

Lexical Metaphors in Song Subtitle and Their Effect on The Poeticness

Aisha Shifa Mutiyara¹, Donald Jupply²

aisha.shifa2016@student.uny.ac.id¹, donaldjupply@uny.ac.id²

Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta
Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Abstract. Song lyrics are highly characterized by poetic expressions. This dimension is mostly instantiated through the deployment of metaphor. A large body of research has been devoted to investigate the translation of metaphors in song lyrics. However, its translation viewed from the aspect of poeticness of the song lyrics remains under researched. Using qualitative method and taking song subtitles from the musical movie “*The Greatest Showman*” as its object, this study attempts to examine the rendering of metaphors focusing on how their force affects the poeticness of the text. From the data, firstly, Dead metaphors are found to be the most employed category in the ST. In the TT, more than half of the translations of metaphors remain metaphorical. One case of addition of metaphor is also found. Secondly, the poeticness of the TT is found to be weaker than the ST, since there are more cases resulting in the decreasing of metaphorical force than the ones resulting in the same or increasing force. Thirdly, five factors are found to impact the maintaining or changing of metaphorical force in the TT: language system, different labelling, translation’s choice, translator’s incompetence, and technical constrains.

Keywords: lexical metaphor, song subtitle, poeticness, musical movie

1 Introduction

In movies, song lyrics must be subtitled if they contribute significantly to the story “as it happens in musicals” (Diaz Cintaz & Remael, 2014). In subtitling songs, “a lot more flexibility” is permitted (p. 128) as the translator must deal with the poetic aspect of the lyrics along with the technical constrains. The poeticness of the lyrics can be seen from the “systematic violation” of the form, norm, and function of standard language (Mukařovský, 2014, p. 43). In other words, poeticness disables the “automatic” mode of language (p. 42). This “deautomatization” can be found in poetic devices such as metaphors.

Systemic functional linguistics (SFL) sees the violation done by metaphors as an “incongruency”. Thus, SFL differentiates metaphor into two: grammatical and lexical. Firstly, in grammatical metaphors, the incongruency occurs in the level of metafunction. It has many kinds and can be found in all the three metafunctions: textual, interpersonal, and experiential. One of the examples is when the form and function of a sentence are not congruent. For instance, “Can you open the window?” takes form as an interrogative but functions as an imperative (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2013).

Secondly is the type discussed in this study, lexical metaphor, where the incongruity occurs in the level of lexis. This is found only in Experiential metafunction. Here, a “flow of events” is seen as a chain of figures. In the center of each figure is Process, which can be either Material, Behavioral, Mental, Verbal, Relational, or Existential (p. 85). One example of lexical metaphors is using Material verb “raise” in the metaphorical “**raising an objection**” instead of using the congruent Verbal verb “voice” in the context of “voicing an objection” (Goatly, 1997, p. 84). In Lakoff and Johnson’s (1980) terms, this incongruity is the clashing of images. This metaphorical expression clashes two images: the image of a person raising a hand and a person *voicing* an objection. In this case, the relationship between the images is analogous. In a discussion, for instance, raising a hand is obligatory for the participants before they say anything, to make the discussion run smoothly, avoiding the possibility of overlapping dialogues. Furthermore, based on the three elements of a metaphor proposed by Goatly (1997), the word “**raising**” here functions as the Vehicle – the referent – and “an objection” is the Topic – the thing being referred. The third element, Ground, where the similarity, analogy, or association is suggested by the metaphor, is not explicitly stated. Also following Goatly, in this paper, the Vehicle, Topic, and Ground are indicated by bold, underlined, and italics respectively (1997, p. xii).

It is crucial for translators to see metaphors as manifestations of a culture. The association between the clashed images in a metaphor depends on the perspective used when the expression is being conceptualized. In most cases, different cultures result in different perspective, and different perspective result in different conceptualization (Kövecses, 2005). The concept operating behind the clashing images in a metaphor is addressed as “metaphorical mapping” by Lakoff and Johnson (1980).

It has been proven that the transculturality of mappings may affect the translation strategy and product in the case of novel (Safarnejad, Abdullah, & Awal, 2013), short stories (Burmakova & Marugina, 2014), lyric translation of music videos (Anudo & Kodak, 2017), and subtitle (Schmidt, 2014; Pedersen, 2015; Pedersen, 2017). However, none of them investigate the force of the metaphors. Dickins (2005) and Pedersen (2017) mention about it in their discussion but it is not their main focus. The analysis focusing on the metaphorical force is significant in giving an illustration about the outcome of the rendering of metaphor, which has not been carried out yet in these previous studies.

