accurately transferred into the target text, but there are still distortions of meaning or translation of double meanings (ambiguous), or there are omitted meanings that offend the message integrity.
Inaccurate	1	The meaning of words, technical terms, phrases, clauses, sentences, or texts of the source language is not accurately transferred into the target text or omitted.

**Table 2.** The Acceptability Assessment Instrument.

Translation Category	Score	Qualitative Parameters
Acceptable	3	The translations are natural; the technical terms are commonly used and familiar to the readers. Phrases, clauses, or sentences follow the norms or rules of the English language.
Less acceptable	2	In general, the translations are natural, but there are a few problems with the use of technical terms or grammatical errors.
Inacceptable	1	The translations are natural; the technical terms are not commonly used and are not familiar to the readers. Phrases, clauses, or sentences do not follow the norms or rules of the English language.

**Table 3.** The Readability Assessment Instrument.

Translation Category	Score	Qualitative Parameters
High readability	3	The words, technical terms, phrases, clauses, sentences, or translation text can be understood easily by the readers.
Medium readability	2	In general, the translated text is understood by the readers; however, certain parts must be read more than once by readers to understand.
Low readability	1	The readers cannot understand the translation.

content analysis. The FGD aims to address issues that the authors are unable to resolve independently. This forum was utilized for evaluation and validation purposes in assessing the translation techniques used in the target text, as well as their effects on translation quality. Five professionals were invited to actively participate in the FGD. All experts possess language proficiency in both English and Indonesian, and they are well-qualified in the fields of translation and linguistics. The qualifications of the FGD members include a professor specializing in translation (a professional translator), an associate professor of translation (also a professional translator), and other lecturers who hold doctoral degrees in translation. To identify the translation techniques and assess quality, both the experts and authors engaged in the FGD. The contributions of a professor and an associate professor (both professional translators) were instrumental in validating the translation techniques and quality. Additionally, lecturers with a doctoral degree in translation, including the authors, played a role in determining the translation techniques applied in the target texts, as well as in scoring the translation quality for each data set. In the FGD, 54 instances of similes and metaphors were identified. Participants in the FGD analyzed the translation techniques utilized in the target text. Once the translation techniques were recognized, the participants evaluated the quality of the translations. The steps involved in data analysis include the following:

- (1). Evaluating similes and metaphor expressions in the source text against their translations in English as the target text.
- (2). Identifying the translation techniques utilized in the target text.
- (3). Assessing how the employed translation techniques affect the quality of target text translation.
- (4). Concluding.

### 3. Results

#### 3.1. Translation Techniques Employed in Translating Similes and Metaphors in the Fourth Canonical Gospels of *Diglot Bible* (NIV-TB)

Referring to **Table 4**, sixteen translation techniques were employed in translating similes and metaphors in

the New Testament parables. The established equivalent technique was the most dominant technique employed with 1385 (72,13%), modulation: 123 (6,40%), explicitation: 118 (6,14%), variation: 75 (3,90%), compensation: 55 (2,86%), implicitation: 49 (2,55%), paraphrase: 41 (2,13%), transposition: 26 (1,35%), addition: 18 (0,93%), generalization: 15 (0,78%), discursive creation: 6 (0,31%), adaptation: 4 (0,20%), literal: 2 (0,10%), particularization: 1 (0,05%), linguistic amplification: 1 (0,05%), and linguistic compression: 1 (0,05%). The total of translation techniques employed in translating similes and metaphors was 1920. From 54 data points of similes and metaphors translation, the following are the samples. The authors used the abbreviations ST and TT in this paper. ST means source text, then TT means target text.

