



## CONTRADICTION OF TYPES OF FIGURATIVE LANGUAGES FOUND IN MATHEW CHAPTER 5-7 OF KUPANG MALAY, INDONESIAN, AND ENGLISH BIBLE: A CONTRASTIVE STUDY ON TRANSLATION PRODUCTS

By Yandres A. Dj. Lao  
[yandreslao@teachers.org](mailto:yandreslao@teachers.org)

**ABSTRACT:** This research entitled CONTRADICTION OF TYPES OF FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE FOUND IN MATHEW CHAPTER 5 – 7 OF KUPANG MALAY, INDONESIAN, AND ENGLISH BIBLE: A CONTRASTIVE STUDY OF TRANSLATION PRODUCTS This writing was aimed at figuring changes of figurative languages used in three different languages of Bible; Kupang Malay, Indonesian, and English. Data source of the research was figurative language in Mathew chapter 5 – 7. As a documentary research, the data was collected by reading and sorting types of figurative language. Analysis of the research applied typology and contrastive study. it was found that there are three different types of figurative language used in Kupang Malay, Indonesian, and English Bible. They are metaphor, simile, and paradox. Changes of figurative language are caused by each language's characteristics.

**Keywords:** *figurative language, bible, translation product, contrastive study, metaphor, simile, paradox*

### INTRODUCTION

Bible as religious text reflects theological meaning to Christians. In order to reach it readers, Bible has been translated into many languages including Kupang Malay, Indonesian, and English. English Bible (EB), Indonesian Bible (IB), and Kupang Malay Bible (KMB) are the products of translation. As the products of translation these texts are also the products of language. It means the content of translation products is the part of languages as well, since the language used in the product of translation is formed by linguistic facets like figures of speech. Figures of speech are used in these three translation products in order to transmit the meaning from source text (ST). These three target texts (TTs) are religious texts used for rendering the ideology of Christian. Schiffman (2002: 23) pointed the relationship of language and religion, where the content of religious texts determined by how the language is used and the use of language must be related with the purposes of the religion itself.

Figures of speech used in these TTs and their constructions, however, are not alike, whether in their types or construction. One type of figures of speech used in EB is not absolutely alike as it is used in IB and KMB. If it is found the same type of figures of speech it may be different in the construction or even diction. This following data sample shows the types of figures of speech and their construction in three different texts.

This writing explore changes of figurative language that occur in translation products. Therefore, this research is included into *product oriented study*, where the analysis is focused on the product of translation only. Neubert (1985) in Bassnet (2002: 34) distinguished study of translation into *process oriented* and *product oriented*. Neubert (1985) also stressed that

the same point of study of translation process and product is meaning. Meaning becomes the main objective in studies of translation. Furthermore, the equivalence of meaning has been the priority in researches. Foley (1997: 170-1) denotes that equivalence in translation has become the main problem, both in translation process and product. The main problem is equivalence. In other word, the study of meaning in translation products is as important as in translation process.

Newmark (1988: 48) wrote about the equivalent effect in the process of translation. Equivalent effect meant by Newmark is the compatibility of meaning in both Source Text (ST) and Target Text (TT). He stressed that the same meaning in ST should be found in TT. Newmark suggested this method to the process of translation since the meaning is the main objectives of the translation itself. He offered methods in translating in order to have equivalent in both ST and TT because as what he stated as the most important point in translation, equivalent meaning must be found in ST and TT. If Newmark's equivalent meaning is very important in ST-TT, then the equivalence must be found in TTs since they are translated from one single language. This point of equivalence has become the background of the comparative study on translation products.

### THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

#### Figurative language

"A figurative language may be said to occur whenever a speaker or writer, for the sake of freshness or emphasis, departs from the usual denotation of words" (Kennedy, 1991: 584). Knickerbocker (1963: 366) noted that figures are images used in a particular way to explore the less known through known. In

solving problem number (1), the researcher will take Little's (1985: 164-166) classification of figurative languages as a guidance. In this theory, Little made a classification of figures based on *comparisons, associations, and other figures of speech.*

### 1) Simile

Ricoeur (1977: 26) distinguished simile and metaphor. He defined simile as a comparative figures of speech. Simile comes from Latin word *similes*, means like. Ricoeur also divided the features of figures based on comparison, since types in comparison are similar, for example simile, metaphor, personification, and metonymy. Thus, before move further to the types of figures, we better firstly recognize the features of every figure in order that proper classification of figures can be easily identified and distinguished. A simile makes an imaginative comparison for purposes of explanation, allusion, or ornament, introduced by a word such as 'like', 'as', or 'such'.