Using the official Indonesian subtitles taken from the official VCD of “The Greatest Showman” sold in Indonesia to minimize the possibility of reckless translation, the metaphors and their renderings employed in all of the nine songs in the movie – *The Greatest Show, A Million Dreams, Come Alive, The Other Side, Never Enough, This is Me, Rewrite the Stars, Tightrope*, and *From Now On* – were analyzed focusing on the metaphorical force and its effect to the poeticness of the Source Text (ST) and Target Text (TT). Three research questions are formulated as follows: 1) What metaphors are employed in the ST and TT? 2) To what extent does the rendering of metaphors impact on the poeticness of the TT? 3) What are the possible factors affecting the poeticness in the TT through the translation of ST metaphors?

2 Methodology

This study used qualitative method to answer the research questions. To answer the first question, this study modified Dickins (2005) Simplified Model to categorize all metaphors in the ST and the TT. This model was chosen because of its ability in “providing a ‘focalized’ continuum from dead metaphors to original metaphors” and “seems accurately mirror the increasing degree of metaphorical forcefulness” (p. 249). The concept of metaphorical forcefulness is closely related to the notion of poeticness as a form of “deautomatization” of language. When a poetic expression is too frequently used, it is no longer regarded as a deautomatization – it has become automated. In other words, the more frequent a metaphor is used, the weaker the force and the less poetic the expression. In the worst case, it can be not regarded as a metaphor at all.

Similar to Pedersen’s (2017), this study eliminates Dickins’ Recent category due to the difficulty in determining the “newness” of the metaphor used in the movie. Although it was released in 2017 and the subtitle was produced in the same year, the setting of the movie – considering that it is a fiction but based on the real biography of P.T. Barnum – is somewhere between 1810-1891 (Barnum’s lifetime, according to <https://www.britannica.com/biography/P-T-Barnum>, accessed on July 23rd, 2021). Nonetheless, the expressions used in the lyrics are not based on this setting. There is an Adapted “*And I’m marching on to the beat I drum*” (TIM.21-22) which derives its sense from the lexicalized “march to a different drummer”, a metaphor firstly established in 2001 (source: [collinsdictionary.com/amp/english/march-to-a-different-drummer](https://www.collinsdictionary.com/amp/english/march-to-a-different-drummer), accessed on July 23rd, 2021).

Following Pedersen (2017) and Dickins (2005), the categorization of ST and TT metaphors was done based on dictionaries and corpuses. Oxford English Dictionary (OED) (Eiger & Simpson, 2009) and Collins Online English Dictionary (<https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english>) were used to categorize ST metaphors (Pedersen, 2017; Dickins, 2005). The digital version *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia* (KBBI) for Android along with two online corpuses: SEALANG (<https://sealang.net/indonesia/corpus.html>) and <https://sealang.net/indonesia/bitext.html>) and IndonesianWAc (https://app.sketchengine.eu/#dashboard?corpname=preloaded%2Findonesianwac3_2stem) were used to categorized the translation of ST metaphors. In addition, to avoid missing the possibility of similar uses of the metaphor in song lyrics, the researcher browsed the expression in *Google* by typing “[the expression] + lyrics” when the expression is not found in dictionary nor corpus, as song lyrics are not indexed nor listed in either of them. Then, the metaphors are classified following Pedersen (2017) as follows:

1. Original if the similar sense was not found in any of the dictionaries and in any song lyrics or title released a year before the release date of the movie (2016) for an ST metaphor and before 2017 for a TT metaphor. The shooting of the movie was started in October 2016 (Prince, Ron, n.d.), so it is assumed that the script and the lyrics have been already written that year. Hence, any similar use of metaphor after 2016 did not

affect the decision in categorizing a metaphor in the ST. For the TT, since the subtitle is assumed to be produced around the release date of the movie (2017), any similar use of metaphor after that year did not affect the classification of the metaphor.

2. Adapted if the metaphor derived its sense via a lexicalized metaphor.
3. Stock, for an ST metaphor: “if the OED marked the head word [the Vehicle –ed.] as fig. [figurative] and gave it number of its own” (Pedersen, 2017, p. 8) or if a similar use was found in any song lyrics released before 2016; for TT metaphors: if KBBI labels the metaphorical sense with *ki*. (*kiasan* = figurative), if a similar use was found in any song lyrics released before 2017, or if the corpus showed that the use of metaphor was still rare.
4. Dead, for an ST metaphor: “if it was subsumed as an alphabetic entry under the numeral of a different sense” (Pedersen, 2017, p. 8); for TT metaphors: if the metaphorical definition was listed among the list of definitions of the lexis in KBBI but not as the first definition, or when the use of the metaphor appeared too frequently in the corpus.