**Table 4.** Translation Techniques Applied in Translating Similes and Metaphors.

Translation Techniques	Frequency	Percentage
Established equivalent	1385	72,13
Modulation	123	6,40
Explicitation	118	6,14
Variation	75	3,90
Compensation	55	2,86
Implication	49	2,55
Paraphrase	41	2,13
Transposition	26	1,35
Addition	18	0,93
Generalization	15	0,78
Discursive creation	6	0,31
Adaptation	4	0,20
Literal	2	0,10
Particularization	1	0,05
Linguistic amplification	1	0,05
Linguistic compression	1	0,05
Total	1920	100

#### Example 1: Established Equivalent

Matthew 7:10	
ST	<i>Or if he asks for a <b>fish</b> will give him a <b>snake</b>?</i>
TT	<i>Atau memberi <b>ular</b>, jika ia meminta <b>ikan</b>?</i>

Referring to Example 1, it can indeed be considered a metaphor. In this verse, Jesus compares earthly parents who, despite their flaws, give good gifts to their children, to God, who gives good things to those who ask Him. This comparison illustrates God's loving and generous nature,

emphasizing that just as parents provide for their children, God will provide for His followers in a caring and attentive manner. The metaphor serves to reassure believers of God's goodness and willingness to help. In translating the metaphor as seen in Example 1, the **established equivalent** techniques were employed. The words "fish" and "snake" in ST, for example, were translated into "*ikan*" and "*ular*" in TT by using established equivalents.

### Example 2: Explicitation

John 10:14	
ST	<i>I am the good shepherd; I know my sheep and my sheep know me</i>
TT	<i>Akulah gembala yang baik dan aku mengenal domba dombaKu dan domba dombaKu mengenal Aku</i>

Referring to Example 2, the sample belongs to a metaphor. In this context, Jesus identifies Himself as the "good shepherd," implying a deep, caring relationship with His followers (the sheep). Unlike a simile, which uses "like" or "as" for comparison, this metaphor directly equates Jesus with the role of a shepherd, emphasizing His protective and guiding nature. In translating this verse, the translator employed **explicitation** technique in TT. The word "*dan*" is added to the target text to make the target text translation is more explicit.

### Example 3: Modulation

Matthew 24:46	
ST	<i>It will be good for that servant whose master finds him doing so when he returns</i>
TT	<i>Berbahagiaalah hamba yang didapati tuannya melakukan tugasnya itu, ketika tuannya itu datang</i>

This verse as seen in Example 3, uses a metaphorical scenario to illustrate the importance of being faithful and diligent in one's duties. The "servant" represents believers, while the "master" symbolizes Christ. The metaphor emphasizes the expectation of readiness and responsibility in serving God. It can be considered a metaphor as it conveys a deeper spiritual truth through the imagery of a servant-master relationship. The translator modulated "*it will be good for*" in ST to become "*berbahagialah*" in TT by using the **modulation** technique.

### Example 4: Variation

John 10:14	
ST	<i>I am the good shepherd; I know my sheep and my sheep know me</i>
TT	<i>Akulah gembala yang baik dan aku mengenal domba dombaKu dan domba dombaKu mengenal Aku</i>

Referring to Example 4, the sample belongs to a metaphor. In this context, Jesus identifies Himself as the "good shepherd," implying a deep, caring relationship with His followers (the sheep). Unlike a simile, which uses "like" or "as" for comparison, this metaphor directly equates Jesus with the role of a shepherd, emphasizing His protective and guiding nature. The word "*I am*" in ST was translated into "*Akulah*" in TT by a translator using the **variation** technique.

### Example 5: Compensation

Luke 6:48	
ST	<i>He is like a man building a house, who dug down deep and laid the foundation on rock. When a flood came, the torrent struck that house but could not shake it, because it was well-built.</i>
TT	<i>Ia sama dengan seorang yang mendirikan rumah: Orang itu menggali dalam-dalam dan meletakkan dasarnya di atas batu. Ketika datang air bah dan banjir melanda rumah itu, rumah itu tidak dapat digoyahkan, karena rumah itu kokoh dibangun.</i>

Luke 6:48 as seen in Example 5 contains a simile. The marker is the use of "*like*" in ST and it was translated into "*sama dengan*" in TT. In this verse, Jesus compares a wise person to a man who builds a house on a solid foundation (rock). The comparison emphasizes the stability and resilience of those who hear and act on His words, contrasting them with those who do not. This use of simile effectively illustrates the importance of a strong foundation in faith and practice. The **compensation** translation technique is employed in this verse in which the sentence "*He is like a man building a house*" in ST was translated into "*Ia sama dengan seorang yang mendirikan rumah*".

