



What is it that is going on?: The Cultural Interface in English Translated Pasumbingays

Jann Dainver L. Maravilla, MA

Jose Rizal Memorial State University Dapitan City, Philippines

Received: 23 Jul 2025; Received in revised form: 21 Aug 2025; Accepted: 25 Aug 2025; Available online: 31 Aug 2025
©2025 The Author(s). Published by Infogain Publication. This is an open-access article under the CC BY license
(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Abstract— Translating pasumbingays (comparison tropes) into English places the cultural dimension at the core of the whole construct. Hence, this paper has sought to describe the cultural interface in literary translation by analyzing the typology and anatomy of the translated pasumbingays. The comparison tropes from the Pasumbingay Anthology were coded and analyzed based on the typology (Djandjuri et al, 2022) and anatomy (Didau, 2022) of metaphors and similes (Qadir & Riloff, 2015). The study reveals that translators have only resorted to minimal typological changes and trope conversions of the pasumbingays in the intercultural translation process to accommodate the inevitable culture differences. Nevertheless, a larger dataset or corpus may be used or developed to verify the present study's results and make the findings more conclusive.



Keywords— literary translation, interculturality, multiculturalism, culture, literature

I. INTRODUCTION

Essentially, translation is more than the notion of transference; it also deals with transformations, negotiations, mediations, and transcendence making it both a complex and complicated phenomenon which involves the human cognitive sphere, and intercultural issues and, thus requires interdisciplinary studies (Annenkova, 2012).

Clearly, it is often argued that the translation process is more than just a linguistic activity; scholars like Malinowski (1923), Hall (1959), Newmark (2002), Kuhiwczak (2003), Geoffrey (2004), Katan (2009), Glodjovic (2010), and Hakemi (2013) believe that it has always been more of a cultural phenomenon, i.e., crossroad of cultures.

Among existing types of translation, the process of literary translation, as it sets far different from other types of translation, carries with it the very sense of the term 'prudence' in deciding to exhibit a level of fidelity, degree of equivalence, the impact of sameness and achievement of communicativeness and function between two cultures interlanguage with each other.

Moreover, literary translation is not about redressing one language through the worldviews of another while retaining flesh and blood of the former. Still, it is by keeping the tension between the same flesh and blood of the former and clothed in a new dress but another fashion of clothing line to suit the season and intended spectators, all for an acceptable compromise in form and content, in a literal and sensible level, and in communicative and functional purposes.

In the Philippines, literary translation has already been dealing more with prose and plays, and less with poetry as the first two genres have been found to have fewer challenges than the third. However, this literary tradition has been limited to the official languages of the Philippines: Filipino and English, due to language politics which significantly affected the country since the outbreak of the Second World War and the implementation of these two languages as "Medium of Instruction". Remaining to be a thriving field is the regional literary translation practice by the Cebuano translators, who caused the gradual overcoming of the marginalized status of Sebuano despite being one of the most widely celebrated Philippine languages to date.

In this light, this paper seeks to investigate and examine the growing interest in Cebuano literary translation practice as one fertile identity recognition advocacy, among others. Furthermore, this paper scientifically examines the dynamics of Sebuano-English translation, especially on translating comparison tropes or *pasumbingay* in Sebuano poetry, as it comprises the dominant feature of any form of poetry and as poetry having the most translation methods and strategies imposed, thus attracting valid inquiries on the behavior of the comparison tropes or *pasumbingays* in the Cebuano culture. Specifically, this paper has explored how the interface between the two cultures, Cebuano and English, affects the typology and anatomy of the tropes involved.

II. METHODS

This study recognizes the subject's nature and scope: Descriptive Interlingual and Intracultural Translation. Hence, it describes the dynamics or the translation phenomenon as a process of two cultures transacting with each other in meaning-making activity for transference and/or context equivalence with comparison trope as the translation unit.

Furthermore, this paper acknowledges that it dealt with an interlingual type of translation since two languages are involved: Sebuano and English. Yet, it is a process that clearly took place within one culture, the Cebuano culture, hence the term 'intracultural'. This has been made possible by Cebuano authors and translators doing the translation activity themselves. Although not all Cebuano authors translated their own works into English, some of these Cebuano authors had their works translated by fellow Cebuanos, too. This explains the intraculturality of the phenomenon: a Cebuano poem by a Cebuano writer was translated by another Cebuano into English, still using the frame of reference and sensibility of a Cebuano who only happened to be knowledgeable of the English language.

