

Conceptual Metaphor Translation and Subtitling: A Case of *Lumumba*

Yvan Rudhel Megaptche Megaptche^{[a]*}

^[a] School of Foreign Languages, Hubei University of Automotive Technology, Shiyan, China.

*Corresponding author.

Received 25 October 2022; accepted 14 November 2022

Published online 26 December 2022

Social Science, 18(6), 82-91. Available from: <http://www.cscanada.net/index.php/css/article/view/12829>
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/12829>

Abstract

The present study analyzes the metaphors contained in the movie *Lumumba*. This study aims to identify the movie's conceptual metaphors and the translation strategies used by the translators to render them into English. In addition, the study aims to draw the motivations behind the choice of these strategies. The study employs Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) metaphor categorization to classify metaphors and Schmidt's (2014) proposed typology to identify translation strategies. The findings show that the subtitles of the movie *Lumumba* contain structural, ontological and orientational metaphors. Besides, four strategies were used to translate the metaphors. They are: (1) using the same metaphor in the source text (ST) and target text (TT); (2) using in the TT, a different metaphor with the same meaning; (3) using a non-metaphoric expression; and (4) deletion of the ST's metaphor. However, a particular strategy that consists of translating a non-metaphoric expression into a metaphoric expression was also identified. Therefore, the TT contains more metaphors than the ST, which shows the translators' taste for metaphoricity. Finally, the findings reveal that cultural, cognitive and technical motivations impacted the translators' choice of strategies. While cultural and cognitive motivations are specific to translators and their cultural knowledge, time and space constraints are technical constraints.

Key words: Conceptual metaphor; Metaphor translation; Subtitling; Audiovisual translation; Cognitive linguistics

Megaptche, Y. R. M. (2022). Conceptual Metaphor Translation and Subtitling: A Case of *Lumumba*. *Canadian*

1. INTRODUCTION

Translation is a daunting task that plays an essential role in exchanging information, news, culture, literature and science between people around the world. Translation is the act of rendering a source text into a target text, considering all semantic, linguistic, cultural and pragmatic features. Translation is seen as a daunting task because not only does it require the translator's bilingual ability in the languages involved, but it also requires the translator's knowledge of the source and target cultures. According to the PACTE (PACTE 2017 as cited in Megaptche M. Yvan Rudhel and Xu Wen 2021), translation competence consists of five main sub-competences, namely: bilingual, extra-linguistic, knowledge of translation, instrumental and strategic sub-competences. However, no matter the mastery of the sub-competences mentioned above, the translator will always face difficulties while translating culturally-bound expressions such as metaphor, proverbs, idioms, and collocations, because they are expressions that involve conceptual mappings and image schemas that are not always shared by every culture.

Metaphor is an interesting phenomenon to study and an exciting phenomenon to translate. Before the 1980s, linguists have always considered metaphor as a mere figure of speech that embellishes the language. That is the case for scholars of the semantic and pragmatic approaches to metaphor. Scholars of the semantic approach to metaphor (Max Black 1955, 274; Donald Davidson 1968; James Dickens 2005) define it as an aesthetic tool of the language and a simple figure of speech that only reflects their meaning and nothing more. Proponents of the pragmatic approach to metaphor (John Searle 1979; Dan Sperber and Deirde Wilson 1986; Paul

Grice 1989) also view metaphor as a figure of speech, but they emphasize the gap between the meaning of a metaphor and its linguistic form. Searle (1979) argues that metaphors cannot be restricted to literal words. He underpins that there is a difference between what is said and what is meant. In order to bring a more efficient definition to metaphor, cognitive linguistic scholars have developed the conceptual metaphor theory (CMT), also known as the cognitive linguistic approach to metaphor. Unlike the semantic and pragmatic approaches to metaphor, the CMT claims that metaphor is embodied in humans and represents the way we experience the world. In their famous book *Metaphors We Live By*, George Lakoff and Mark Johnson (1980) state that metaphors work because they are grounded on recurring patterns of embodied experiences. It implies that metaphor is not just an aesthetic tool, but it is the way we conceptualize the world. Hence, metaphor can be found in books, songs, movies, TV shows and many other aspects of our lives. The presence of metaphor in all aspects of our lives makes metaphor translation more complex than we may have thought.

Although it is a relatively new area in translation studies, audiovisual translation (AVT) has increasingly become one of the most significant and fast developing areas in the field of translation studies (Jorge Diaz-Cintas 2008; Aline Remael 2010). Yves Gambier (2003) claims that before TV and video tapes gained popularity, AVT was known as *film translation* and works in this area of translation were only passed around among professionals and academics without being published (Diaz-Cintas 2009). Gambier (2003) distinguishes between many types of AVT, such as consecutive interpreting, simultaneous interpreting, voice-over, free commentary, simultaneous translation (or sight translation), and multilingual production. Interlingual subtitle, a type of audiovisual translation, is a kind of translation during which a spoken language is translated into a written language, shown at the bottom of the screen, simultaneously with the dialogue. The translator can choose to do it alone or handle the translation to a professional, who will perform the subtitling accordingly.