For the translation, these categories were combined with Toury’s (2012) strategies of the translation of metaphor. Toury (2012) proposed six possible strategies to translate metaphors (pp. 107-110). Four of them are seen from the ST perspective: metaphor into the same metaphor, metaphor into different metaphor, metaphor into non-metaphor, and metaphor into 0 (omission), while the other two are seen from the TT perspective: non-metaphor into metaphor and 0 into metaphor. Thus, by also putting the change of force, this study categorized the translation as follows:

1. Metaphor into the same metaphor
The TT metaphor was classified under this category if the Vehicle corresponded with the one of the ST and the translation resulted in the same force as the ST.
2. Metaphor into different metaphor
The TT metaphor was classified under this category if: 1) it used different Vehicle from the ST, 2) the Vehicle was the same with the ST but referred to the different sense, or 3) the Vehicle was same but result in a different force due to the conventionality of the expression in the TL.
3. Metaphor into non-metaphor
This category was further divided into two: into non-figurative (if an ST metaphor became a literal expression in the TT) and into another figurative (if an ST metaphor became another figurative expression in the TT). The translations under this category were weighed zero (0), as they were all non-metaphors.
4. Metaphor into 0 (Omission)
This category was for any ST metaphor which was not translated in the TT. Consequently, this category resulted in zero (0) force.

Also, since there were some metaphors which were translated literally and mistranslated, two more categories – literal translation and mistranslation – were added.

To answer the second research question, all metaphors in the ST and the TT were given different weigh to measure the degree of poeticness. The category carrying the strongest force is Original and the weakest is Dead. Thus, the weighing was 4, 3, 2, and 1 for Original, Adapted, Stock, and Dead metaphor, respectively. The translations resulting in all non-metaphors including non-figurative expression, another figurative, omission, literal translation, and mistranslation are given zero (0) weigh.

The third research question was answered by classifying ST metaphors based on their force in the TT (decreasing, same, or increasing) and based on the possible factors motivating the translation outcomes. According to Steiner, three factors contributing to the translation shift are language system, text, and translator's competence (2004). Considering that the object of this study is metaphor translation in subtitle, the translation shift refers to the change of metaphorical force due to the translation. Moreover, these three factors can be elaborated as follows. Firstly, as this study focuses on the translation of the metaphors, language system here is specified into the aspect of the transculturality of the metaphorical concept or mapping as proven by the previous studies mentioned before. In other words, if the mapping of a metaphor in the ST is transcultural, the possibility for the translation to maintain the same force is greater than if the mapping is monocultural. Furthermore, this factor also covers the conventionality aspect. A similar expression may generate a different force in the ST and TT if the degree of conventionality of the expression between the ST and the TT are different. This may be reflected by the frequency of usage of the expression in the corpus or lyrics, or by the labelling of the metaphorical sense in the dictionaries. Hence, this study specified this factor two: "language system" and "different labelling". Secondly, as subtitle is the object of this study, the text factor is understood as the time and space constrains (Diaz Cintaz & Remael, 2014) and thus addressed as "technical" factor. Lastly, this study divides Steiner's "translator's competence" into two: "translator's choice" and "translator's incompetence". The main purpose of this division is to differentiate whether the shift is intentional due to the translator's choice or unintentional due to the translator's incompetence.

3 Findings and Discussions

The metaphors in the ST and the TT

Answering the first research question, Table 1 below presents the crosstabulation of cases of the translation of metaphors and into metaphors. From the total of 209 cases, 208 of them are the translation of ST metaphors. In the TT, more than the half of their rendering remain metaphorical (132 cases, 64%). The remaining one case is a rare one; a literal expression in the ST turns into a metaphor in the TT.