### Example 6: Paraphrase

Mark 4:22	
ST	<i>For whatever is hidden is meant to be disclosed, and whatever is concealed is meant to be brought out into the open.</i>
TT	<i>Sebab tidak ada sesuatu yang tersembunyi yang tidak akan dinyatakan, dan tidak ada sesuatu yang rahasia yang tidak akan tersingkap.</i>



Example 6 is a metaphor. In this verse, the idea that “nothing is hidden except to be made manifest” suggests that truths will eventually be revealed. The metaphor implies that hidden things—whether knowledge, intentions, or aspects of life—will come to light, emphasizing transparency and revelation. This reflects a deeper truth about understanding and enlightenment in spiritual contexts. ST was translated by a translator by using a **paraphrase** technique in TT.

### Example 7: Implication

#### Mark 4:29

ST	<i>As soon as the grain is ripe, he puts the sickle to it, because the harvest has come.</i>
TT	<i>Apabila buah itu sudah cukup masak, orang itu segera menyabit, sebab musim menuai sudah tiba.</i>

Example 7 presents a metaphor. The verse describes the process of harvesting, stating that when the grain is ripe, the harvester puts in the sickle because the harvest has come. This imagery illustrates the idea of spiritual growth and readiness, emphasizing the natural progression of faith and the timing of God’s work. The translator employed an **implication** technique by not translating the word “to it” of ST in TT.

### Example 8: Transposition

#### Mark 1:10

ST	<i>And when He came up out of the water, immediately He saw the heavens being torn open and the Spirit descending on him like a dove.</i>
TT	<i>Dan segera setelah Ia keluar dari air, Ia melihat langit terbuka dan Roh seperti burung merpati turun ke atas-Nya.</i>

Example 8 presents a simile. This verse contains a simile. The phrase “like a dove” compares the way the Spirit descends to the gentle motion of a dove. This use of “like” makes it a simile, illustrating the nature of the Spirit’s descent vividly. TT translator employed the **transposition** technique in translating “He” in ST into “Ia” in TT.

### Example 9: Addition

#### Luke 13:34

ST	<i>O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, the city that kills the prophets and stones those who are sent to it! How often would I have gathered your children together as a hen gathers her brood under her wings, and you were not willing!.</i>
----	--

#### Luke 13:34

TT	<i>Yerusalem, Yerusalem, engkau yang membunuh para nabi dan melempar batu kepada mereka yang diutus kepadamu! Berapa banyak kali Aku ingin mengumpulkan anak-anakmu, seperti seekor induk ayam mengumpulkan anak-anaknya di bawah sayapnya, tetapi engkau tidak mau!.</i>
----	---

Example 9 expresses Jesus’ lament over Jerusalem, using the simile of a hen gathering her chicks to illustrate His desire to protect and care for the people. The word “melempar” in TT is additional information added by the TT translator. The technique was an **addition** translation technique sample.

### Example 10: Discursive Creation

#### Luke 18:12

ST	<i>I fast twice a week; I give all that I get.</i>
TT	<i>Aku berpuasa dua kali seminggu dan aku memberikan sepersepuluh dari segala penghasilanku.</i>

Example 10 contains a metaphor. Here, the act of fasting and giving tithes is not just a literal description but serves as a metaphor for self-righteousness and the outward display of piety. The Pharisee uses these acts to compare himself favorably against others, illustrating his sense of superiority. This metaphor highlights the themes of humility and true righteousness found in the surrounding context of the parable. The sentence “I give all that I get” in ST was translated into “aku memberikan sepersepuluh dari segala penghasilanku” in TT by using a **discursive creation** translation technique.

### Example 11: Generalization

#### Matthew 22:2

ST	<i>The kingdom of heaven is like a king who prepared a wedding banquet for his son.</i>
TT	<i>Hal Kerajaan Sorga seumpama seorang raja, yang mengadakan perjamuan kawin untuk anaknya.”</i>

This verse as seen in Example 11 is a metaphor. While it uses “like,” which is a common indicator of simile, in this context, it functions as a metaphor to convey a deeper meaning about the kingdom of heaven. The comparison emphasizes the nature of the kingdom as a celebratory invitation, rather than directly comparing two unlike things. The **generalization** translation technique can be identified when the translator translated “for his son” in

ST into “*untuk anaknya*” in TT. TT translation is more general.