Jan Pedersen (2015) argues that metaphor translation in AVT can cause lots of challenges and difficulties because, apart from the verbal and written aspects, it also takes the audio and visual aspects into account. The present study uses the movie *Lumumba* as the research object. *Lumumba* is a movie (originally in French) directed by Raoul Peck and subtitled in English by Lenny Borger and Cynthia Schoch. Based on a true story, *Lumumba* is a movie that tells the story of Patrice Emery Lumumba, one of the key figures of Pan-Africanism. He played a pivotal role in the independence of the former Belgian Congo in particular, and African countries in general. It is a movie that was widely distributed in the francophone and anglophone worlds, and many other linguistic areas. Therefore, it is

crucial to discover how it was subtitled in English. This study seeks to identify the conceptual metaphors in the source language (SL). Besides, the study also aims to discover the translation strategies used by translators in the target language (TL). Finally, the study aims to draw the motivations behind the choice of these strategies. To achieve these objectives, the researcher has formulated the following research questions: 1) What are the metaphors found in *Lumumba*? 2) What are the translation strategies used to translate them? 3) What are the motivations behind the choice of these strategies?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Recently, metaphor translation in subtitling has increasingly gained more attention. Scholars from different areas of translation have engaged in investigating metaphor translation in AVT in general and subtitling in particular (see Goran Schmidt 2014; Pedersen 2015; Siegfrieda A. S. Mursita Putri and Martha 2019; Prasna Audri Alanisa and Aris Munandar 2019; Tatit Shinta F Jayawardani, Sri Endah Tabiat, and Sahruddin; Shifa Mutiyara and Donald Jupply 2022). In his article *Metaphor translation in Subtitling*, Schmidt (2014) conducted research on how subtitlers (translators who perform subtitling) cope with metaphor translation. Schmidt's research object is a set of English subtitles of one Croatian movie. Furthermore, his research also aims to present the factors motivating translators. More specifically, he employs CMT to determine the translation strategies used to translate the metaphors. The results reveal that there are four basic ways to render metaphors: (1) using the same conceptual metaphor; (2) using a different conceptual metaphor; (3) using a non-metaphorical paraphrase; and (4) deleting the metaphor. In addition to the strategies mentioned, there are cases where a non-metaphorical expression can be translated by a metaphorical expression. Finally, the results also show that the universality of metaphors and factors such as time and space, specific to subtitles, can influence the choice of the translation strategy. Although Schmidt's work is quite comprehensive, it does not reveal the types of metaphors identified in the ST. Moreover, the study provides little explanation of the factors motivating the choice of the metaphor strategies.

Another study of metaphor translation in subtitling is that of Pedersen (2015). Pedersen investigates how visualized metaphors in the TV series *Yes, Prime Minister* and *The Simpsons* have been rendered into Swedish subtitles. The results show that when a metaphor is visualized, it may cause severe translation crisis points (TCP) and put heavy constraints on the options available to the subtitler if unintended intersemiotic tension is to be avoided. The results also reveal that visualized metaphor is a reasonably rare translation problem which can usually be solved using traditional strategies such as Van Den

Broeck's (1981) strategies. They are: (1) translating sensu stricto; (2) substitution; and (3) paraphrase. Despite the number of insights provided by Pedersen's work, it does not focus, as expected, on conceptual metaphors contained in the subtitles. Besides, it analyzes the translation strategies from a pragmatic point of view. In addition, it does not explain the factors that influence the choice of translation strategy. Our work intends to exclusively adopt a cognitive linguistic approach to translation and be the most explicit possible.

Putri and Martha (2019) have also researched metaphor translation in subtitling. Their study aimed to find out the categories of conceptual metaphors and applied strategies in the Indonesian subtitles of *Sherlock Holmes 2: A Game of Shadow* (2011). Their study applies Combined Strategies proposed by Yvonne Lindqvist (2002). The findings indicate that analogy, personification, and image metaphors appear in the movie. In addition, the findings also reveal that five translation strategies were identified, namely: (1) word-for-word translation; (2) substitution 1; (3) substitution 2; (4) paraphrase; and (5) compensation 2. Furthermore, the research indicates that the translation appears less natural and fails to transfer the cultural essence from the English metaphors. Putri and Martha's study is based on a traditional linguistic approach to metaphor and metaphor translation that does not provide adequate tools to understand and translate metaphors.

Other researchers, such as Alanisa and Munandar (2019) have also carried out research on metaphor in subtitling by analyzing the metaphors in *Mulan* and *Moana*. The research aims were to identify the strategies used in the translation of metaphors and to explain the reasons for the use of these translation strategies. Their research employs Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) conceptual metaphor theory to identify the metaphors and Peter Newmark's (1988) theory to classify the translation strategies. The results indicate that only three of the seven strategies proposed by Newmark were employed to translate the metaphors in the two movies. They are: (1) reproducing the same image as the SL; (2) replacing the image into a different image in the TT; and (3) converting the image into sense. The use of Newmark's categorization of translation strategies prevents their work from fully conveying the exact translation strategies used. Also, the explanation of the motives for using the translation strategies is not explicit enough.

Jayawardani et al. (2020) conducted a work that aimed to discover the various metaphors and translation strategies used in translating the metaphors in the English subtitles of *12 Years of a Slave* into Indonesian. This work employed Mildred Larson's (1985) theory of metaphor categorization and Newmark's (1988) theory of metaphor translation strategies. The research findings reveal that dead metaphors and live metaphors appear in the Indonesian subtitle. The findings equally reveal that the translation strategies used to translate metaphors are: (1)

reproducing the same image in the TL; (2) replacing the image in the SL with a standard TL image; (3) translating metaphor by simile; (4) converting metaphor into sense; and (5) deleting the metaphor. There is a considerable difference between our work and that of Jayawardani et al. Jayawardani et al.'s work is grounded on traditional linguistic viewpoints of metaphor. In contrast, our work is exclusively grounded on cognitive linguistic viewpoints of translation and metaphor translation.