(1)

ST: Or you can risk it all and see

TT: *Atau bisa kau **pertaruhkan** dan lihat*

Back translation:

Or you can bet it all and see

(The Other Side)

In the SL, “risk” is not metaphor since the meaning “to hazard, endanger; to expose to the chance of injury or loss” is the first definition of verbal “risk” in the OED, implying a literal sense. In the TT, it is translated as “*pertaruhkan*”. It is a verb formed from the nominal “*taruh*” with prefix “*per-*” and affix “*-kan*”. Literally, “*taruh*” refers to a bet. Hence, “*pertaruhkan*” here means “to do the bet”. It has been used conventionally as a metaphor referring to “to risk” such as in “*mempertaruhkan nyawa*” (= to put one’s life on the line), and “*mempertaruhkan jabatan*” (= to risk one’s position). This case supports Pedersen’s (2017) claim that “addition of a metaphor when there is only a topic in the ST” is “unlikely in subtitling” (p. 9).

From the 208 metaphors found in the ST, most of them belong to Dead category (101) and the least belong to Adapted category with 19 cases, only one case less than those in Original category. In general, most of the translations of metaphors result in the same metaphor (69 cases, 33%). Following this, the second-most taken option is translating into non-figurative with 46 cases (22%). The least taken option is translating “into another figurative expression” with only 2 cases (1%)

Table 1. The ST metaphors and their translations

ST		TT										TOTAL
		Same Metaphor	Different / into Metaphor				NM		LT	MT	OM	
			Or	Ad	St	De	F	NF				
Or	Count	8	2	0	0	0	1	3	1	4	1	20
	%	35	10	0	5	0	5	15	5	20	5	100
Ad	Count	7	1	5	3	0	0	1	2	0	0	19
	%	38	5	26	16	0	0	5	10	0	0	100
St	Count	24	1	6	0	16	1	13	4	2	1	68
	%	36	1	9	0	24	1	19	6	3	1	100
De	Count	31	2	8	14	4	0	30	5	3	4	101
	%	30	3	7	14	4	0	30	5	3	4	100
Literal	Count	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	%	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	100
Subtotal	Count	70	6	19	17	21	2	46	13	9	6	
	%	33	3	9	9	10	1	22	6	4	3	
Total	Count		133						76			209

%	64	36	100
List of abbreviations:			
Or: Original metaphor			
Ad: Adapted metaphor			
St: Stock metaphor			
De: Dead metaphor			
NM: non-metaphor			
F: Figurative			
NF: Non-figurative			
LT: Literal translation			
MT: Mistranslation			
OM: Omission			

The effect of the translation on the metaphorical force in the TT

As mentioned in the methodology section above, Original, Adapted, Stock, and Dead metaphors weighed 4, 3, 2, and 1 respectively. Those weighed 0 were all non-metaphors, including those translated into non-figurative, another figurative, literal translation resulted in incomprehensible translation, mistranslation, and omission. To answer the second research question, each weigh was multiplied with its frequency, resulting in the total score of metaphorical force as presented in Table 2.

Table 2. The scoring of metaphorical force of the ST and the TT

weigh	ST		TT	
	Frequency	Score	Frequency	Score
4	20	80	14	56
3	19	57	26	78
2	68	136	41	82
1	101	101	52	52
0	1	0	76	0
Total	209	374	209	268

The total score of the metaphorical force of the ST is 106 points higher (374) than the one of the TT (268). This indicates that the overall translation results in the decreasing of the degree of poeticness of the TT. From the frequency in the TT column, it can be seen that the number of cases weighed 4, 2, and 1 are all fewer compared to the ST. Indeed, a huge gap is seen in the frequency of those weighed 0, which has 75 more cases compared to the one in the ST.

Table 3 provides a clearer illustration of the change and maintaining of the metaphorical force in the ST. In Table 1, some cells are colored. Those with white color indicate that the translations generate the same metaphorical force as the ST. Those in light grey color indicate increasing force in the TT, and those in dark grey color indicate decreasing force in the TT. The counts of frequency of the ST metaphors based on the resulted metaphorical force in the TT can be seen in Table 3 below. Except for Adapted metaphors, the decreasing of metaphorical force occurs the most in Original (55%, 11 cases), Stock (55%, 37 cases), and Dead (42%, 43 cases). The case non-metaphor in the ST is of course gains force as it is translated into Dead metaphor in the TT.

The factors motivating the maintaining or change of the metaphorical force in the TT

From the discussions of examples above, it can be inferred that all of the five factors formulated by modifying those proposed by Steiner (2004) – language system, technical constrains, different labelling, translator’s choice and incompetence – appears in the data. The frequency of each factor and the number of cases of the maintaining or changing of force can be seen in Table 4 below.