### Example 12: Adaptation

Matthew 13:47	
ST	<i>The kingdom of heaven is like a net that was let down into <b>the lake</b> and caught all kinds of fish.</i>
TT	<i>Demikian pula hal kerajaan surga itu seumpama pukat yang dilabuhkan <b>di laut</b> lalu mengumpulkan berbagai jenis ikan.</i>

Referring to Example 12, in this case, the phrase “*is like*” indicates a comparison, making it a simile. It illustrates the inclusive nature of the kingdom of heaven by comparing it to a fishing net that collects various types of fish, emphasizing the gathering of all kinds of people into the kingdom. The word “*the lake*” in ST was translated into “*di laut*” in TT by the translator using the **adaption** translation technique.

### Example 13: Literal

Mark 4:26-27	
ST	<i>The kingdom of God is as if a man should scatter seed on the ground; he sleeps and rises night and day, and the seed sprouts and grows; he knows not how.</i>
TT	<i>Demikianlah hal Kerajaan Allah: Seperti seorang yang menaburkan benih di tanah; ia tidur dan bangun, baik siang maupun malam, dan benih itu tumbuh dan semakin besar, tetapi ia tidak tahu bagaimana.</i>

Example 13 presents a simile. The phrase “*as if*” in ST makes a comparison between the kingdom of God and the process of scattering seed. This simile illustrates the idea of the kingdom’s growth being natural and beyond human control, emphasizing the mysterious workings of God’s kingdom. The **literal** translation technique was employed by a TT translator in translating the ST into TT.

### Example 14: Particularization

Mark 4:3	
ST	<i>Listen! A <b>farmer</b> went out to show his seed.</i>
TT	<i>Dengarlah! Ada seorang <b>penabur</b> keluar untuk menabur</i>

Referring to Example 14, it represents a metaphor. In this context, the “*farmer*” and “*seed*” represent broader concepts. The farmer symbolizes those who spread the message of the Gospel, while the seed represents the Word of God. This metaphor illustrates how different responses

to the message can lead to varying outcomes, emphasizing the importance of receptiveness to spiritual teachings. **Particularization** translation technique as seen in TT. The word “*a farmer*” in ST was translated into “*seorang penabur*” in TT.

### Example 15: Linguistic Amplification

Matthew 12:29	
ST	<i>Then he can rob his house</i>
TT	<i><b>Sesudah diikatnya</b> barulah dapat ia merampok rumah itu</i>

Example 15 describes how metaphor is employed to illustrate the concept of spiritual authority and the need for preparation and strength in overcoming evil. **Linguistic amplification** is used when the translator adds the sentence “*sesudah diikatnya*” in TT.

### Example 16: Linguistic Compression

Matthew 18:33	
ST	<i>Shouldn't you have had mercy on your fellow servant just as I had on you</i>
TT	<i>Bukankah engkau pun harus mengasihani kawanmu seperti aku telah mengasihani engkau</i>

Example 16 is part of a parable about forgiveness, where a king forgives a large debt but the servant fails to show the same mercy to another. In this context, the verse serves as a metaphor for divine forgiveness and the expectation that we extend that same grace to others. It illustrates the moral responsibility of individuals to practice compassion and forgiveness, reflecting the greater mercy that God shows to humanity. This verse uses metaphorical language to convey deeper spiritual truths about forgiveness and mercy in human relationships. The **linguistic compression** translation technique is used in TT translation.