**Example:** *He eats like a pig*

The word *like* indicates simile since it stands as a comparator between *he* and *a pig*. This type of figures has some features that distinguish it from other types.

### 2) Metaphor

Metaphor is an implied simile. It does not, like the simile, state one thing is like another, but takes that for granted and proceeds as if the two things were one. Pardede (2008:23) stated, metaphor is an analogy identifying one object with another and ascribing to the first object, one more of the quality of the second.

**Example:** *Time is money*

The example shows the metaphor of *time*. *Money* is compared to the *time* that stands as the first thing. In other word, *time* is considered as precious as *money*.

Larson (1998: 279) distinguished metaphor into two kinds; they are dead and live metaphor. Dead metaphor is used for certain cases that the symbols used cannot be replaced or expressed by another. In other word, this metaphor cannot be change, both structure and symbols used inside. It is only used for one single context, cannot be applied to other context. Moeliono (1989) gave an example of dead metaphor, "*Kecantikan mereka adalah pinang dibelah dua*". It is included into dead metaphor since the context of *pinang dibelah dua* in Indonesia cannot be associated with another context. This phrase is only associated with *kecantikan* or *beauty*.

### 3) Paradox

A paradox occurs in any statement that seems to contradict itself, but turns out to make sense on a deeper level (Little, 1985). The word itself comes from the Greek words *para*, which means distinct from, and *doxa*, which means opinion. A paradox is not an easy device to use successfully. However, if used effectively, the reader spends time deciphering the true meaning behind the phrase, therefore emphasizing a larger idea and significance. For example, consider the phrase *the pen is mightier than the sword*. This statement seems to contradict

itself. A pen cannot cause as much physical damage as a sword, which is what is implied by using the term *mightier*. But if you look at the meaning behind the words, the message becomes clear. The phrase does not truly imply physical strength. The true message is that the art of persuasion and manipulation, which can be done through the written word, can actually cause more damage than outright physical attack.

One example in literature that highlights this idea comes in J. Patrick Lewis' poem *The Unkindest Cut*.

*Knives can harm you, heaven forbid;  
Axes may disarm you, kid;  
Guillotines are painful, but  
There's nothing like a paper cut!*  
(Little, 1985)

### Contrastive Analysis

Lado (1957: 2) stated that in learning a language we need to recognize the features of the language. According to Lado, in the process of learning, the learners will firstly try to recognize the simplest features of the language. Then, they will try to understand some more difficult features. The tendency to learn the simplest features firstly is caused by the similarity of the features in the language they are learning with their mother tongue.

Based on this assumption, Lado emphasized the importance of determining the difference and similarity between two languages. By recognizing the difference and similarity the learners will easily learn the foreign language. This method of learning, by Lado, is called contrastive analysis. This theory is applied in the research since the data of research had the same characteristics as meant by Lado. Those characteristics are the features of language. Besides, the data were taken from three different languages of Bible. It means that these different languages of Bible have the same meaning inside.

Lado suggested two procedures in doing contrastive analysis. These two procedures involve features of language such as word, phrase, sentence, and meaning.

### General Procedure of Grammatical Comparison

There are three points we need to understand in doing this procedure. These three points should be considered since they are grammatical features of language. They are:

1. The structures of the languages are alike
2. The structures of the language have the same meaning
3. Structural distribution of the language system are alike

### METHOD

Kothari (2004: 3) divides four types of methods in research based on the contradictory aspects. He describes qualitative method as the research which concerns in qualitative phenomenon, i.e., phenomena

relating to or involving quality or kind. Kothari also gives the method of descriptive which includes survey and fact-finding enquiries of different things. The major purpose of descriptive research is description of the state of affairs as it exists at present.

This research is included into library study. Thus, the objects of this research are taken from the translation products. Translation products refer to the TTs, they are Kupang Malay, Indonesian and English Bible. These three objects are written texts from different languages. However, they are translated from one single language, Greek. Even though Greek is the ST, it is not discussed in the analysis since the scope of the research is only on the products of translation. Kupang Malay Bible is the Christian text which is written in local language of Kupang. This text is entitled *Janji Baru* translated from Greek by the team from *Unit Bahasa dan Budaya* (UBB), (2007), Nusa Tenggara Timur, in cooperation with Wycliffe Bible Translator, Palmerston, Australia. These texts consist of 21 parts or books. Text of Indonesian Bible is also the object research. This Indonesian version that will be used is called *Terjemahan Baru*(TB) translated from Greek by the team from *Lembaga Alkitab Indonesia* (LAI), (1996). There is also English Bible entitled *New Testament*, published by *Lembaga Alkitab Indonesia* (LAI), (2007).