Table 3. The frequency of ST metaphors based on their force in the TT

ST		Force in the TT			Total
		Decreasing	Same	Increasing	
Original	Counts	10	10	0	20
	%	55	45	0	100
Adapted	Counts	6	12	1	19
	%	32	63	5	100
Stock	Counts	37	24	7	68
	%	55	35	10	100
Dead	Counts	43	34	24	101
	%	42	34	24	100
Literal	Counts	0	0	1	1
	%	0	100	0	100
Total	Counts	97	79	33	209
	%	46	38	16	100

Table 4. The number of cases resulted in the decreasing, increasing, or same metaphorical force caused by each factor

Cause		Force			Total
		Decreasing	Same	Increasing	
Language system	Count	40	76	21	137
	%	29	56	15	100
Different labelling	Count	13	0	10	23
	%	56	0	44	100
Translator's choice	Count	18	5	2	25
	%	72	20	8	100
Translator's incompetence	Count	22	0	0	22
	%	100	0	0	100
Technical constrains	Count	2	0	0	2
	%	100	0	0	100
Total	Count	95	81	33	209
	%	45	40	15	100

From the table above, the technical factor is found to have the least number of cases. It only has two cases, and all of them resulted in the decreasing force. On the other hand, the systemic factor affects 127 cases, the most among all the five factors. More than half of them (76, 56%) result in the same force. Translator's choice may also motivate the maintaining of metaphorical force (5 cases), The other factor which makes the maintaining of force possible is translator's choice, with five occurrences in total. For another 18 cases motivated by this factor, they have lesser force in the TT and the remaining two have greater force in the TT. Translator's incompetence only motivates the cases with decreasing force (22 cases). Lastly, different labelling may result in the decreasing and increasing force (13 and 10 cases, respectively).

For Original metaphors, many conditions must be fulfilled to produce a comprehensible, force-maintaining translation. Original metaphor means that the relationship between the Topic and the Vehicle is newly established. Thus, the Ground must be specified at least implicitly in the preceding or the following lyrics to guide the audience in understanding the intended meaning (Goatly, 1997). This is found in all the cases of Original metaphors in the data. Thus, besides the ability of the translator in interpreting the metaphor, the success of the translation depends on how well the Ground is translated especially when the ST Vehicle is transferred directly to the TT. Example (2) below illustrates this point. It shows that the translation successfully maintains the Original force without affecting the comprehensibility of the metaphor.

(2)

ST: Some people long for a life *that is simple and planned* / **Tied with a ribbon**

TT: Sebagian orang ingin hidup *yang sederhana dan terencana* / **Terikat dengan pita**

Back Translation:

Some people want a life that is simple and planned / Tied with a ribbon

(Tightrope)

On the other hand, for cases with an implicit Ground, the translator may omit the Vehicle if the metaphor is not significant in creating the flow of the lyrics as in (3).

(3)

ST: So come with me and **take the ride** / It'll take you to **the other side**

TT: Jadi ikutlah bersamaku / **Menuju sisi lain**

Back translation:

So come with me / To the other side

(The Other Side)

The Other Side is a sung dialogue between Barnum and Carlyle, when Barnum trying to persuade Carlyle to join his circus. Although Barnum and Carlyle are both performers, they perform on a different stage: circus for Barnum and theater for Carlyle. This difference is expressed through the image of "road". They are going on a different route with a different vehicle. Hence, to join Barnum can be said as "to come with Barnum" or "to take the same ride as Barnum". Since both "come with me" and "**take the ride**" refer to the same meaning, the omission does not affect the comprehensibility of the metaphors. Moreover, the image of "taking a different ride" to express the sense of "undergoing a different course of life" is unknown in the TL; in the TL, the conventional metaphor is only using the image of "way" (as in *jalan hidup* or way of life), giving more justification towards the omission.

On the other hand, when the Vehicle plays the important part of the lyrics, one option is to translate into non-figurative expression as in (4). In the TL, the literal sense of "*ikut*" may refer to "following someone to a certain destination" or "joining an activity".

(4)

ST: 'Cause I got what I need / And I don't wanna **take the ride**

TT: Karena aku dapat yang kubutuhkan dan aku tak mau ikut

Back translation:

Because I got what I need and I don't want to join you

(The Other Side)

If the translator opts to maintain at least the figurative form in the TT, his/her interpretation of the Original metaphor is crucial. In (5) below, the metaphors turn into simile

as the TT uses “*bagai*” (=like, as), but overall, the sense is not transferred at all due to translation errors (mistranslation).