## 3.2. The Impact of Translation Techniques Applied on the Quality of Simile and Metaphor Translation in the Fourth Canonical Gospels of *Diglot Bible* (NIV-TB)

Translation techniques can be defined as procedures for analyzing and classifying how translation equivalence functions. One of the fundamental characteristics of translation techniques is their influence on the outcome

of translation, as mentioned by Molina & Albir <sup>[17]</sup>. In this study, we authors aim to describe the impact of translation techniques on the quality of simile and metaphor translation. As mentioned in the previous section of the findings, there were sixteen translation techniques utilized in translating similes and metaphors. Each of these has contributed to the quality of translation in the following ways: the established equivalent, explication, paraphrase, addition, modulation, implicitation, transposition, generalization, adaptation, variation, particularization, linguistic amplification, linguistic compression, and compensation have all enhanced the accuracy, acceptability, and readability of simile and metaphor translations. Conversely, literal and discursive creation techniques have resulted in lower accuracy, reduced acceptability, and moderate readability of the translation. The following are examples of translation quality.

### 3.2.1. Accurate

Matthew 7:10	
ST	<i>Or if he asks for a <b>fish</b> will give him a <b>snake</b>?</i>
TT	<i>Atau memberi <b>ular</b>, jika ia meminta <b>ikan</b>?</i>

TT translation has been translated accurately by a translator by employing the **established equivalent** technique. The words “*fish*” and “*snake*” as samples were translated into “*ikan*” and “*ular*” in TT by using an established equivalent technique. TT translation represents an accurate translation. The translation quality score using Nababan et al’s model is 3 3 3 <sup>[18]</sup>. It means the TT translation is accurate, acceptable, and highly readable.

### 3.2.2. Less Accurate

Luke 18:12	
ST	<i>I fast twice a week; <b>I give all that I get</b>.</i>
TT	<i>Aku berpuasa dua kali seminggu dan <b>aku memberikan sepersepuluh dari segala penghasilanku</b>.</i>

The sentence “*I give all that I get*” in ST was translated into “*aku memberikan sepersepuluh dari segala penghasilanku*” in TT by using a **discursive creation** translation technique. The impact of discursive creation on

the quality of translation is that it led to less accurate translation of TT. The TT translation must be “*aku memberikan semua penghasilanku*”. The translation quality score using Nababan et al’s model is 2 3 3 <sup>[18]</sup>. It means the TT translation is less accurate, acceptable, and highly readable.

### 3.2.3. Inaccurate

There is no inaccurate translation in this current study.

### 3.2.4. Acceptable

John 10:14	
ST	<i>I am the good shepherd; I know my sheep and my sheep know me</i>
TT	<i>Akulah gembala yang baik <b>dan</b> aku mengenal domba dombaKu dan domba dombaKu mengenal Aku</i>

The implementation of explication technique in that sample contributed to the acceptable translation of TT. The translation added the word “*dan*” in the TT translation to make the meaning of the ST more explicit in the TT translation. The translation quality score using Nababan et al’s model is 3 3 3 <sup>[18]</sup>. It means the TT translation is accurate, acceptable, and highly readable.

### 3.2.5. Less Acceptable

John 4:13	
ST	<i><b>Jesus answered</b>, “Everyone who drinks this water will be thirsty again</i>
TT	<i>Barangsiapa minum air ini, ia akan haus lagi</i>

The phrase “*Jesus answered*” in ST was not translated by the TT translation. As a result of it, TT translation is less acceptable. The TT translator employed a **discursive creation** technique that led to a less acceptable translation. The translation quality score using Nababan et al’s model is 3 2 2 <sup>[18]</sup>. It means the TT translation is accurate, less acceptable, and of medium readability.

### 3.2.6. Unacceptable

There is no unacceptable translation in this current study.

### 3.2.7. High Readability

#### Matthew 24:46

ST	<i>It will be good for that servant whose master finds him doing so when he returns</i>
TT	<i>Berbahagiaalah hamba yang didapati tuannya melakukan tugasnya itu, ketika tuannya itu datang</i>

TT translator employed the **modulation** technique in translating the sentence “*it will be good for*” in ST into “*berbahagialah*” in TT. The modulation technique contributed to the high readability translation. The translation quality score using Nababan et al’s model is 3 3 3<sup>[18]</sup>. It means the TT translation is accurate, acceptable, and highly readable.