**Data Source**

The data sources of this research are the translation product of Bible, especially The New Testament. The primary data of this research were taken from Mathew chapter five to seven of English Bible (EB), Indonesian Bible (IB), and Kupang Malay Bible (KMB) especially from Mathew chapter 5-7. The secondary data will also be taken from some other parts of the Bible since the content of figurative language is related to the context that may be found in previous part of the Bible. Kinds of data were figurative languages compiled from the TTs.

**DISCUSSION**

**Contradiction of Types of Figurative Languages Found in Mathew Chapter 5-7 of Kupang Malay, Indonesian, and English Bible**

The classification of types of figure of speech is based on their features or attributes. After determining the types of figurative languages, the researcher discover some group of data based on the difference of types. Those groups of data are classified based on the texts taken from the same data, by means in the same data the researcher found different type whether in KMB, IB, or EB. There are seven groups of data that are taken from the same verses but contain different types of figurative language.

Since the analysis has widely been done in the previous section, there is no deeper analysis in this part. The groups of data are only presented in tables because it enables us to discover the differences of types in the same data.

**1. ( Zero ) – Paradox – Paradox**

In the first group, the researcher discovered two data with the different types in KMB, IB, and EB. In KMB, the researcher did not find any types of figurative language. While in IB the data indicate the type of paradox. The text of EB is classified as paradox as well.

Table 1. The First Group of Data Based on the Differences of Types

| No | Data code | KMB ( Zero )  | IB (Paradox)  | EB (Paradox)   |
|----|-----------|---|---|--|
| 1  | 1-5-3     | <i>Orang kasian dong ontong, tagal Tuhan Allah sandiri tu, dong pung Raja yang bae.</i>                                     | <i>Berbahagialah orang yang miskin di hadapan Allah, karena merekalah yang empunya Kerajaan sorga.</i>      | <i>Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the Kingdom of heaven</i>                               |
| 2  | 2-5-10    | <i>Orang yang kana siksa tagal iko sang Tuhan Allah dong ontong, tagal Tuhan Allah sandiri tu, dong pung Raja yang bae.</i> | <i>Berbahagialah orang yang dianiaya oleh sebab kebenaran, karena merekalah yang empunya Kerajaan sorga</i> | <i>Blessed are those who are persecuted for righteousness' sake, for theirs is the Kingdom of heaven</i> |

The data in the table indicate that there is no type of figurative language found the sentences of KMB. While in IB and EB there is paradox found in the sentences.

**2. Metaphor – Paradox – Paradox**

Table 2. The Second Group of Data Based on the Differences of Types

| No | Data code | KMB (Metaphor)   | IB (Paradox)  | EB (Paradox)   |
|----|-----------|--|---|--|
| 1  | 3-5-12    | <i>Biar bagitu, ma basong musti bekin diri sanang deng hati babungsa, tagal Tuhan Allah su sadia balas kasi basong pung bagian, satu mal'unuk di sorga. Ma inga, e! Bukan cuma basong yang dapa sangsara bagitu, te dulu-dulu orang dong ju bekin jahat bagitu sang Tuhan Allah pung jubir dong.</i> | <i>Bersukacita dan bergembiralah, karena upahmu besar di sorga, sebab demikian juga telah dianiaya nabi-nabi yang sebelum kamu.</i> | <i>Rejoice and be exceedingly glad, for great is your reward in heaven, for so they persecuted the prophets who were before you.</i> |

The second group of data consists of metaphor-paradox-paradox. Paradox is found in both IB and EB sentences, while in KMB we find metaphor. The sentences in IB and EB have the same characteristics and contain features of paradox as well.