(5)

ST: **It's the preacher in the pulpit / And your blind devotion**

TT: **Bagai pengajar di mimbar, akan kau temukan ketaatan**

Back translation:

Like a teacher in the podium / you will gain obedience

(*The Greatest Show*)

Since the beginning of the lyrics of *The Greatest Show*, it is repeatedly stated that Barnum's circus is the long-awaited fantasy coming to life. Thus, as the word “fantasy” suggests, the show arouses some kind of disbelief towards the audiences. However, as the unbelievable performance happens in front of their eyes, as a faithful believer has no other option than to believe what the preacher said, the audiences of the circus have no other option than to put aside their disbelief and be amazed. Thus, in the ST, the image “preacher” and “blind devotion” are parallel in conveying the context of faithfulness. In the TT, this context turns into a learning; the image of “preacher” is rendered into a bland “teacher” and consequently, the “blind devotion” turns into “obedience”. Moreover, the two images of “preacher” and “blind devotion” are meant to be understood as different images being put next to each other as “and” is used as the conjunction. However, in the TT, the image of “teacher” and “obedience” is continuous, since the temporal conjunction “*akan*” (=will) is used, making the sense is only about a delivery of a teaching and that it turns people to be obedient. Hence, the translation is problematic in many ways due to the translator's incompetence. The alternative is to translate it into “*bagai pendakwah di mimbar dan keimanan butamu*”.

As the sense of an Adapted metaphor is derived from a lexicalized metaphor (Dickins, 2005), to translate it while maintaining the force should be easier than to translate Original metaphor, as long as the entrenched lexicalized metaphor is transcultural as in (6).

(6)

ST: When **the sharpest words wanna cut me down / I'm gonna send a flood / Gonna drown 'em out**

TT: Saat ***cacian* ingin menjatuhkanku / Akan kukirimkan banjir untuk tenggelamkan mereka**

Back translation:

When the harsh words want to trip me down / I will send a flood to drown them out

(*This is Me*)

“**Drown**” is lexicalized metaphor in both the SL and the TL, referring to “to overpower” in the context of sound. Consequently, it can be inferred that SOUND IS LIQUID mapping is transcultural. Through this mapping, this sense is entrenched, creating the metaphorical “**flood**” as the Actor of the metaphorical Process of “drowning”.

It is also possible for an Adapted to be reduced to its sense and consequently, lose its force as in (7) below. The factor motivating the translator to render the Adapted “**flick the switch**” into non-figurative “**mengubah**” is more likely to be technical, as the mapping EMOTION=LIGHT (Goatly, 1997, p. 76) is shared between the SL and the TL, with the similar sense that “bright” refers to positive atmospheres and “dark” refers to negative atmospheres. This mapping connects the image of “flicking the switch” to the lexicalized metaphorical change of state from “dark” into “bright” as a person turning on a lamp.

(7)

ST: But you can **flick the switch** / And **brighten up** your **darkest day**

TT: Tapi kau bisa **mengubahnya** dan **menerangi** hari-harimu

Back translation:

But you can change it and brighten up your day.

(*Come Alive*)

In the cases of Stock and Dead metaphors, the labelling of sense in the dictionary may give different force despite the same metaphorical expression is used in the ST and TT.

(8)

ST: Leave behind your **narrow mind**

TT: Berhenti **berpikiran sempit**

Back translation:

Stop thinking narrowly.

(*Come Alive*)

Above, the metaphorical sense of “**narrow**” connoting “incapable of broad views” (OED) is known the SL and TL. This sense is not labelled as *fig.* by OED but by KBBI, it is labelled as *ki.* (=fig.). Since the Dead metaphor turns into Stock in the TT, the translation results in the greater force.

The adversary effect may also happen due to different labelling. In the example (9) below, the metaphorical sense of “see” referring to “knowing” is labelled as *fig.* only by OED. Hence, in the TT, the force decreases one point, as the translation of the Stock metaphor results in a Dead metaphor.

(9)

ST: I know you **see** it

TT: Kutahu kau **melihatnya**

Back translation:

I know you see it

(*The Other Side*)

The change of force between these two categories may also be intentionally caused by the choice of the translator.

(10)

ST: Impossible comes true, **intoxicating** you

TT: Hal mustahil terwujud, itu **mengendalikanmu**

Back translation:

Impossible comes true, it is taking over you.

(The Greatest Show)

In the ST, the metaphorical sense of “**intoxicate**” which refers “to excite beyond self-control” (OED) is labeled as figurative. It has the equivalence expression in the TL with the same form and meaning: “**memabukkan**” (=intoxicate). However, it is rendered as the Dead “**mengendalikan**”. Here, the change is not only in terms of metaphorical force, but also the imagery. The use of “**intoxicate**” clash the image of the “impossible thing” with “alcoholic liquor”, while the use of “**mengendalikan**” (=taking over) personifies the “impossible” as the controller of “you”.

