

# THE RELATIONSHIP OF TRADITIONAL HOUSE AND COMMUNAL FARMING LAND AS CULTURAL PROPERTIES OF CLAN IN MANGGARAIAN SOCIETY (A CULTURAL LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS)

Fransiskus Bustan

[frankybustando@gmail.com](mailto:frankybustando@gmail.com)

Lecturer of the Faculty of Teacher Training and Educational Sciences, Nusa Cendana University Kupang

Ni Wayan Sumitri

[wsmitri66@gmail.com](mailto:wsmitri66@gmail.com)

Lecturer of the Faculty of Teacher Training and Educational Sciences, PGRI Mahadewa University Indonesia, Bali

***ABSTRACT.** This study aims to describe the relationship of traditional house and communal farming land in Manggaraian society. The study is viewed from the perspective of cultural linguistics as one of the new theoretical perspectives in cognitive linguistics exploring the relationship of language, culture, and conceptualization. The study is descriptive-qualitative. The results of study show that the relationship of traditional house and communal farming land in Manggaraian society is reflected in the verbal expression of Manggaraian language, *Gendangn one, lingkon pe'ang 'Drum inside, round field outside'*. The forms and meanings of linguistic phenomena used in the verbal expression designate the conceptualization of Manggaraian society regarding the ownership of the *mbaru gendang* as the origin house of the *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan living in one village and the *lingko randang* as common farming land belonging to the *wa'u* as the source of their life welfare as dry land farmers. The verbal expression is a linguistic evidence inherited from the ancestors of Manggaraian society indicating the existence of the *wa'u* as partilineal-genealogic clan as a house-based community whose livelihood is as dry land farmers.*

**Key words:** *traditional house, communal farming land, clan cultural properties, Manggaraian society*

## I. INTRODUCTION

Indonesia is a large multiethnic nation as its society is formed from thousands of ethnic groups. As every ethnic group has its local culture and language, Indonesia is known not only as a multiethnic nation but also as a multicultural and multilingual nation. The miniature of Indonesia as a large multiethnic, multicultural, and multilingual nation can be seen in the province of East Nusa Tenggara as its population consists of eighteen ethnic groups. One of the ethnic groups is Manggaraian ethnic group which refers to Manggaraian society residing in the region of Manggarai which occupies approximately one third of the length of the island of Flores as one of the big islands in the province of East Nusa Tenggara (Bagul, 1997; Erb, 1999; Lawang, 1999; Bustan, 2005; Bustan, 2006; Bustan et al, 2017; Bustan, 2018; Bustan & Bire, 2018; Gunas et al, 20023; Bustan & Kabelen, 2023). The members of Manggaraian society are identified as members of Manggaraian ethnic group because they are bound by the awareness of sharing the same culture, Manggaraian culture, and the awareness of speaking the same language, Manggaraian language (Bustan, 2005; Bustan, 2006; Bustan, 2018; Liunokas et al, 2023). This implies meaning that both Manggaraian language and Manggaraian culture belonging to Manggaraian society as members of Manggaraian ethnic group are closely related. The relationship is reflected in the conceptualization ascribed in their cognitive map in viewing and making sense of the world, including both the factual world and the symbolic world (Bustan, 2005; Berger & Luckman, 1967; Grice, 1987; Cassirer, 1987; Suriasumantri, 2001).

Bearing the matters stated above in minds, this study investigates the relationship of Manggaraian language, Manggaraian culture, and conceptualization of Manggaraian

people as members of Manggaraian ethnic group in viewing and making sense of their world. As the relationship is so complex in nature that the study focuses on the forms and meanings of linguistic phenomena used in the verbal expression of Manggaraian language designating the conceptualization of Manggaraian society regarding the relationship of their traditional house and communal farming land as the cultural properties of clan inherited from their ancestors. The study is conducted for the basic reason that the forms of linguistic phenomena used in the verbal expression imply multiple meanings that include social, economy, juridical, historical, and religious meanings. Added to this, the relationship of traditional house and communal farming land as the cultural properties of clan in Manggaraian society has been changed at a certain degree in their today's Manggaraian society. The changes are due to the dynamics of Manggaraian culture as the result of the dynamics of Manggaraian society in viewing and making sense of their world. Because of such changes, the relationship of their traditional house and communal farming land as the cultural properties of clan inherited from their ancestors becomes a frozen form of cultural text in today's Manggaraian society.