**3. ( Zero ) – Metaphor – Metaphor**

Table 3. The Third Group of Data Based on the Differences of Types

| N o | Data code | KMB ( Zero )  | IB (Metaphor)   | EB (Metaphor)  |
|-----|-----------|---|---|--|
| 1   | 4-5-13    | Kalo kotong mau bekin enak makanan na, katong parlu taro garam dolo. Bagitu ju orang-orang yang idop di ini dunia, dong parlu sang bosong. Ma kalo garam su jadi tawar, na, dia pung guna apa? Cuma angka buang di jalan ko kana inja sa. | Kamu adalah garam dunia. Jika garam itu menjadi tawar, dengan apakah ia diasinkan? Tidak ada lagi gunanya selain dibuang dan diinjak orang. | You are the salt of the earth; but if the salt loses its flavor, hoe shall it be seasoned? It is then thrown out and trampled underfoot by men |
| 2   | 8-6-3     | Jadi kalo bosong mau tolong orang kasian dong, na, jang kasi tau sapa-sapa, e!  | Tetapi jika engkau memberi sedekah, janganlah diketahuhi tangan kirimu apa yang diperbuat tangan kananmu                                    | But when you do a charitable deed, do not let your left hand know what your right hand is doing.   |
| 3   | 19-7-16   | Karmana bosong bisa kanal orang yang pura-pura tu? Lia sa dari apa yang dong bekin. Sama ke orang lia bua., ko kanal itu bua pung pohon. Bua yang bae, sonde kaluar dari pohon yang sonde bae.  | Dari buahnyalah kamu akan mengenal mereka. Dapatkah orang memetik buah anggur dari semak duri atau buah ara dari rumput duri?               | You will know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes from thorn-bushes or figs from thistles?  |
| 4   | 20-7-20   | Bagitu ju deng itu jubir pura-pura tu. Bosong bisa kanal sang dong dari dong pung bekin-bekin.  | Jadi dari buahnyalah kamu akan mengenal mereka.   | Therefore by their fruits you will know them   |

There are four same data found in KMB, IB, and EB with different types. In KMB we find no types of figurative language. While in IB and EB we identify paradox in the sentences.

**4. Simile – Metaphor – Metaphor**

Table 4. The Fourth Group of Data Based on the Differences of Types

| N o | Data code | KMB (Simile)  | IB (Metaphor)  | EB (Metaphor)  |
|-----|-----------|---|--|--|
| 1   | 5-5-14    | Basong ju musti idop sama ke lampu, ko biar orang banya dapa lia deng bae-bae. Basong musti idop sama ke kota yang ada di atas gunung, yang samua | Kamu adalah terang dunia. Kota yang terletak di atas gunung tidak mungkin tersembunyi. | You are the light of the world. A city that is set on a hill cannot be hidden. |

|   |         |   |  |   |
|---|---------|---|--|---|
|   |         | orang dapa lia.   |  |   |
| 2 | 11-6-22 | Orang pung mata, sama ke lampu yang bekin tarang dia pung dalam hati. Kalo dia pung mata tarang, na, dia iko jalan idop yang bae, sama ke orang yang jalan dalam tarang.  | Mata adalah pelita tubuh. Jika matamu baik, teranglah seluruh tubuhmu.   | The lamp of the body is the eye. If therefore your eye is good, your whole body will be full of light.  |
| 3 | 15-7-6  | Jang ajar hal barisi so 'al Tuhan kasi tukang ba 'olok. Tagal dong tu sama ke anjing jahat yang nanti bale datang ko sarang sang bosong. Dong ju bodo sama ke babi. Kalo orang kasi kalong mahal, na, di sonde toe! Te dia cuma tau inja-inja sa. | "Jangan kamu memberikan barang yang kudus kepada anjing dan jangan kamu melemparkan mutiaramu kepada babi, supaya jangan diinjaknya dengan kakinya, lalu ia berbalik mengoyak kamu." | Do not give what is holy to the dogs; not cast your pearls before swine, lest they will trample them under their feet, and turn and tear you in pieces. |

There are three data found in Mathew chapter 5-7 of KMB, IB, and EB which indicate a group based on the difference of type. In this group, the data that are taken from KMB text show characteristics of simile. Meanwhile in IB and EB the data give information about metaphor with its attributes in the sentence.

Based on the result of the analysis of types, KMB contains many more simile than metaphor. It indicates that KMB uses wider explanation in term of giving information about the main purposes of the sentence.

**5. Simile – Simile & Metaphor – Simile**

Table 5. The Fifth Group of Data Based on the Differences of Types

| N o | Data code | KMB (Simile)  | IB (Simile: a) (Metaphor: b)  | EB (Simile)  |
|-----|-----------|---|---|--|
| 1   | 9-6-16    | Kalo bosong sambayang deng puasa, na, jang bekin muka masnana 'ok sama ke orang yang omong laen bekin laen. Te dong bekin bagitu ko biar orang dong puji sang dong, bilang, 'We! Dong ni, orang barisi, o! Deng makan puji bagitu, dong su tarima abis dong pung upa. | (a) Dan apabila kamu berpuasa janganlah muram mukamu seperti orang munafik.<br><br>(b) Mereka mengubah air mukanya supaya orang melihat bahwa mereka sedang berpuasa. Aku berkata | Moreover, when you fast, do not be like the hypocrites, with a sad countenance. For they disfigure their faces that they may appear to men to be fasting. Assuredly, I say to you, they have their reward. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  | kepadamu;<br>sesungguhn<br>ya mereka<br>sudah<br>mendapat<br>pahnya. |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|