One of the most recent works on metaphor translation in subtitling is that of Mutiyara and Jupply (2022). Their research aimed to examine the translation of metaphors in the subtitles of the musical movie *The Greatest Showman*. Besides, the study also focused on how metaphor translation force affects the poeticness of the TT. The research concludes that the ST mainly contains dead metaphors. Also, more than the half of the ST metaphors are kept in the TT. However, due to the fact that there are many cases resulting in the decreasing of the metaphorical force, the poeticness of the TT appears to be weaker than the ST. Finally, the research reveals that language system, different labelling, translation choice, translator's incompetence, and technical constraints are the five factors that impact the maintaining or changing of metaphorical force in the TT. This study is unique in the sense that it emphasizes song subtitles and the level of poeticness. Still, it does not use the CMT and does not emphasize the strategies used to translate the metaphors identified.

From the previous research, it can be noticed that some of the studies on metaphor translation in subtitling are based on traditional linguistic approaches to metaphor and metaphor translation (see Putri & Martha 2019; Jayawardani et al. 2020; Mutiyara & Jupply 2021), one is based exclusively on cognitive linguistic approaches (Schmidt 2014), and others are based on a combination of traditional linguistic and cognitive linguistic approaches (Pedersen 2015; Alanisa & Munadar 2019). It is worth mentioning that none of the studies reviewed deals with translating metaphors from French into English. The present study intends to fill this gap by employing the cognitive linguistic approaches to metaphor and metaphor translation, to analyze the metaphors in *Lumumba*, identify the strategies used to translate them (from French into English), and provide the various factors that could have motivated the choice of the translation strategies.

3. THEORETICAL FOUNDATION

3.1 Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT)

Until the early 1990s, linguistics and cognitive science scholars were defining metaphor as a linguistic or aesthetic tool without no fundamental significance for cognition (Rudhel 2020). However, cognitive linguistic research has proposed a completely different approach

to metaphor understanding, which views metaphor as a way of thinking. Conceptual metaphor theory is a theory of metaphor that views metaphor not just as a stylistically attractive way of expressing ideas through language but as a way of thinking or expressing embodied experiences (Friedrich Ungerer and Hans-Jörg Schmid 2006; Vyvyan Evans & Melanie Green 2006). Lakoff and Johnson (1980) introduced this view of metaphor in their book *Metaphors We Live By*. Lakoff and Johnson's main goal was to change the presumption that metaphor is a linguistic device by providing systematic evidence that promotes metaphor as a fundamental aspect of thought.

Zoltan Kövecses (2002) argues that CMT sees metaphor as a way of understanding one conceptual domain with reference to another conceptual domain. His definition can be summarized as follows: CONCEPTUAL DOMAIN (A) IS CONCEPTUAL DOMAIN (B). Conceptual metaphors are written in capital letters because they occur as such in the language. Conceptual metaphors are often made of two domains: the source domain and the target domain. While the source domain is the conceptual domain from which metaphorical expressions are drawn to understand another conceptual domain, the conceptual domain perceived is the target domain. Cognitive scholars also highlight the difference between a metaphorical expression and a conceptual metaphor. Metaphorical expressions are linguistic manifestations of conceptual metaphors. For example, the metaphorical expression "I demolished his argument" is the linguistic manifestation or instantiation of the conceptual metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR in which the target domain ARGUMENT is structured in terms of WAR.

3.2 Types of Metaphors

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) distinguish three types of conceptual metaphors. They are: structural metaphors, ontological metaphors and orientational metaphors.

a. Structural metaphors:

This type of metaphor is considered the largest conceptual metaphor group (Rudhel 2020). Structural metaphors involve using a concept of one domain to structure a concept in another domain (*ibid*). For example, Lakoff and Johnson (1980) explain that in the structural metaphor TIME IS MONEY, the concept of time is understood in terms of money because we live in a world where work is systematically associated with the time it requires. Hence, we understand and experience time as something we can spend, waste, invest, save, and so on. Structural metaphors are contained in metaphorical expressions such as:

You are *wasting* my time.

I have *invested* a lot of time in her.

b. Ontological metaphors

These metaphors are called ontological because they give an ontological status to general categories of abstract target domains. When using ontological metaphors, we

conceive our experiences in terms of objects, substances and containers, in general, without stating explicitly what object, substance or container is meant (Schmidt 2012). For example, in the ontological metaphor THE MIND IS MACHINE, the *mind* is conceptualized as something that can be turned on and off and has an efficiency level and productive capacity. The following metaphorical expressions are manifestations of ontological metaphors:

My mind has been *turned off*.

His mind is *full* of mathematics.

c. Orientational Metaphors

Orientational metaphors are metaphoric patterns in which a concept is shown as possessing a spatial orientation (Rudhel 2020). These orientational patterns include up-down, in-out, center-periphery and so on. As argued by Lakoff and Johnson (1980), orientational metaphors differ from structural and ontological metaphors because they do not structure one concept in terms of another. Rather they elaborate a system of concepts with respect to one another. Below are some examples of orientational metaphors:

CONSCIOUS IS UP; UNCONSCIOUS IS DOWN

Wake *up*

He *sank down* into coma

HAPPY IS UP; SAD IS DOWN

I am feeling *up*

I *fell* into depression

3.3 Metaphor Translation

Prior to the cognitive linguistic approach to translation, metaphor translation was analyzed using linguistic approaches. Gideon Toury (1995) describes linguistic approaches as source text-oriented approaches. He states that looking at metaphor translation from a target text-oriented approach can provide additional strategies for dealing with metaphor. On the one hand, the cognitive linguistic approach focuses on the description and explanation of the translation strategies identified; on the other hand, it highlights how the source and target cultures conceptualize the world. Schmidt (2014) has established a new typology of metaphor translation strategies that combines Toury's (1995) and Kövecses' s (2003) typologies. Schmidt's (2014) typology is made of 6 strategies (some having sub-strategies) that we summarized as follows:

- Using the same metaphor in the ST and TT (CM-CM): This strategy maintains the metaphoric or conceptual mapping in the source and target texts. However, while the conceptual metaphor remains the same, the metaphorical can be (or not) replaced. This strategy mainly (except in a few circumstances) consists of a literal translation.