## **II. FRAMEWORK**

Different societies speak different languages for the reason that every language has its own system. The differences between the systems of languages can be seen in three formal levels that, in technical linguistic terms, include semantic, lexico-gramatical, and phonological level (Hasan, 1988). As every language represents the world of thoughts with its own ways, the differences between languages are actually due to cultural differences shared by the speakers of those languages. This view is in line with the conception of Humboldt that the diversity of languages is not a diversity of signs and sounds, but a diversity of the worldviews (Cassirer, 1987; Miller, 1968; Keesing, 1981; Ochs, 1988; Hall, 1997; Alshammari, 2018). The conception comes closest to the theory of linguistic relativity proposed by Sapir and Whorf that the varying cultural concepts and categories inherent in different languages affect the cognitive classification of the experienced world in such a way that speakers of different languages think and behave differently. As such, the principles that should be taken into account when we explore a new language are as follows: (a) we perceive the world in terms of categories and distinctions found in our native language and (b) what is found in one language may not be found in another language due to cultural differences (Boas, 1962; Miller, 1968; Bustan, 2005; Birx, 2011). The principles are in line with the insight of Brown (1994) that culture is deeply ingrained part of the very fiber of our being, but language as the means for communication is the most visible and available expression of our culture (Brown, 1994; Palmer, 1996; Foley, 1997; Kramsch, 2001; Fairclough, 2003). The use of language as the most visible and available expression of culture shared by a society as members of a social group can be seen in the features of language they employ in various domains which reflect the ways they view and make sense of their world (Boas, 1962; Goodenough, 1964; Foley, 1997; Palmer & Sharifian, 2007). The culture of a people finds its reflection in the language they employ because they value certain things and do them in a certain way, they come to use their language in ways that reflect what they

value and what they do (Palmer & Sharifian, 2007; Wardaugh, 2011; Wierzbicka, 1991; Birx, 2011).

The use of language as the most visible and available expression of culture belonging to a society is one of the main concerns of study in cultural linguistics as one of the theoretical perspectives in cognitive linguistics which explores the relationship between language, culture, and conceptualization. As language can be defined differently, in the perspective of cultural linguistics, language is defined as a cultural activity and, at the same time, and as an instrument for organizing other cultural domains. The conception is based on the premise that language used by a society as members of a social group is shaped not only by special and general innate potentials but also by their physical and sociocultural experiences. As the definition and significance of culture vary from school to school, in the perspective of cultural linguistics, culture is defined as the source of conceptualization of experience faced by a society as members of a social group in viewing and making sense of their world (Palmer & Sharifian, 2007; Palmer, 1996; Wallace, 1981; Keesing, 1981). The relationship between both language and culture belonging to a society as members of a social group is reflected in their conceptualization which refers to the way they conceptualize experiences in their minds or cognitions. Therefore, language they employ is defined as the window into their minds or cognitions (Palmer & Sharifian, 2007; Wallace, 1981; Stross, 1981; Casson, 1981; Whorf, 2001).

On the other side, it is worth noting that the use of language as a symbolic system with the power to shape and create such symbolic realities as norms, values, perceptions, and identities is expressed through discourse as its vehicle (Kramersch, 2009; Dillitone, 2002). Discourse as the vehicle of symbolic realities is produced when they interact with each other, as pointed out by Kovecses (2009) that when people interact with each other for particular purposes and to achieve their goals of interactions, they produce particular discourses as assemblies of meanings dealing with particular subject matters. When the discourses present a conceptual framework within which significant subject matters are discussed in their culture and latent norms of conduct, discourses are identified as the sources of ideologies. Therefore, according to Geertz (1971) and Schneider (1976), a discourse is defined as the source of making meaning in a culture. The function of a discourse as the source of making meaning in a culture is realised in a cultural discourse as an umbrella term for any form of discourse which takes place within a cultural domain that contains a set of items, behaviors, and beliefs defined as belonging to the same category of things (Gumperz, 1992).