The source culture, then, is Cebuano, and the target is [Philippine] English.

The data used in this study were ten (10) poems from the *Pasumbingay* anthology. This is a collection of

Sebuano poems by Cebuano's best and most promising poets today (Mojares, 2008). This was published in 2008 by BATHALAD, Inc. and was funded by the National Commission for Culture and the Arts.

Moreover, this anthology is deemed appropriate for this study as it contains the poems of the best representatives of Cebuano poetry to date. Also, the poems are translated by Cebuanos as well, some of whom are the authors themselves, and other poems are translated by fellow authors appearing in the anthology. Hence, the corpus must present a reliable sample of Cebuano poetry and its corresponding English translation, both central to the realization of the objectives of this paper.

During the pre-analysis stage, the researcher first coded the data:

ST= Source Text. TT = Target Text, Seq=Sequence (actual order of poem in the anthology), CTS=Comparison Trope Set (the cluster of comparison trope in each poem)

Then, the researcher tallied the comparison tropes and identified the most commonly observed in the Source Text [Sebuano] and the Target Text [English]. This was followed by classifying the comparison tropes between **M=Metaphor or S=Simile B** (the two major comparison tropes under study). Next, the researcher analyzed the typology of metaphor (Didau, 2022) and simile (Qadir & Riloff, 2015). Finally, the researcher analyzed the anatomy of metaphor (Djamdjuri et al, 2022) and simile (Qadir & Riloff, 2015).

III. RESULTS, ANALYSIS, AND DISCUSSION

The cultural perspective of literary translation governs the data analysis in this paper, hence employing a cultural approach. Said analytical perspective largely utilizes the creative transposition (Jakobson, 1959) notion as the premise for such an approach.

Comparison Tropes in The *Pasumbingay* Anthology

Table 1. The Comparison Tropes in the *Pasumbingay* Anthology

Seq.No.	CTS No.	Title of the Poem	Number of Comparison Tropes (Sebuano)	Comparison Tropes (Sebuano)	Number of Comparison Tropes (English)	Comparison Tropes (English)
1	1	"Kamalig"	2	M1, S1	2	M1, S1
2	6	"Tabanog"	7	M5, S2	5	M3, S2

3	7	"Unsaon pagpangga sa babayeng claustrophobic"	3	S3	3	S3
4	8	"Pagpangandam"	2	S2	2	S2
5	11	"Pagbantay"	2	M2	2	M2
6	14	"Sa akong pagkaanod sa ganghaan sa panganod"	4	M1, S3	4	M1, S3
7	15	Kandiis	3	M3	3	M3
8	16	"Halad kay Juliet/ Alang kang Juliet"	1	S1	1	M1
9	19	"Konsepto sa nasuhito"	4	S4	4	S4
10	21	"Bagyo sa balaknong kinabuhi"	1	M1	1	M1
Total Number of Comparison Tropes			29	M13, S16	27	M12, S15

Table 1 shows that there are 29 Sebuano comparison tropes identified from the 10 poems of which 13 are metaphors and 16 are similes; while there are only 27 comparison tropes in the translated versions of which 12 are metaphors and 15 are similes.

Moreover, it is shown in the table above how CTS 6 has reduced its number of comparison tropes from 7 in the SL to 5 in the TL. The 5 comparison tropes include 3 metaphors and 2 similes. The reason for this reduction of the number of metaphors will be explained and discussed in the succeeding sections of this section on analysis.

Furthermore, it can also be noted that there is a comparison trope conversion that happened to S1 in SL of CTS 16 in as it becomes M1 in TL. Similarly, the

explanation regarding the reason for this conversion will be discussed in the later part of this analysis.

Typological Analysis of Metaphors and Similes in ST and TT

This section is the presentation of the typology of metaphors based on the relationship between the tenors and vehicles: Specifically, there are four (4) types of metaphors based on the tenor-vehicle dynamics: **standard metaphor** has two exactly unrelated objects being compared to each other; **implied metaphor** presents either an implicit tenor or vehicle; **visual metaphor** allows the tenor to be compared to any visual image; lastly, the **extended metaphor** has a vehicle embedded throughout the poem.