- Using in the TT, a different metaphor with the same meaning (CM-CM2): Here, the translator uses a different conceptual metaphor with similar meaning. In other words, the ST and TT metaphors' meaning is the same. However, the conceptual mappings are different.

- Using a non-metaphoric expression (CM-nonCM): This strategy involves a loss of metaphoricity. With this strategy, a metaphorical expression is translated into a non-metaphorical expression. It entails that although the metaphor is lost, the meaning is kept.

- Deleting the ST metaphor (CM-O): The metaphor is deleted or omitted.

- Translating a non-metaphoric expression into a metaphoric expression (Non-CM-CM): Here, an ST non-metaphorical expression is translated by a metaphorical expression that conveys the same meaning. Schmidt (2014) argues that one way of looking at this strategy is as a compensation strategy. It may be used to compensate for the loss of metaphorical expressions lost during using strategies such as CM-nonCM and CM-0.

- A zero element is translated by a metaphorical expression (O-CM).

4. METHODOLOGY

The present research employs a qualitative method to analyze and expose the data collected. The data of this research were retrieved from French (original) and English (subtitle) versions of the movie *Lumumba*. The duration of the movie is 139 minutes. The data are metaphors contained in the dialogues and monologues. To achieve this study, the researcher followed three steps:

- The researcher watched the movie several times to identify the metaphors contained in the French version. All the metaphors identified were written down according to the time they are used.

- The researcher watched the movie again by paying close attention to each line of the English subtitles and wrote down any conceptual metaphor that appeared.

- The researcher adjusted the English subtitles with their French equivalent.

The metaphors identified in the source and target texts were classified using Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) metaphor categorization. To ensure that the metaphor-related words identified really are, we used *Le Robert* online dictionary (for French) and the *Cambridge Dictionary* (for English). Once the metaphor classification was done, the researcher identified the metaphor translation strategies using Schmidt's (2014) proposed typology that combines Toury's (1995) and Kövecses's (2003) typologies. Finally, the researcher also analyzed the various factors that may influence the choice of the translation strategies identified.

5. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

5.1 Types of Metaphors

The three types of metaphors were identified in the movie *Lumumba* in the present study. Their frequency and percentage are described as follows:

Table 1
Types of metaphors identified in *Lumumba*

Types of metaphor	Frequency	Percentage
Structural	20	48%
Ontological	20	48%
Orientational	2	4%
Total	42	100%

Table 1 shows the frequency of the Types of Metaphors identified in the movie *Lumumba*. As shown in Table 1, structural, ontological and orientational metaphors were identified in the movie's subtitles. The data from Table 1 show that structural and ontological metaphors are dominant since their appearance frequencies are the highest. Besides, orientational metaphors' frequency of appearance is the lowest.

5.1.1 Structural Metaphors

(1) ST: *On se croyait maître du destin alors que des ennemis plus puissants menaient le jeu.*

TT: We thought we controlled our destiny but other powerful enemies were pulling the strings. [00:08:32]

In this example, the expression *menaient le jeu* (leading the game) is mapped onto controlling a situation. Consequently, the structural metaphor identified in this example is CONTROLLING IS LEADING THE GAME. In other words, by controlling DR Congo and maintaining Congolese under rude administration with the help of local traitors, the Belgians were leading the game that consisted of preventing DR Congo from acquiring its independence.

(2) ST: *On va les manger.*

TT: We will eat them raw. [00:14:46]

The linguistic expression above instantiates the conceptual metaphor WINNING IS EATING. This conceptual metaphor uses the source domain EATING to conceptualize the target domain WINNING. To better understand this conceptual metaphor, we may have to contextualize it. At this time of the movie, Patrice Lumumba and his friends learn that De Gaulle, president of France at the time, is about to grant some French colonies independence. Therefore, Patrice Lumumba and his friends are sure to win their independence battle against Belgium (their colonizer). So, the source concept *manger* (eat), which initially refers to chewing and swallowing, is used to express the action of winning.

(3) ST: *L'indépendance du Congo, si elle est proclamée par la Belgique [...], nul congolais digne de ce nom ne peut oublier que c'est par la force qu'elle a été conquise.*

TT: Our independence, though proclaimed by Belgium [...], no self-respecting Congolese can forget we fought for it. [00:38:32-44]

In the example above, the structural metaphor INDEPENDENCE IS WAR is identified. In this metaphor, the French word *force* (strength) is employed as the metaphor-related word. According to *Le Robert*

online dictionary, the word *force* originally means physical or moral strength. Therefore, this metaphor maps the source domain WAR onto the target domain INDEPENDENCE. Originally, independence is the ability to live one's life without being helped or influenced by other people. However, due to colonization, the concept of independence was understood in terms of battle or war, which should be fought. Thus, the metaphor INDEPENDENCE IS WAR.

5.1.2 Ontological Metaphors

The following ontological metaphors are found in *Lumumba*:

(4) ST: *Le bloc nationaliste que je préside appuira de toutes ses forces la candidature de M. Kasavubu.*

TT: The Nationalist Force I preside eagerly backs Mr Kasavubu's candidacy. [00:29:38]

The metaphor-related word in this example is *appuira* (will press) which comes from the verb *appuyer* (to press). Initially, the verb *appuyer* (to press) means to press or to support something or press something against something. Patrice Lumumba conceptualizes Mr Kasavubu's candidacy as an object that should be pressed or supported. Consequently, this example instantiates the ontological metaphor CANDIDACY IS AN OBJECT.