Along with the conception of Langacker (1999) that language is an essential instrument and component of culture whose reflection can be seen in the forms of linguistic phenomena used, Kovecses (2009) propounds that a cultural discourse is a repository of meanings shared by members of a culture. As cultural domain is a basic unit of meaning that shapes how a people as members of a social group organize their world, a cultural discourse in this light can be defined as the vehicle for the representation of their cultural conceptualization. The cultural conceptualization is reflected in the forms and meanings of linguistic phenomena they employ in the cultural discourse. The forms refer to the physical features of linguistic phenomena used in the cultural discourse, as seen in such

linguistic units as words, phrases, clauses, and sentences. The meanings refer to the contents stored in the forms of linguistic phenomena used that function as the source of the conceptualization of experiences faced by the speakers those languages in their contexts of living together in viewing and making sense of their world (Foley, 1997; Bustan, 2005). Therefore, the analysis of conceptualization ascribed in the cognitive map of a society as members of a social group should refer to the forms and meanings of linguistic phenomena they employ in cultural discourses (Bustan, 2005).

### **III.METHODOLOGY**

This is a descriptive study as its aim is to describe the relationship of traditional house and communal farming land as the cultural properties of clan in Manggaraian society based on the conceptualization ascribed in their cognitive map. The sources of data were primary and secondary data. In line with the two kinds of data, the procedures of research were field and library research. The field research was aimed at collecting the primary data regarding the conceptualization of Manggaraian society on the relationship of traditional house and communal farming land as the cultural properties of clan. In an attempt to achieve the intended aim, the field research was carried out in the regency of Manggarai, especially in Ruteng town as the capital city of Manggarai regency, as the main location of field research (Muhadjir, 1995). The data were obtained by using ethnographic approach, that is dialogic-ethnographic approach (Hymes, 1974; Spradley, 1997; Palmer & Sharifian, 2007; Geertz, 1971; Foley, 1997; Bernstein, 1972). The methods of data collection were interview and focused-group discussion. The interviews were done with the members of Manggaraian society represented by five key informants selected on basis of ideal criteria proposed by Faisal (1990), Spradley (1997), and Sudikan (2001). The interviews were aimed at distilling their conceptualization regarding the relationship of traditional house and communal farming land as the cultural properties of clan in Manggaraian society, as reflected in the forms and meanings of verbal expressions in Manggaraian language. For the sake of data triangulation, the focused-group discussion was also carried out with the key informants. Besides recording data, we also took some notes during the interview and focused-group discussion. The library research was done to collect the secondary data relevant to the relationship of traditional house and communal farming land as the cultural properties of clan in Manggaraian society as the main concern of the study. The method of data collection was documentary study. The documents used as the sources of reference were of two kinds, including general documents (books) and special documents (scientific articles, results of research, paper). The collected data were then analyzed qualitatively by inductive method as the analysis was started from the data to local-ideographic theory/concept as it describes the relationship of traditional house and communal farming land as the cultural properties of clan in Manggaraian society.

### **IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

#### **Results**

The results of study show that there is a close relationship between both Manggaraian language and Manggaraian culture belonging to Manggaraian society as members of Manggaraian ethnic group. The relationship is manifested in the conceptualization of ascribed in their cognitive map in viewing and making sense of the world, including both the factual world and the symbolic world. Along with the main concern of this study, more specifically, the manifestation of such a relationship is reflected in the conceptualization of Manggaraian society regarding the relationship between both traditional house known as *mbaru gendang* in Manggaraian language and communal farming land known as *lingko randang* in Manggaraian language as the cultural properties of clan known as *wa'u* in Manggaraian language which refers to a patrilineal-genealogic clan (Verheijen, 1991; Bagul, 1997; Erb, 1999; Lawang, 1999; Bustan, 2005; Bustan, 2006; Bustan, 2018).

## **Discussion**

Before discussing in more depth the relationship between both traditional house and communal farming land as cultural properties of clan in Manggaraian society as the main concern of study, it is firstly necessary to describe the term *mbaru gendang* (traditional house) and the term *lingko rangkang* (communal farming land) as key concepts of the relationship.