### 3.2.8. Medium Readability

#### John 4:13

ST	<i>Jesus answered, “Everyone who drinks this water will be thirsty again</i>
TT	<i>Barangsiapa minum air ini, ia akan haus lagi</i>

The phrase “*Jesus answered*” in ST was not translated by the TT translation. As a result of it, TT translation is a medium readable translation. The TT translator employed a **discursive creation** technique that led to the medium-readable translation. The translation quality score using Nababan et al’s model is 3 2 2<sup>[18]</sup>. It means the TT translation is accurate, less acceptable, and medium readability.

### 3.2.9. Low Readability

There is no low readability translation in this current study.

## 4. Discussion

Research on translating similes and metaphors raises important questions about the techniques used and the overall quality of the translations. This study specifically examines the translation techniques applied to similes and metaphors in the fourth canonical Gospels of a *diglot* Bible (NIV-TB) and evaluates how these techniques impact translation quality. Furthermore, this research addresses a gap in the existing literature on simile and metaphor

translation, as prior studies have largely overlooked the specific techniques utilized and their influence on quality. According to the framework proposed by Molina & Albir<sup>[17]</sup>, several translation techniques are recommended for translating similes and metaphors, including established equivalents, explication, paraphrase, addition, modulation, implicitation, transposition, generalization, adaptation, variation, particularization, linguistic amplification, linguistic compression, and compensation, all of which contribute to the accuracy, acceptability, and readability of similes and metaphors in translation. Meanwhile, literal and discursive creation techniques have resulted in lower accuracy, reduced acceptability, and moderate readability in translations.

The dominant translation technique used for translating similes and metaphors in this study is the established equivalent. In the realm of translation, particularly from English to Indonesian in religious texts such as the Gospels in this study, several innovations arise: (1) Cultural familiarity: Established equivalents resonate with the target audience’s cultural context, making the translation more relatable and understandable. (2) Preservation of meaning: This technique helps maintain the original meaning and intent behind the source text, which is crucial in religious texts where nuances are significant. (3) Consistency: Using established equivalents allows for consistency across translations, which can be important for theological interpretations and teachings. (4) Clarity: It often provides a clearer understanding of complex ideas, especially in texts rich with figurative language like similes and metaphors. Meanwhile, novelties arise from established equivalent techniques in translating similes and metaphors as follows: (1) Adaptation to context: While established equivalents are used, translators may innovate by adapting metaphors to better fit the target audience’s cultural and linguistic context. This can involve reimagining imagery that resonates more deeply. (2) Dynamic equivalence: Some translators employ a dynamic equivalence approach, where the focus shifts from word-for-word translation to conveying the same effect or feeling, especially in poetic or metaphorical expressions. (3) New interpretations: Translators might introduce fresh interpretations of traditional metaphors, allowing for contemporary understanding while respecting the original text’s intent. (4) Intertextual connections:

Translators may draw connections to other biblical texts or cultural references that enhance understanding, providing a richer reading experience.

The primary feature of the established equivalent translation technique can be outlined as follows: (1) Translator: The translator acts as the key figure who interprets the source text and modifies it for the target audience. Their linguistic and stylistic choices greatly affect the translation's quality and effectiveness. (2) Source text: The original English text from the canonical Gospels is an essential element in this process, providing the foundational meaning, cultural context, and intended messages that must be communicated. (3) Target audience: The Indonesian readers constitute another crucial element. Their cultural background, familiarity with the language, and interpretive frameworks shape how the translation is perceived and understood. (4) Translation techniques: Established equivalent techniques, such as dynamic equivalence and formal equivalence, serve as instruments that guide the translator's methodology. These techniques assist in balancing fidelity to the original text with accessibility for the target audience. (5) Cultural context: The cultural and religious contexts of both the source and target languages significantly influence the translation process, affecting how similes and metaphors are interpreted and expressed. In summary, the established equivalent technique is valued for its ability to convey meaning effectively and resonate with the audience, while innovations in translating similes and metaphors can bring new insights and relevance to the text. On the other hand, literal and discursive translation techniques were not recommended for translating similes and metaphors in the fourth canonical Gospels since literal translation may fail to convey cultural nuances, idioms, or metaphors, which can alienate the target audience or misrepresent the original message. Meanwhile, discursive creation technique has led translators may insert personal interpretations into the translation, which can lead to variations in understanding that do not align with the original intent of the author.