Table 2. Typology of the Metaphors in the ST and TT based on the Tenor-Vehicle Dynamics

Seq No.	CTS No.	Metaphors in ST	Metaphors in TT	Remarks
1	1	M1: Visual	M1: Visual	Retained
2	6	M1: Implied M2: Implied M3: Visual M4: Visual M5: Visual	M1: Implied M2: Implied M3, M4, M5: Implied	Retained Retained Changed
3	11	M1: Standard/Visual M2: Standard	M1: Standard/Visual M2: Standard	Retained Retained
4	14	M1: Standard	M1: Standard	Retained
5	15	M1: Standard/Visual M2: Standard/Visual M3: Standard/Visual	M1: Standard/Visual M2: Standard/Visual M3: Standard/Visual	Retained Retained Retained
6	16		M1: Standard	Converted
7	21	M1: Visual	M1: Implied	Changed

Total	Visual=5	Implied=4	
	Hybrid=4	Hybrid=4	
	(Standard/Visual)	(Standard/Visual)	
	Standard=2	Visual=1	
	Implied=2	Standard=3	

Table 2 shows the typology of metaphors in both the ST and the TT. Notably, there three (3) distinct types, plus one hybrid, for a total of four types of metaphor which have been employed by the Cebuano authors and considered by the Cebuano translators as described in the table. Specifically, the most commonly used type of metaphor among the select Sebuano poems is the ‘standard type’, which, accounting for its participation in the hybridized type, occurred 6 times, and the least used is the ‘implied’ type which only occurred two (2) times. Similarly, the ‘standard’ type of metaphors is described the most commonly used metaphor in the TT having occurred seven (7) times; the least commonly used type of metaphor is the ‘visual’ type having distinctly occurred once.

As it can be seen from the same table and following the discussion of Table 3, of the seven (7) poems with metaphors, only three have metaphors which are phenomenal: **Seq2-CTS6-M3** to **M5**, **Seq7-CTS21-M1** and **Seq6-CTS16-M1**.

Specifically, **Seq2-CTS6-M3** to **M5** is a phenomenon in this analysis because these three metaphors are visual metaphors in ST, and they have become implied in the translation version. The ST tenors: **M3**: *kamot*, **M4**: *tiil*, and **M5**: *buhok* have been translated into **M3**, **M4**, **M5**: ‘waves that break’ to capture the transformation of the original collective subject of the original tenors which is a ‘departed loved one’ into a ‘kite’ as implied by the vehicles *pako*, *ikog*, and ‘*higot*’, and for which the TT vehicle ‘[a person] singing dirges’ laments about. This translation phenomenon, which appears to be a shift of trope by form and type, herein labelled by the researcher is ‘morphotypological shift’, clearly supports what the Durado et.al (2008), editors of the *Pasumbingay* anthology, claim that there is no such a word in English that comes closest to the Sebuano word ‘*pasumbingay*’ but the likes of metaphor, imagery, simile, allegory, analogy, apologue, and even personification.

Another phenomenon that can be seen from the table is the change of typology of **Seq7-CTS-21M1** from being a ‘visual metaphor’ in the ST being an ‘implied metaphor’ in the TT. This is due to the change that the TT vehicle went through in the process of translation; from the

ST vehicle *hinagiban* to TT vehicle *From inflicting any pain*, which both mean ‘weapon’ as can be inferred from both ST and TT grounds. This implies that the vehicle translation was made from word to sense (Newmark, 1988). This is possible through Nida's dynamic equivalence theory of translation (1964). Hence, this is a case of a plain ‘typological shift’.

On the other hand, **Seq6-CTS16-M1** is another phenomenon because it can be seen from Table 2 that this comparison trope has not retained its status as a simile and eventually became a metaphor in the translation process. Hence, it is herein labeled as ‘statutypological shift’. As stated above, this can possibly happen since simile is a subcategory of metaphors (‘metaphor’, Masterclass, 2022).

Lastly, it can be inferred from the same table that the metaphors, which are standard metaphors, are also presented as visuals due to the visual characteristics of the vehicles as objects of comparison with the tenors concerned. This is indicated, for example, in **Seq5-CTS15-M1** which its tenor ‘*kanang gamayng lumping sa imong amping*’, translated as ‘that tiny dent on your cheek’ in English becomes an image of a *hingpit nga hinagiban*, translated as ‘perfect weapon’ in English. Likewise, a standard metaphor can also be a visual metaphor even it its tenor is not an abstract one. This is similarly indicated in **Seq5-CTS15-M1** to **M3** of which their respective tenors are already a visual image of a *kandiis*, translated as dimple in English, and is compared to another set of visual images such as *hinagiban*, *kuhit* and *balahibo*, translated in the TT as a weapon, a pole and a feather, respectively.