3. ( Zero ) – Metaphor – Metaphor
4. Simile – Metaphor – Metaphor
5. Simile – Simile & Metaphor – Simile
6. Simile – Simile & Metaphor – Metaphor
7. Simile – Simile – ( Zero )

This group of data has a different case comparing with others. In the column of KMB, the sentences are included into simile. The text of EB consists of simile as well. Meanwhile in IB, there are two different types of figurative language in a single verse. There are two sentences in the data (verse) of IB text. Since those two sentences have types of figurative language, the data is separated into two parts (a) and (b).

**6. Simile – Simile & Metaphor – Metaphor**

Table 6. The Sixth Group of Data Based on the Differences of Types

| No | Data code | KMB (Simile)   | IB (Simile: a) (Metaphor: b)   | EB (Metaphor)   |
|----|-----------|--|--|---|
| 1  | 18-7-15   | Ati-ati deng tukang tipu yang angka diri, bilang, dong tu Tuhan pung jubir. Te dong bekin diri pura-pura bae sama ke domba. Padahal dong tu jahat sama ke anjing utan yang datang makan domba. | (a) Waspadalah terhadap nabi-nabi palsu yang datang kepadamu dengan menyamar seperti domba, (b) tetapi sesungguhnya ya mereka adalah serigala yang buas. | Beware of false prophets, who come to you in sheep's clothing, but in wardly they are ravenous wolves |

The sixth group of data is similar to group five. In this group, the text of KMB reflects simile, while the text of EB shows metaphor.

**7. Simile – Simile – ( Zero )**

Table 7. The Seventh Group of Data Based on the Differences of Types

| No | Data code | KMB (Simile)   | IB (Simile)  | EB ( Zero )  |
|----|-----------|--|--|--|
| 1  | 21-7-24   | Orang yang datang dengar sang Beta, ais bekin iko Beta pung omong, dia tu sama ke orang yang pintar, yang kasi badiri dia pung ruma di atas fanderen batu. | Setiap orang yang mendengar perkataan-Ku ini dan melakukannya, ia sama dengan orang yang bijaksana, yang mendirikan rumahnya di atas batu. | Therefore whoever hears these sayings of Mine, and does them, I will like him to a wise man who built his house on the rock. |

This group only consists of one data. In this group, KMB and IB texts indicate simile, while EB text does not contain any type of figurative language.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the result and analysis, there are seven types of Contradiction of Types of Figurative Languages Found in Mathew Chapter 5-7 of Kupang Malay, Indonesian, and English Bible. They are:

1. ( Zero ) – Paradox – Paradox
2. Metaphor – Paradox – Paradox

**REFERENCES**

Bassnett, S. 2002. *Translation Studies*.Third Edition. New York: Routledge

Foley, W. 1997.*Anthropological Linguistics. AnIntroduction*. Massachusetts: Blackwell

Kennedy, X. J. 1991. *Introduction To Fiction*. New York: HarperCollins College Publisher

Kothari, C. R. 2004. *Research Methodology.Methods and Techniques*.New Delhi: New Age International Publishers

Knickelbocker, K. L. 1963. *Interpreting Literature*. New York, Chicago: Holt, Rinehart and Winston

Lado, Robert. 1957. *Linguistics Across Cultures*. Toronto: The University of Michigan Press

Larson, M.L.1998. *Meaning-based Translation*. Lanham: University Press of America Inc.

Little, G. 1985.*Political Ensembles: A Psycho-social Approach to Politics and Leadership*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press

Moeliono, A.M.1989. *DiksiatauPilihan Kata*.Jakarta: GramediaPustaka Jaya

Newmark, P. 1988. *A Text Book of Translation*.New York: Prentice Hall

Pardede, M. 2008.*Understanding Poetry*. Jakarta: Gramedia

Ricoeur, P. 1997. *The Rule of Metaphor*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press

Schiffman, H. 2002. *Linguistic Culture and Language Policy*.New York: Routledge

Tim Penyusun Lembaga Alkitab Indonesia. 1996. *Alkitab*. Jakarta: Lembaga Alkitab Indonesia

Tim Penyusun Lembaga Alkitab Indonesia.2007.*Perjanjian Baru – New Testament*. Jakarta: Lembaga Alkitab Indonesia

Tim Penerjemah Unit BahasaBudaya (UBB) NTT. 2007. *JanjiBaru. Bahasa Kupang*. Jakarta: LembagaAlkitab Indonesia