(5) ST: *Sacs à merde.*

TT: Pieces of shit. [00:47:13]

The metaphor contained in this metaphorical expression is the ontological metaphor HUMAN BEINGS ARE USELESS CONTAINERS. Some Congolese soldiers were expressing their anger regarding the condescending treatment the Belgian colonizers gave them by verbally assaulting some of the Belgians they met in the street. After they were reported to their hierarchy, their white superior qualified them as *sacs à merde* (bags of excrement)—another way of telling them how useless they were. The metaphor-related word *sacs* (bags) is used to conceptualize the Congolese soldiers.

(6) ST: *L'ONU est manipulée par les américains.*

TT: The UN is manipulated by the US. [01:02:52]

Here, the UN (United Nations) is conceptualized as an object that can be manipulated. The metaphor employs the word *manipulée* (manipulated), which comes from the verb *manipuler* (to manipulate). The UN is mapped onto an object that can be manipulated because Mobutu is orchestrating killings in the Kasai region, pretending Lumumba sends him. However, when Lumumba complains that the UN qualifies the killings as genocide, Mobutu replies that the Americans manipulate the UN. This example alludes to the ontological metaphor THE UN IS AN OBJECT.

5.1.3 Orientational Metaphors

The movie *Lumumba* contains the following orientational metaphors:

(7) ST: *Je veux voir dans un mois la courbe remontée.*

TT: I want to see an **upturn** in a month. [00:10:32]

The metaphorical expression in (7) is a realization of the orientational metaphor GOOD IS UP in which the word *remontée* (gone back up) coming from the verb *remonter* (to go back up) is employed as the metaphor-related word. Here, Lumumba's boss at the Brewery company is telling him that they are facing a crisis, and one of the reasons why they are recruiting him is to help them make things as good as they were.

(8) ST: *Qui est derrière toi?*

TT: Who is **behind** you? [01:18:16]

The orientational metaphor identified in (8) is SUPPORT IS BEHIND. Mobutu is planning to overthrow Lumumba, the Prime Minister and Kasavubu, the President. However, Lumumba strongly believes he cannot achieve such a huge task alone. Therefore, by using the word *derrière* (behind), Lumumba refers to the people supporting Mobutu.

5.2 Metaphor Translation Strategies

After analysis, it was discovered that four translation strategies were used to translate the metaphors identified. Moreover, it was also discovered that there are cases where non-metaphorical expressions are translated by metaphorical expressions. Table 2 shows the metaphor translation strategies with their frequency of use.

Table 2
Translation Strategies Identified in the English subtitles of Lumumba

Translation strategy	Frequency	Percentage
CM-CM	23	43%
CM-CM2	14	26%
CM-nonCM	4	7%
CM-O	1	2%
NonCM-CM	12	22%
Total	54	100%

From Table 2, it can be observed that the translator mainly used strategy 1 (43%), which consists of using the same metaphor in the ST and TT. Strategy 1 is followed by strategy 2 (26%), which consists of using, in the TT, a different metaphor with the same meaning. Furthermore, with strategy 5 (22%), which consists of translating a non-metaphorical expression into a metaphorical one, we can conclude that the TT has gained more metaphors. In other words, there are more metaphors in the TT than in the ST.

5.2.1 Using the Same Metaphor in the ST and TT (CM-CM)

This strategy is used 23 times in *Lumumba*. Some examples of its use in the English subtitles include:

(9) ST: *Notre parti est un immense parti le votre n'est rien.* (Our party is huge yours is nothing)

TT: Our party is **huge** yours is nothing. [00:06:39-40]

(10) ST: *Je veux voir dans un mois la courbe remontée.* (I want to see in a month the curve back up)

TT: I want to see an **upturn** in a month. [00:10:32]

From example (9), we can observe the relation between the concept of political party and the concept of object. This relationship between the two concepts is expressed through the adjective *immense* (huge), which is often used to qualify objects or places. Thus, the metaphor identified in the ST is POLITICAL PARTIES ARE OBJECTS because attributes of objects are transferred to political parties. The TT in (9) keeps the metaphorical expression and the conceptual mapping of the ST. In other words, the target text's metaphorical expression also instantiates the ontological metaphor POLITICAL PARTIES ARE OBJECTS. Example (10) also shows that the conceptual mapping of the ST is the same in the TT. The metaphorical expression in the ST instantiates the orientational metaphor GOOD IS UP, in which the word *remontée* (gone back up) coming from the verb *remonter* (to go back up) is employed as metaphor-related and mapped on a good achievement. By using the term *upturn*, the TT maintains the ST's metaphorical expression and conceptual mapping.

(11) ST: *Ils veulent gagner du temps.* (They want to gain time)

TT: They want to **gain** time. [00:23:40]

(12) ST: *Je ne veux pas attendre d'être complètement paralysé.* (I don't want wait to be completely **paralysed**)

TT: I can't wait to be completely **paralysed**. [01:19:39]

In (11), the ST's metaphorical expression contains the structural metaphor TIME IS A REWARD which could be considered an extension of Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) TIME IS MONEY. The conceptual mapping in the ST involves a relation between the concept of time and the concept of reward. In this metaphor, the attributes of the verb *gagner* (to gain/win), which refers to acquire or to become a winner, are transferred to time. Consequently, time is understood in terms of a reward. The same metaphorical mapping is seen in the TT. In example (12), we can identify a relationship between the concepts of INABILITY and DISEASE. Being unable to do something is understood in the ST as *paralysé* (paralyzed). Hence, the metaphor contained in the ST metaphorical expression is INABILITY IS A DISEASE. The TT employs the same metaphorical expression and keeps the same conceptual metaphor.