The choice of translator may also strengthen the metaphorical force in the TT. In (11) below, the Stock “**the same old part you gotta play**” is translated into Adapted “**dirimu yang lama**”, changing the Vehicle “**part**” into “**self**” despite the fact that the same metaphorical expression also exists in the TL.

(11)

ST: Don't you wanna get away / From **the same old part you gotta play**?

TT: Tidakkah kau ingin bebas dari / **Dirimu yang lama**

Back Translation:

Don't you want to be free / From your old self

(The Other Side)

The “**part you gotta play**” here may literally refer to the part played by Carlyle in the theater and may also refer metaphorically to “his duty or character in the real life”. In this study, it is comprehended as the latter. This is because in the middle part of the lyrics, the “part” was referred as an “uptown part” by Carlyle (“Don't you know that I'm okay / With this uptown part I gotta play?”), an expression to distinguish himself from Barnum, since being a circus player at that time is a “disgrace” as mentioned in the latter lyrics sung by Carlyle: “If I were mixed up with you / I'd be the talk of the town / Disgraced and disowned, another one of the clowns”.

If the rendering uses the Dead “**peran**” (=part), the metaphor would maintain its force in the TT. “**Dirimu yang lama**” referring metaphorically to a spatial confine is never used before. However, a similar sense is found in one of Indonesian pop song “*Aku yang dulu bukanlah yang sekarang*” (Septian, Tegar. 2013. “*Aku yang Dulu Bukanlah yang Sekarang*”). The

similarity lies in the conceptualization that the “past self” and the “present self” are two different persons. “**Dirimu yang lama**” adapts this sense and entrenches it into the concept that the “old self” is a kind of prison.

The gaining of force is also found in (12) below. The Vehicle “**spotlight**” is never used in the TL to connote “public notice or prominence” (Collins English Dictionary: <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/spotlight>” Accessed July 23rd, 2021). Instead, a similar (but not totally equivalence) sense is carried by the metaphorical verb “**menyoroti**” (literal meaning: shooting a beam of light) as in “*atasan selalu menyoroti segala pekerjaan bawahannya*” (taken from KBBI; =the superiors are always supervising the subordinates’ works) or nominal “**sorotan**” (literal meaning: an object being shot by beams of light) referring to “a response” (KBBI) as in “*ucapan pemimpin yang kontroversial itu selalu menimbulkan banyak sorotan dari kalangan pemuka masyarakat*” (taken from KBBI; =the statements said by the controversial leader always attract many responses from public figures). Nonetheless, the translation renders the Vehicle as it is, establishing an Original metaphor in the TT. The example below is similar to Pedersen’s (2017). In one of his findings, the Vehicle “**wearing two hats**” is rendered as it is even though the expression is alien in the TL, resulting in a potentially “perplexing” Original metaphor (p. 13).

(12)

ST: All the shine of a **thousand spotlights**

TT: Semua sinar dari **ribuan lampu sorot**

Back translation:

All the shine of a thousand spotlights

(Never Enough)

Although this translation involves direct transferring of the ST Vehicle and potentially confusing, it is not classified as literal translation since the next two lines directs the interpretation – that it “*will never be enough*”. Moreover, in the movie, *Never Enough* was sung along with the scene when Barnum and Lind were in their peak of success and fame. To conclude, even though the TT employs the metaphorical “**lampu sorot**” which is alien in the for the TL audience, it is still comprehensible for the context of interpretation is specified by the next line and also the scene.

Preserving an ST Vehicle may also lead to an inappropriate translation when the Vehicle connotes different sense in the TL. In (13) below, the metaphorical “an **ache**” is translated literally as “**rasa sakit**”. In the SL, the Dead “**ache**” connotes a longing, but in the TL, it conventionally connotes mental pain.

(13)

ST: And buried in your bones, there’s an **ache** that you can’t ignore

TT: Dalam tulangmu terkubur **rasa sakit** yang tak bisa diabaikan

Back translation:

In your bones is buried an ache that you cannot ignore

(The Greatest Show)

Not only this translation fails to transfer the sense, but also disconnects this line from the previous; "*Ladies and gents, this is the moment you've waited for*". This also proves that the translator is completely unaware about the sense of the metaphorical "**ache**", despite the explicit statement that the lyrics is about "a long-awaited moment". For cases like this, it is suggested for the translator to render the metaphor into its literal sense *rasa rindu* to avoid misinterpretation.