From the analysis above, it can be inferred that those metaphors by nature are generally imagery in form and function which aim to stimulate the senses of the readers or audience (Reeder, 2022). Although some metaphors are implicitly used in the select poems under investigation, they are outnumbered by those that paint concrete pictures in the readers’ minds.

The next section discusses the typology of these similes based on the explicitness of the ‘event’ as a component in the simile to signal the obviously shared attribute between the **tenor** and the **vehicle**. Hence, the

explicit mention of an **event** in a simile is called a ‘**closed simile**’, which warrants an explanation for comparing the subject and the object, or the tenor and vehicle, respectively.

On the other hand, an ‘**open simile**’ does not explicitly mention any event that would explain the comparison between the tenor and the vehicle; hence the shared attribute is implied.

Table 3. Typological Analysis of Similes in ST and TT

Seq. No.	CTS No.	Similes in ST	Similes in TT	Remarks
1	1	S1: closed	S1: closed	retained
2	6	S1: closed S2: closed	S1: closed S2: open	retained changed
3	7	S1: closed S2: closed S3: closed	S1: closed S2: closed S3: closed	retained retained retained
4	8	S1: open S2: open	S1: open S2: open	retained retained
5	14	S1: open S2: open S3: open	S1: open S2: open S3: open	retained retained retained
6	16	S1: open	(translated as a metaphor)	converted
7	19	S1: closed S2: open S3: closed S4: closed	S1: closed S2: open S3: open S4: closed	retained retained retained retained
Closed		9	7	
Open		7	8	

Table 3 shows the typological analysis of the similes both in ST and TT indicating that both the two types of similes have been used by the authors. Specifically, the type that is insignificantly higher in frequency by use is the closed simile which occurred nine (9) times over the open simile which occurred only seven (7) times in ST; while it remains true in TT having eight (8) open similes over seven (7) closed ones.

Comparatively, the number of open similes in TT is only higher by one trope due to the change of typology from **closed** to **open** as indicated in **Seq2-CTS6-S2** such that the original tenor *tiil*, translated as ‘feet’, is compared to *balod* as the vehicle in ST but is rewritten as phrasal vehicle “*what it was like to stay...*”, this time referring to a person who has the ability to come and walk away, just like the ability of the waves to ebb and flow along the shore. Here, the ST vehicle has changed regarding the object of comparison while retaining the sense of ‘departure’, hence another case of ‘morphotypological shift’.

Moreover, **Seq6-CTS16-S1** is another phenomenon based on the data presented in the same table. It can be seen that the open simile in ST is translated as a standard metaphor. The trope conversion happened due to the absence of a comparator in the translated version. Specifically, the simile “[**tenor**]*ikaw* + [**comparator**]*daw* + [**vehicle**]*ang adlaw sa kalibutan*” is translated as “[**tenor**]*you are* + [**vehicle**]*the sun of earth*”.

Lastly, it can be inferred that most of the metaphors have retained its typology after translation, while **Seq2-CTS6-S2** and **Seq6-CTS16-S1** went typological change and trope conversion, respectively.

Thus, it can be interpreted that the liberty of translators to translate *pasumbingays* could go as far as modifying the tenors and vehicles for as long as the same sense is relayed to the target audience (Newmark, 1988; Nida, 2002).

Table 4. Summary of the Analysis of Translated Comparison Tropes in terms of Typology in ST and TT

CT	No. of Comparison Tropes		Typology	Frequency in ST	Frequency TT
	ST	TT			
Metaphor	13	12	Standard	2	3
			Visual	5	1
			Implied	2	4
			Hybrid	4	4
Simile	16	15	Open	7	8
			Closed	9	7

Table 4 summarizes the comparison tropes identified in both ST and TT. The number of tropes by kind is comparatively insignificant to each other. The same can be implied in the comparative number of comparison tropes by type in ST and TT. This implies that the authors have been exhibiting a balance as far as the use of metaphor and

simile is concerned, and so do the translators in attempting to preserve the statuses and typologies in their respective translations.