5.2.2 Using in the TT, a Different Metaphor With the Same Meaning (CM-CM2)

The examples below show the use of this strategy in the English subtitles of *Lumumba*:

(13) ST: *On se croyait maître du destin alors que des ennemis plus puissants menaient le jeu.* (We thought we were the masters of destiny while more powerful enemies were *leading the game*)

TT: We thought we controlled our destiny but other powerful enemies were **pulling the strings**. [00:08:32]

(14) ST: *Leur chiffre d'affaire a fait un bond.* (Their turnover has **jumped**)

TT: Their turnover has **boosted**. [00:10:06]

In example (13), the ST expression *menaient le jeu* (leading the game) is mapped onto controlling a situation. Consequently, the conceptual metaphor identified in this example is CONTROLLING IS LEADING THE GAME. The target domain CONTROLLING remains the same in the TT, whereas the source domain is modified. The TT's metaphorical expression instantiates the metaphor CONTROLLING IS PULLING. Instead of *leading the game*, the TT employs the expression *pulling the strings*. Nevertheless, the metaphorical meaning remains the same in the ST and TT. The scenario in (14) is the same as in (13). While the metaphorical meaning remains the same in the TT, the conceptual mapping differs. In the ST, the metaphorical expression alludes to the conceptual metaphor A TURNOVER IS A LIVING BEING. The target concept *increase* is understood in terms of *bond* (jump). The ST metaphorical expression employs the mental image of *jumping* to talk about the increase in turnovers, which is not the case in TT. Instead, the metaphorical expression in the TT instantiates the metaphor A TURNOVER IS A VEHICLE in which the target concept *increase* is understood in terms of boost (specific to vehicles and engines). Despite the difference between the conceptual mappings of the ST and the TT, the metaphorical meaning remains unchanged.

(15) ST: *Au moment solennelle où la République du Congo se présente au monde.* (At the solemn moment when the Republic of Congo *presents herself* to the world)

TT: As the Congo solemnly **steps into** the world. [00:37:06]

The metaphorical expression in (15) reveals the conceptual metaphor A COUNTRY IS A HUMAN BEING. In this metaphor, the attributes of human beings, such as presenting or introducing yourself, are transferred to a country (the Republic of Congo, for this matter). Unlike (13) and (14), in which only the target domain remained unchanged in the TT, in (15), both the source and the target domains are changed. The metaphorical expression in the TT contains the metaphor THE WORLD IS A CONTAINER. This metaphor conceptualizes the world as a container into which countries such as Congo can enter. Nevertheless, substituting the ST's conceptual mapping in the TT does not hinder the initial metaphorical message.

5.2.3 Using a Non-Metaphoric Expression (CM-Non-CM)

The following are examples of the use of this strategy in the English subtitles of *Lumumba*:

(16) ST: *C'est le fils d'un homme que nous avons écarté de notre parti l'année dernière.* (He is the son of a man we *kicked out* of our party last year)

TT: His father was excluded from our party last year. [00:26:37]

(17) ST: *Ne vous en faites pas M. Le ministre on prend tout à notre charge.* (Don't worry Mr. Minister, we will take care of everything)

TT: Don't worry we are paying.

In example (16), we can identify a conceptual relation between concepts of people and objects. The target concept *excluded* is understood in terms of *écarté* (kicked out). Regarding the TT, we no longer have the original metaphor PEOPLE ARE OBJECTS. Instead, the metaphorical expression is paraphrased. The same situation occurs in (17), where the metaphor A BILL IS AN ENTITY is identified. In the initial metaphor, the expression *prendre en charge* (to take care of) is mapped onto *paying*. We can observe that this metaphor is lost in the TT, and the meaning is simply paraphrased.

(18) ST: *Tu sais qu'il y a beaucoup de gens qui voudraient ta peau.* (You know there are a lot of people who want your skin)

TT: Many people want to see you dead. [01:17:45]

(19) ST: *Si le sol buvait mon sang ce sera votre propre destruction.* (If the ground drinks my blood it will be your own destruction)

TT: If my blood soaks this soil, it's your end. [01:29:28]

In (18), it is shown that the conceptual metaphor LIFE IS A BODY PART is lost but not the meaning. It means that TT still conveys the ST's meaning; however, it does not keep its metaphoricity. In the ST, the body part *peau* (skin) is employed to map the target domain *life*, whereas it does not appear in the TT. In example (19), the ST metaphorical expression instantiates the metaphor THE SOIL IS A LIVING BEING, in which attributes of human beings are transferred to the *soil* through the word *buvait* (drank) from the verb *boire* (to drink). While the meaning is kept in the TT, the conceptual mapping and the metaphor disappear.

5.2.4 Deletion of the ST Metaphor (CM-O)

(20) ST: *Le micro traîne* dès que Kasa finit son speech, Patrice le prend. (The microphone *drags* as soon as Kasa finishes his speech, Patrice takes it)

TT: Once Kasa finishes talking, Patrice takes the mic. [00:35:15] Structural

In this example, the conceptual metaphor OBJECTS ARE LIVING BEINGS neither the conceptual mapping nor the meaning of the metaphor was conveyed in the TT. The metaphor has been deleted. It is worth mentioning that it does not change the meaning of the text. However, it is not always the case. In many cases, when this strategy is used, the ST's message and authenticity are damaged.