The novelty of this research method that distinguishes it from previous researchers is as follows: (1) Research design: This study combined both qualitative and quantitative methods. (2) Data collection: This study employed a focus group discussion, which is an effective way to gather

data with professional experts. (3) Data source: Analysing translation technique and quality of similes and metaphors in the fourth canonical Gospels of the *diglot* Bible (NIV-TB) has never been conducted by previous researchers. The findings in this study have completed the biblical texts research conducted by previous scholars, only in the Book of Revelation, Psalms, and Hosea, and this study focused on the canonical Gospels. The previous studies focused on the Old Testament; on the other hand, this study focused on the New Testament, mainly the canonical Gospels. The previous researchers did not discuss the translation techniques and quality, but this study analysed them.

The framework of Nababan et al. is also appropriate for assessing the quality of translations in this study<sup>[18]</sup>, as accuracy, acceptability, and readability are the key indicators of a good translation. The development of the theories presented by Molina & Albir and Nababan et al. employed in this research offers novel perspectives within translation studies<sup>[17,18]</sup>, particularly regarding the translation of simile and metaphor expressions. These theories can reveal the techniques used by translators and evaluate their impact on the quality of the translated work.

The findings of this research suggest that translators should employ the appropriate translation techniques outlined by Molina & Albir when translating simile and metaphor expressions to ensure accuracy, acceptability, and readability<sup>[17]</sup>. Additionally, translators need to enhance their knowledge and competence regarding understanding the forms and meaning of similes and metaphors in the target text to achieve a meaningful equivalence between the source and target translations. A limitation of this study is its lack of focus on translation ideology or methods for translating similes and metaphors. It is anticipated that this will pave the way for future researchers interested in exploring similes and metaphor translation frameworks.

## 5. Conclusions

The framework outlined by Molina & Albir has been chosen for this study because the authors observed that translators working in Indonesian translation as target text employed the translation techniques they proposed<sup>[17]</sup>. Out of the 18 techniques identified, 16 were employed by the translators. In the context of translating similes and metaphors in the canonical Gospels of a *diglot* Bible (NIV-



TB), the most frequent technique used was the established equivalent, followed by modulation and explicitation techniques, which were also commonly used by target text translators. Techniques such as literal and discursive creation are discouraged for translating similes and metaphors, as they tend to result in translations that are less accurate, less acceptable, and of medium readability. In contrast, the techniques of established equivalent, explicitation, paraphrase, addition, modulation, implicitation, transposition, generalization, adaptation, variation, particularization, linguistic amplification, linguistic compression, and compensation are recommended for translating similes and metaphors in the context of translating similes and metaphors in the canonical Gospels of a *diglot* Bible (NIV-TB) as they enhance the accuracy, acceptability, and readability of translations in the target texts translation. Furthermore, the quality of the translation of similes and metaphors in this study is deemed inadequate, as the authors found that techniques like literal and discursive creation translations were not effectively implemented. Among the factors influencing translation quality, accuracy is identified as the most significant, surpassing acceptability and readability.

## Author Contributions

Conceptualization, A.E.K. and M.R.N.; methodology, M.R.N.; software, A.E.K.; validation, M.R.N., D. and R.S.; formal analysis, D.; investigation, A.E.K.; resources, A.E.K.; data curation, M.R.N.; writing—original draft preparation, A.E.K.; writing—review and editing, A.E.K.; visualization, R.S.; supervision, M.R.N.; project administration, A.E.K. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

## Funding

This work received no external funding.

## Institutional Review Board Statement

Not applicable.

## Informed Consent Statement

Not applicable.

## Data Availability Statement

The authors confirm that all data generated and analyzed in this study are included in this paper.

## Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the editors and reviewers for their support.

## Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## References

- [1] Pradhan, J., 2025. Bridging Centuries and Cultures: The Cultural, Linguistic, Historical, and Literary Influence of Bible Translations Over Years. *International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews*. 6(4), 6396–6403.
- [2] Dube, M.W., 2024. Behold, the Global Translated Bible(s)! Research and Pedagogical Implications. *Journal of Biblical Literature*. 143(1), 5–25. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15699/jbl.1431.2024.1b>
- [3] Fields, E.G., 2016. Translating the Bible: The Case for a Mediating Approach [Doctoral Dissertation]. Reform Theological Seminary: Charlotte, NC, USA. pp. 1–89
- [4] Lakoff, G., Johnson, M., 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. University of Chicago Press: Chicago, IL, USA.
- [5] Maria, S., Bram, B., 2023. Metaphors and Similes in the Book of Revelation. *IDEAS: Journal of Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*. 11(1), 514–525. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24256/ideas.v11i1.3891>
- [6] Resi, C., Adrallisman, 2021. The Analysis of Figurative Language Used in Chapter 1–30 of Psalms in King James Version Bible. *e-LinguaTera*. 1(2), 1–19.
- [7] Oestreich, B., 1997. Metaphors and Similes for Yahweh in Hosea 14:2–9 (1–8): A Study of Hoseanic Pictorial Language [Doctoral Dissertation]. Andrew University: Berrien Springs, MI, USA. pp. 1–399.
- [8] Toar, D.D., Bram, B., 2023. Similes of Woman and Men in the Book of Song of Songs. *Al-Lisan: Jurnal Bahasa*. 8(1), 1–12. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30603/al.v8i1.3090>
- [9] Lao, Y., 2019. Contradiction of Types of Figurative Languages Found in Matthew Chapter 5–7 of Kupang Malay, Indonesian, and English Bible: A Contrastive Study on Translation Products. *International Journal AJES (Academic Journal of Educational Science)*. 3(2), 22–26.

- [10] Situmorang, J.P., 2025. The Translation of Metaphors From English Into Toba Batak in Old Testament Bible. *Muse: Journal of Art*. 3(2), 88–95.
- [11] Tebbit, S., 2013. Metaphor in Biblical Translation: A Study of the Translation of Metaphorical Concepts in the Fourth Gospel in Modern Italian Bible [Doctoral Dissertation]. University of Western Australia: Perth, WA, Australia. pp. 1–255.
- [12] Koa, M.T.S., 2020. The Equivalent of The Translation Parables in the Bible. *Linguistika*. 27(1), 13–22. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24843/ling.2020.v27.i01.p02>
- [13] Krisifu, A., Nababan, M.R., Santosa, R., et al., 2025. Translation of Children’s Rhyme Bible Storybook on “The Creation” from English into Indonesian. *World Journal of English Language*. 15(1), 318–329. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v15n1p318>
- [14] Swarniti, N.W., 2021. Translation Methods Found in New Testament Bible of Mark’s Gospel. *Retorika: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa*. 7(2), 172–179. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22225/jr.7.2.3823.172-179>
- [15] Chanch, N.H., 2021. Similes as An Effective Literary Device in The Vietnamese-English Translation Equivalent. *Journal of Research and Innovation in Language*. 3(2), 115–123. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31849/reila.v3i2.6829>
- [16] Kendenan, E., 2017. Simile & Metaphor in Translation: A Study on Students’ Translation of Amy Tan’s “Two Kinds” Short Story. *Language Circle: Journal of Language and Literature*. 11(2), 107–116. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15294/lc.v11i2.9583>
- [17] Molina, L., Albir, A., 2002. Translation Techniques Revisited: A Dynamic and Functionalist Approach. *Meta*. 47(4), 498–512. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7202/008033ar>
- [18] Nababan, M., Ardiani, N., Sumardiono, 2012. The Development of a Translation Quality Assessment Model/ Pengembangan Model Penilaian Kualitas Terjemahan [in Indonesian]. *Jurnal Kajian Linguistik dan Sastra*. 24(1), 39–57.
- [19] Santosa, R., 2017. Qualitative Linguistics Research Methods/Metode penelitian kualitatif kebahasaan [in Indonesian]. UNS Press: Surakarta, Indonesia.