Anatomical Analysis of Metaphors and Similes in ST and TT

Table 5. Anatomy of Metaphors and Similes in ST and TT

<i>Pasumbingay</i>	Tenor	Comparator	Event	Vehicle	Shared Property
Metaphor	✓			✓	✓
Simile	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Table 5 shows that a metaphor has three components: the **topic** or **tenor**, which is the subject of the metaphor; the **vehicle** is the term used as metaphorically; and the **ground**, which is the established relationship or meaning between the **tenor** and the **vehicle** (Didau, 2022).

On the other hand, a simile has five components: the **topic** or **tenor** which is the subject of the comparison; the **vehicle** is the object of comparison; and the **event** refers to the act or state of comparison; the **‘comparator’** are usually functioning as prepositions connecting the objects in comparison; and the **property (shared attribute)** which can optionally be included to explicitly state how the tenor is being compared with the vehicle, this likewise establishes the **relationship** or meaning between the tenor and the vehicle (Qadir& Riloff, 2015).

It can be further substantiated here that metaphor is a direct comparison between two seemingly unlike objects that are related to a shared property called the ‘ground’. While simile is a metaphor that allows indirect comparison between two uncommonly compared objects by using comparators and the occasional presence of an ‘event’.

The data of this study demonstrated and confirmed the anatomy of both comparison tropes, metaphor and simile.

In fact, the analysis of the anatomy of the said *pasumbingays* has revealed the nature of the structure and the movement of structure of these tropes once they get translated from Sebuano to English.

Table 6. Pairing Levels in the Anatomical Structure of Metaphor and Simile

PASUMBINGAY	Metaphor		Simile	
	ST	TT	ST	TT
word-to-word	✓	✓	✓	
word-to-phrase	✓	✓	✓	
phrase-to-phrase	✓	✓	✓	✓
phrase-sentence	✓	✓		
sentence-to-sentence	✓			

Table 6 shows that the anatomy of the 13 metaphors found in the six (6) Sebuano poems are expressed in word-to-word (**Seq2-CTS6-M3**), word-to-phrasal (**Seq1-CTS1-M1**), phrasal-to phrasal (**Seq5-CTS15-M1**), phrasal to sentential (**Seq5-CTS15-M2**) and sentential to sentential (**Seq4-CTS15-M1**) pairing levels in as far as their respective tenor-vehicle dynamics are concerned. This reflects the ubiquity and importance of metaphors in the Sebuano language or any language in general as it can be observed in various lengths, frequencies, and discourse unit pairings, i.e., from words to sentential levels (Cardillo et al., 2010.) Further, this implies that metaphors, as collectively called *pasumbingay* in Sebuano alongside similes, allegories, and other types of analogy, has been integral in the language and the culture of its speakers (Du, 2021).

Moreover, of the 6 poems, there are two (2) titles involved in the employment of metaphor: (1) **Seq1-CTS1-M1** and (2) **Seq2-CTS6-M1**. This is an instance of extended metaphor, which is the object of comparison in the poem, with the subject being usually the title. ‘*All the World’s a Stage*’, which is an extract from William Shakespeare’s play ‘*As You Like It*’, is a title and a metaphor in itself and is further demonstrated throughout the whole of the poem. Such are the cases for (1) **Seq1-CTS1-M1** and (2) **Seq2-CTS6-M1**, except that their corresponding vehicles are either both explicitly and implicitly supplied throughout the respective bodies of each poem. Remarkably, the titles which have been used as part of an extended metaphor are nouns, just as how the famous poems ‘*Road Not Taken*’ by Frost and ‘*Hope*’ by Dickinson make use of the noun titles as the subject of comparison in establishing an extended metaphor throughout each body of the poems.

On the other hand, the anatomical structures of the 12 metaphors found in the seven (7) English translations of the poems are expressed in word-to-word (**Seq3-CTS11-M1**), word-to-phrasal (**Seq6-CTS16-M1**), phrasal to phrasal (**Seq5-CTS15-M12**), and sentential to phrasal (**Seq4-CTS14-M1**) pairing levels in as far as their

respective tenor-vehicle dynamics are concerned. Of the seven (7) poems, the (2) titles which are involved in the employment of metaphor in the original poems have preserved their respective comparison trope state in their corresponding translation: (1) **Seq1-CTS1-M1** and (2b

Noticeably, the number of poems where metaphors are identified increases by one (1), with the **CTS 16** added to the list after a simile from the same set has been translated as a metaphor, as indicated in **Seq6-CTS16-S1->M1**. This implies that conversion like this happens without necessarily affecting the intended sense and meaning of the comparison. This conversion is likely possible because all similes are metaphors, while not all metaphors can be drawn from similes (‘metaphor’, Masterclass, 2022).