5.2.5 Translating a Non-Metaphoric Expression Into a Metaphoric Expression (Non-CM-CM)

(21) ST: *On accuse notre bière de rendre impuissant. Ils vont jusqu'à dire ça.* (They accuse our beer of making you impotent. They go so far as to say that)

TT: They even accuse our beer of causing impotence. They go that **low**. [00:10:19]

(22) ST: *Il a passé des papiers dehors.* (He passed some papers outside)

TT: He **slipped** messages out. [00:17:02]

(23) ST: *Ou bien le front primitif reprendra le dessus.* (Or the primitive front will take over)

TT: Or else the primitive **roots** will sprout again. [00:23:33]

In (21), it can be observed that the ST does not contain any metaphorical expression. However, the TT contains a metaphorical expression instantiating the conceptual metaphor BAD IS DOWN, in which the metaphor-related word *low* is employed. In addition, the same phenomenon occurs in examples (22) and (23). In example (22), there is no metaphorical expression in the ST, though there is one in the TT. The metaphorical expression in the TT is an instantiation of the ontological metaphor MESSAGES ARE SUBSTANCES, in which messages are understood in terms of substances that can be slipped. In example (23), we can identify the structural metaphor AN ASSOCIATION IS A PART OF A PLANT in the TT, while there is none in the ST.

6. MOTIVATIONS FOR CHOOSING A STRATEGY

6.1 Cultural Motivations

In translation, we sometimes tend to be limited to the bilingual knowledge in the SL and TL, while translation is also about bicultural knowledge. Moreover, translation is a cross-cultural communication between different languages and cultures. Hence, the source and target cultures may significantly impact the choice of a translation strategy (Xiangying Cao 2018). Dongfeng Wong and Dan Shen (1999) claim that each culture develops specific conceptions about the world through long and specific evolution.

More specifically, the fact that a metaphor or metaphorical expression is shared among the two cultures we are translating in may influence the choice strategy 1 (CM-CM), as it can be seen in the following examples:

(24) ST: *Notre parti est un immense parti le votre n'est rien.* (Our party is *huge* yours is nothing)

TT: Our party is **huge** yours is nothing. [00:06:39-40]

(25) ST: *On va les manger.* (We will eat them)

TT: We will **eat** them raw. [00:14:46]

The metaphors above are shared in the SL and TL. Thus, it becomes almost automatic to use this strategy. Furthermore, the fact that a metaphor or metaphorical expression is not shared in both cultures may influence the choice of strategies 2 (CM-CM2), 3 (CM-non-CM) and 4 (CM-0), as seen in the examples below:

(26) ST: *Le bloc nationaliste que je préside appuira de toutes ses forces la candidature de M. Kasavubu.*

(The nationalist bloc that I chair *will support* with all its strength the candidacy of Mr. Kasavubu.)

TT: The Nationalist Force I preside **eagerly backs** Mr Kasavubu's candidacy. [00:29:38]

(27) ST: *Si le sol buvait mon sang ce sera votre propre destruction.* (If the ground *drinks my blood* it will be your own destruction)

TT: If my blood soaks this soil, it's your end. [01:29:28]

(28) ST: *Le micro traîne* dès que Kasa finit son speech, Patrice le prend. (The microphone *drags* as soon as Kasa finishes his speech, Patrice takes it)

TT: Once Kasa finishes talking, Patrice takes the mic. [00:35:15]

In example (26), the original metaphor is replaced by a metaphor that suits the target culture. Besides, in (27), it is a different phenomenon. The metaphorical expression is replaced by a non-metaphoric expression. Finally, in (28), the metaphor is omitted in the TT. The choice of these strategies is influenced by the fact that the metaphors are not shared by the two cultures.

6.2 Cognitive Motivations

These are motivations that are specific to the translators. No matter the strategies prescribed to achieve a good translation, the translator remains the key to every translation activity. In other words, even when the translator is aware of the proper translation strategies, his choice is not always influenced by cultural or linguistic factors. Sometimes, his ways of thinking and aesthetic orientation will equally impact his decisions (Cao 2018). It may explain why the translators use strategy 3 (CM-non-CM) when the target text has a cultural equivalent of the ST. The following example illustrates this point:

(29) ST: *C'est le fils d'un homme que nous avons écarté de notre parti l'année dernière.*

TT: His father was excluded from our party last year. [00:26:37]

The example above shows that the translator paraphrased the ST metaphor-related metaphor, though he could use the TL expression *kicked out*. Cognitive motivations may also explain why the translators use strategy 4 (Non-Cm-CM). By using strategy 4, the translator may want to add some conventionality in the TT.

(30) ST: *Tu peux m'aider?* (Can you help me?)

TT: will you **give me hand**. [00:04:28]

(31) ST: On me refuse une amnistie. (They deny me an amnesty)

TT: They **turned down** an amnesty. [00:33:58]

In examples (30) and (31), the translators could have chosen to translate the ST expression literally. However, they instead decided to use more conventional expressions in the TT.

6.3 Technical Motivations

As argued by Payota Georgakopoulou (2009), the length of a subtitle is directly related to its on-air time. He adds

that subtitles can be perfect in terms of other aspects, but if it fails in terms of reading time, viewers will not be able to read them. Furthermore, subtitles also have limited space, and because of that, the translator may have to avoid unnecessary explanations. Usually, a subtitle can only be about 36 to 40 characters (including spacing and punctuation marks) and a maximum of two lines (Pedersen 2011). These constraints may have also influenced the choice of some strategies. In (32), we can see that the metaphor is omitted in the TT, but the meaning remains the same:

(32) ST: *Le micro traîne* dès que Kasa finit son speech, Patrice le prend. (The microphone *drags* as soon as Kasa finishes his speech, Patrice takes it)

TT: Once Kasa finishes talking, Patrice takes the mic. [00:35:15]

In a nutshell, we have three significant motivations that impact the choice of a translation strategy during subtitling. They are: cultural motivations, cognitive motivations and technical motivations. While cultural and cognitive motivations are specific to the translator and his cultural knowledge, time and space constraints are technical constraints.