4 Conclusions

Three conclusions are formulated as follows:

1. Among the four categories of metaphor, Dead category are found with the most numbers of cases in the ST. Also, only one non-figurative expression is found to be rendered as a Dead metaphor in the TT, supporting the Pedersen's (2017) claim that in subtitle, the "addition of a metaphor" in the TT is unlikely in subtitling (p. 9). More than half of the translations result in metaphorical expressions. The least taken option is translation into non-figurative.
2. The poeticness of the TT is found to be weaker than the ST. This is due to the greater number of cases weighed zero (0) in the TT compared to the ST.
3. Five factors are found to motivate the maintaining, decreasing, or increasing of metaphorical force in the TT. The first factor, language system, is found to affect the most number cases, in all of the three possible outcomes of the metaphorical force in the TT. Translator's choice is the other factors which affects the translation in all the three possible outcomes. There are no case of the maintaining of force caused by different labelling, translator's competence, and technical factors. The first causes the force to increase or decrease, and the second and the third only causes the force to decrease.

References

- [1] J. Diaz Cintaz and A. Remael, *Audiovisual Translation: Subtitling*, New York: Routledge, 2014.
- [2] J. Mukařovský, "Standard language and poetic language," in *The History of Czech Functional Linguistics*, 2014, pp. 41-53.
- [3] M. Halliday and C. M. Matthiessen, *Halliday's Introduction to Fuctional Grammar*, Oxon: Routledge, 2013.
- [4] A. Goatly, *The language of metaphors*, London: Routledge, 1997.
- [5] G. Lakoff and M. Johnson, *Metaphors we live by*, Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1980.
- [6] Z. Kövecses, *Metaphor in Culture: Universality and Variation*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

- [7] C. N. Anudo and B. Kodak, "A Conceptual Analysis of Metaphors in Selected Dholuo Popular Music," *International Journal of Innovative Research and Development*, 6 (3), pp. 168-176, 2017.
- [8] J. Dickins, "Two models for metaphor translation," *Target*, pp. 227-273, 2005.
- [9] J. Pedersen, "How metaphors are rendered in subtitles," *Target*, pp. 1-24, 2017.
- [10] R. Eiger and J. (. Simpson, *Oxford English Dictionary Second Edition on CD-ROM Version 4.0*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- [11] E. Steiner, *Translated Texts: Properties, Variants, Evaluations*, Peter Lang, 2004.
- [12] Cohen and L. Jonathan, "The semantics of metaphor," in *Knowledge and Language: Selected Essays of L. Jonathan Cohen*, Springer-Science+Business Media, B.V., 2002, pp. 27-40.
- [13] J. Pedersen, "On the subtitling of visualised metaphors," *The Journal of Specialised Translation*, 23, pp. 162-180, 2015.
- [14] F. Safarnejad, I.-H. Abdullah and N. M. Awal, "Rendering Happiness Metaphors: A Cognitive Analysis from Persian into English," *GEMA Online*, 13(2), pp. 193-205, 2013.
- [15] J. Hanić, T. Pavlović and A. Jahić, "Translating emotion-related metaphors: A cognitive approach," *ExELL (Explorations in English Language and Linguistics)*, 4 (2), pp. 87-101. DOI: 10.1515/exell-2017-0008, 2016.
- [16] E. A. Burmakova and N. I. Marugina, "Cognitive Approach to Metaphor Translation in Literary Discourse," *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 154, pp. 527-533. DOI: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.10.180, 2014 .
- [17] P. Newmark, *A textbook of translation*, New York: Prentice Hall International, 1988.
- [18] G. Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies and beyond: Revised Edition*, Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2012.
- [19] G. Lakoff and M. Turner, *More than Cool Reason*, Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1989.
- [20] G. Schmidt, "Metaphor translation in subtitling," *Linguistics, Culture and Identity in Foreign Language Education*, pp. 832-840, 2014.
- [21] A. R. Al-Hasnawi, "A cognitive approach to translating metaphors," *Translation Journal*, 11 (3), p. <http://translationjournal.net/journal/41metaphor.htm>, 2007.
- [22] M. Taverniers, "Grammatical metaphor and lexical metaphor: different perspectives on semantic variation," *Neophilologus*, p. 321-332, 2006.
- [23] M. Gracey, Director, *The Greatest Showman*. [Film]. 2017.