Moreover, another remarkable phenomenon is the convergence of three (3) metaphors in **Seq2-CTS6**, specifically **M3**, **M4**, and **M5**. This results from the original metaphor clusters in the ST where the three distinct tenors ‘*kamot*’, ‘*till*’, and ‘*buhok*’ have been reduced to an image of the ‘*waves*’; while the corresponding vehicles ‘*pako*’, ‘*ikog*’ and ‘*hikot*’ are translated as the personified waves as ‘*singing dirges*’. It can be inferred that the translation has exercised a degree of liberty of rewriting the original cluster of metaphors into a single personification. According to Newmark (1988), this case is possible because a metaphor is conceptually defined not only by the subject-object relationship in terms of comparison but also by the sense (ground) that holds the two together as the shared similarity, hence the translatability can also take place in the sense level aside from performing it over the tenor (subject) and/or the vehicle (object).

Furthermore, the anatomy of the 16 similes found in the ST are expressed in word to word (**Seq2-CTS6-S2**), word to phrasal (**Seq1-CTS1-S1**), and phrasal to phrasal (**Seq7-CTS19-S3**) pairing levels in as far as their respective tenor-vehicle dynamics are concerned. Out of the 16 similes, 7 of which do not explicitly come with their corresponding **events**. Also, it can be seen from the table

that there is only one (1) poem of which the title is part of the simile used, and it is indicated in **Seq1-CTS1-S1** functioning as **tenor**: *kamalig*. This implies that the use of a comparator in simile seems to restrict the possibility of extending a simile to sentential level in terms of pairing a tenor and a vehicle. The same implication can be drawn for only having one poem, of which the title serves as the tenor of a simile trope. In **Seq1-CTS1**, the tenor '*kamalig*', which is the title of the poem, is further described as '*solitaryong nagbarog*' translated as 'alone he stands' is followed by its vehicle preceded by the comparator '*daw*' translated as 'like' therefore forming a complete simile as a single unit of the trope. Thus, it can be interpreted that simile is less likely to be extended like metaphors except for epic or Homeric similes which are usually observed in epic poetry. Here similes run to several lines to intensify the subject's heroic stature and serve as decoration, '*Iliad*' is an example (Britannica.com).

Furthermore, the comparators used in the ST similes, such as *daw*, *sama*, *mora*, *ingon*, *as* and *like*. Out of the six (6) comparators, the most commonly used is *sama* which occurred six (6) times; while the least used, which both occurred only once, are *as* and *like*, which are not Sebuano words and are clearly resulting from the code-mixing process that has been taking place between Sebuano and English indicative of the current speech lexicon of Cebuano speakers (Maravilla, 2021) such that these two English words are used in a Sebuano poem. Nevertheless, they are accounted as comparators in the ST in this study.

This can therefore be interpreted that Sebuano poems make use of comparators depending on the context of the similes such that for those that are associated with abstractions like depth and transformation, as indicated in the shared properties of the tenors and vehicles in **Seq2-CTS6** and **Seq4-CTS8**, respectively, the comparator '*sama*' is likely to be preferred. While the comparator '*ingon*' is more likely preferred for similes that depict specificity in comparison terms like how the details are presented in **Seq3-CTS7-S1** to **S3**. In the said comparison trope set, the tenors of the similes '*pangga siya*' are likened to specific tangible action '*ingon ka hugot sa pagtuno sa kwerdas sa sista*' for **S1**; and to concrete images '*ingon ka sigkit sa ang-ang sa hagdan*' or the proximity between the rungs in a ladder for **S2**, and '*ingon ka huot sa lusong sa alwa*' or the how perfectly fit a pestle is for its mortar for **S3**.

On the other hand, comparators '*daw*' and '*mora*' or '*mora kuno*' are used to indicate less certainty of comparison between the tenor and the vehicle such that in **Seq1-CTS1-S1** the tenor '*kamalig*' seems loosely likened to '*bugtong isog*' and is further justified in the preceding

lines in the same stanza to reinforce the function of the comparison. The same behavior is observed as '*mora*' is used as the comparator in the code-mixed similes as shown in **Seq7-CTS19-S3** to **S4**, hence the need to be reinforced by their respective events to establish further the comparative effect between the respective tenors and their corresponding vehicles.