CONCLUSION

The present research findings show that the subtitles of the movie *Lumumba* contain all three types of conceptual metaphors, namely: structural, ontological and orientational. Besides, in order to translate (from French into English) the metaphor, the translators employed four strategies. They are: (1) using the same metaphor in the ST and TT (CM-CM); (2) using in the TT, a different metaphor with the same meaning (CM-CM2); (3) using a non-metaphorical expression (CM-Non-CM); and (4) deleting the ST metaphor (CM-O). However, a particular strategy consisting of translating a non-metaphorical expression into a metaphorical expression (NonCM-CM) was also identified. Therefore, the TT contains more metaphors than the ST. This shows the translators' taste for metaphority. Finally, it was also discovered that cultural, cognitive and technical motivations impacted the translators' choice of strategies. While cultural and cognitive motivations are specific to translators and their cultural knowledge, time and space constraints are technical constraints. The research is related to those of Schmidt (2014) and Alanisa and Munandar (2019). Unlike Schmidt's (2014), more specific strategy choice motivations were given. Compared to Alanisa and Munandar (2019), our work did not only use conceptual metaphor theory to classify the types of metaphor. It is also used to identify translation strategies.

The present work lacks enough data. Hence, for further studies, researchers can expand the present study to a more extensive scope by adding the number of research

objects to gather more data. Besides, the research can also be expanded to the areas of visualized metaphors and audio description.

REFERENCES

- Alanisa, Prasna A., & Munandar, A. (2019). The translation strategies of metaphors in the movies *Mulan* and *Moana*. *Lexicon*, 6(2), 200-211.
- Black, M. (1955). Metaphor. *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, 55, 273-294.
- Cao, X. Y. (2018). *Influential factors on translation*. 7th International Workshop on Arts, Culture, Literature, and Education.
- Davidson, D. (1978). What metaphors mean. In S. Sacks (Ed.), *On Metaphor* (pp.29-46). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Díaz-Cintas, J. (Ed.). (2008). *The didactics of audiovisual translation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Díaz-Cintas, J. (2009). Audiovisual translation: An overview of its potential. *Topics in translation*, No. 36: *New trends in audiovisual translation*. Clevedon, GB: Multilingual Matters.
- Dickins, J. (2005). Two models for metaphor translation. *Target*, 17(2), 227-273.
- Evans, V., & Melanie, G. (2006). *Cognitive linguistics: An introduction*. Great Britain: Edinburgh University Press.
- Gambier, Y. (2003). Introduction. *The translator*, 9(2), 171-189.
- Georgakopoulou, P. (2009). Subtitling for the DVD industry. In Diaz-Cintas Jorge, & A. Gunilla (Eds.), *Audiovisual translation: Language transfer on screen* (pp.21-35). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Grice, H. P. (1989). *Studies in the way of words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Jayawardani, Tatin Shinta F., Tabiati, S. E., & Sahiruddin, S. (2020). Types of metaphors and translation procedures used in Indonesian subtitle of *12 Years a Slave*. *Metalingua*, 18(2), 263-270.
- Kövecses, Z. (2002). *Metaphor: A practical introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kövecses, Z. (2003). Language, figurative thought, and cross-cultural comparison. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 18 (4), 311-320.
- Lakoff, G., & Mark, J. (1980). *Metaphor we live by*. Chicago, USA: University of Chicago Press.
- Larson, M. L. (1985). *Meaning based translation: A guide to cross language equivalence*. New York: University Press of America.
- Lindqvist, Y. (2002). *Översättning som social praktik: Tony Morrison och Harlequinserien på svenska*. Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.
- Raoul, P. (2000). *Lumumba*. Retrieved from Patrice Lumumba Full Movie - With English Subtitles - YouTube.
- Mutiyara, A. S., & Donald, J. (2022). *Lexical metaphors in song subtitle and their effect on the poeticness*. International Conference on English Language Teaching, Literature and Translation.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *Approaches to translation*. London and New York, UK and USA: Prentice Hall.
- PACTE. (2017). *PACTE translation competence model, a holistic, dynamic model of translation competence* (pp.35-44). Pacte Group, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam.
- Pedersen, J. (2015). On the subtitling of visualized metaphors. *The Journal of Specialised Translation*, 23, 162-180.
- Putri, Siegfrieda A. S. Mursita, & Martha. (2019). An analysis of metaphor translation in the subtitle of Sherlock Holmes 2: A game of shadows (2011) movie. *Journal of Linguistics and Literature*, 3, 66-75.
- Remael, A. (2010). *Audiovisual translation, handbook of translation studies*. NL: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Rudhel, Yvan M. Megaptche. (2020). Understanding metaphors and their translation from the linguistic and cognitive linguistic perspectives. *International Journal of Research Publications*, 83-98.
- Rudhel, Yvan M. Megaptche, & Xu, W. (2021). Translation competence: Beyond bilingualism. *Indian Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 2(4), 31-38.
- Schmidt, G. (2012). *A cognitive-linguistic approach to the translation of metaphor from English into Croatian*. Doctorate dissertation. University of Osijek.
- Schmidt, G. (2014). Metaphor translation in subtitling. *Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 2(2).
- Searle, R. J. (1979). Metaphor. In O. Andrew (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought* (pp.92-123). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sperber, D., & Deirdre, W. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive translation studies and beyond*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins (p.312). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Ungerer, F., & Schmid, H.-J. (2006). *An introduction to cognitive linguistics*. (2nd ed.). Harlow: Pearson Longman. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Van den Broeck, R. (1981). The limits of translatability exemplified by metaphor translation. *Poetics Today*, 2(4), 73-87.
- Wong, D. F., & Shen, D. (1999). Factors influencing the process of translating. *Meta*, 44(1), 78-100.
- www.dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english
www.lerobert.com/google-dictionnaire-fr