Hence, this can be interpreted that comparators do not actually behave by random choice of the poets but by the context at hand. They behave according to the certainty of the comparison terms and the nature of the objects and subjects of comparison. Additionally, the similes can have abstract and concrete tenors and vehicles and exhibit code-mixing. This implies that Sebuano Pasumbingays, at least for similes in this case, have been dynamic in terms of linguistic and stylistic preferences, more so with the decision to use the said comparators.

IV. CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of the study, the researchers hereby conclude that the authors have been exhibiting a balance as far as the use of metaphor and simile is concerned, and so do the translators in attempting to preserve the statuses and typologies in their respective translations (Rura, 2015); majority of the translations of these comparison tropes have reached a fairly precise level of equivalence to the ST while only a few have exhibited mid to low approximation in terms of cultural difference as revealed by the morphotypological and statutypological shifts of some *pasumbingays* after they got translated into English.

Moreover, it has been evident that both cultures cooperate in the process of meaning-making as provided by a relatively yet generally low level of cultural difference; also, translators have the tendency to subject both the source culture and target culture to close comparative evaluation of their respective contexts of culture and situation despite these being the works of writers and translators from the same culture, hence collectively possessing one value and belief system.

Therefore, the typological shifts (sense), trope conversions (status), and structural changes (form) are realized in translating *pasumbingays* due to the presence of culturemes in every text, hence the indispensable role of culture in the process of negotiation, mediation, transcendence, and transformation of any points of difference, hence the interface.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the conclusion, the researcher strongly recommends that a larger data or corpus may be used or developed to verify the present study's results and make the findings more conclusive.

translations of the Russian poet Alexander Galich.
<https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/n16-1146>

REFERENCES

- [1] Cardillo, E., Schmidt, G., Kranjec, A., Chatetterjee, A. (2010). *Stimulus design is an obstacle course: 650 matched literal and metaphorical sentences for testing neural hypothesis about metaphor*. Behavior Research Methods
- [2] Didau, D. (2022, March 1). Using tenor, vehicle and ground to analyse metaphors. David Didau. Retrieved March 13, 2022, from <https://learningspy.co.uk/english-gcse/using-tenor-vehicle-and-ground-to-analyse-metaphors/>
- [3] Djamdjuri, D. (2022). Metaphor in Parable from the Noble Qur'an: A Corpus Based Stylistic Approach. Jurnal Studi Al-Qur'an.
- [4] Du, N.S. (2021). *Balak: Cebuano poetry and bridging gaps in a multilingual nation*. Heights Ateneo – The Official Literary and Artistic Publication and Organization of the Ateneo d Manila University.
- [5] Geoffrey S (2004). A practical guide for translators. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- [6] Glodjovic, A. (2010). Translation as a means of cross-cultural communication: Some problems in literary text translations. Facta Universitatis, Series: Linguistics and Literature, 8(2), 141–151.
- [7] Hakemi, B. G. (2013). The possibilities and limitations of literary translation: A review of J. payne's and henri clarke's translations of ghazalyat of hafez. International Journal of English and Literature, 4(8), 375–387. <https://doi.org/10.5897/IJEL12.166>
- [8] Hall, E. (1959). The silent language (1st ed.). Garden City, New York : Doubleday & Company, Inc. Matters.
- [9] Kuhiwczak, P. (2003). Chapter 8. The troubled identity of literary translation. Translation Today, 112–124. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853596179-010>
- [10] Katan, D. (2009, January 13). Translation as intercultural communication. Taylor & Francis. Retrieved September 22, 2021, from https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9780203879450_12/translation-intercultural-communication-david-katan
- [11] Malinowski. (1923). The problem of meaning in primitive language. London: K. Paul, Trend, Trubner.
- [12] Newmark, P. (1988). A textbook of translation. Prentice Hall.
- [13] Nida, E. A. (2002). *Contexts in translating (benjamins translation library)*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- [14] Qadir, A., Riloff, E., & Walker, M. A. (2016). Automatically inferring implicit properties in similes. Proceedings of the 2016 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, 1, 1223-1232.
- [15] Rura, L. (2010). Analysis of translated tropes: metaphors, similes & analogies in a case study of the English & Dutch