### **Traditional House**

As mentioned earlier, the traditional house as a cultural identity of clan in Manggaraian society is called *mbaru gendang* in Manggaraian language. As seen in its forms, the term *mbaru gendang* is a noun phrase made up of two words as its component parts, including the word (noun) *mbaru* 'house' as the core word that functions as the HEAD (H) and the word (noun) *gendang* 'drum' that functions as its MODIFIER (M). Referring to its lexical items, the *mbaru gendang* means 'drum house'. The traditional house of Manggaraian society is called the *mbaru gendang* because there stores the *gendang* 'drum'. The *gendang* is conceptualized by Manggaraian society as the representation of the ancestors of the *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan living in one *beo* 'village' who owns the house. Along with the conceptualization of the *gendang*, the *mbaru gendang* is thought of as a sacred house because it serves as the central place of ritual authority in a village. As such, it is not surprising that the *gendang* stored in the *mbaru gendang* is given special treatments its place and use. In terms of its place, the *gendang* is hang in such in a way in the *siri bongkok* as the central pole of the *mbaru gendang* that it cannot be reached by children playing around the *siri bongkok*. In addition, the *gendang* is only beaten by Manggaraian society in certain contexts of ritual in accordance with tradition inherited from their ancestors. It is worth noting that the drum beaten on the situational contexts of ritual is aimed at communicating with their ancestors in the spiritual world.

### **Communal Farming Land**

As mentioned earlier, the communal farming land as a cultural property of clan in Manggaraian society is called *lingko randang* in Manggaraian language. As seen in the

forms of its linguistic phenomena, the term *lingko randang* as is a noun phrase made up of two words as its component parts, including the word (noun) *lingko* ‘farming land’ as the core word that functions as the HEAD (H) and the word (noun) *randang* ‘party’ that functions as its MODIFIER (M). The *lingko randang* refers to a communal farming land belonging to the *wa’u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan living in one village. The form of the *lingko randang* is circular and in the middle there is a *lodok* as the center of the land. The *lodok* as the center of the *lingko randang* is said to be the sacred place (*axis mundi*) because it symbolizes the unity of the sky (father above) and the land (mother below). In certain contexts, the term *lingko rame* is also used as the synonym of the term *lingko randang*. The term *lingko rame* is a noun phrase made up of two words as its component parts, including the word (noun) *lingko* ‘farming land’ as the core word that functions as the HEAD (H) and the word (adjective) *rame* ‘crowded’ as the attribute that functions as its MODIFIER (M). It is called *lingko rame* because the farming land is celebrated lively in the ritual of *penti*, agricultural new year’s party celebrated as a sign that the old season has ended and the new season will begin (Bustan, 2005).

### **Relationship of Traditional House and Communal Farming Land**

The relationship between both the *mbaru gendang* and the *lingko randang* as the cultural properties of the *wa’u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan in Manggaraian society is reflected in the verbal expression of Manggaraian language, *Gendangn one, lingkon pe’ang* ‘Drum inside, round field outside’. The features of linguistic phenomena used in the verbal expression are specific to Manggaraian culture as the parent culture or hosting culture in which Manggaraian language is embedded. In terms of the two poles of linguistic sign, the specific features of linguistic phenomena used in the verbal expression can be seen in their forms and meanings. As seen in the forms of linguistic phenomena used, the verbal expression appears as a declarative sentence as it provides information regarding the ownership of both the *mbaru gendang* and the *lingko randang* as the cultural properties of the *wa’u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan in Manggaraian society.

While in terms of its component parts, the verbal expression appears in the form of a compound sentence made up of two independent clauses, including (1) *Gendangn one* ‘Drum inside’ and (2) *Lingkon pe’ang* ‘Round field outside’. The combination of the two independent clauses forms an asyndeton construction as the relationship of the two independent clauses is not linked by using the word (function word) *agu* ‘and’ as the coordinating conjunction that functions as a lexical cohesive device. The coordinating conjunction is intentionally omitted for the reason that the verbal expression is a fixed form of verbal expression inherited from the ancestors of Manggaraian society uncovering their conceptualization on the relationship between both the *mbaru gendang* and the *lingko randang* as the cultural properties of the *wa’u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan. Nevertheless, the lexical items of the verbal expression are still cohesive in their forms and coherent in their meanings as well designating the conceptualization of Manggaraian society regarding the relationship between both the *mbaru gendang* and the *lingko randang* as the cultural properties of the *wa’u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan.

On the other side, the omission of the coordinating conjunction is aimed at keeping and maintaining the harmony of tempo and rhythm when the verbal expression is spoken and listened to as the number of words of the two clauses is of two words. The beautiful form that invites sensory pleasure when the verbal expression is spoken and listened to is also marked by using the pair of antonymous words, that is the word (the adverb of place or locative marker) *one* 'inside' in the independent clause (1) and the word (the adverb of place or locative marker) *pe'ang* 'outside' in the independent clause (2). Even though the two words have semantic relations, the structure of the two independent clauses cannot be changed by placing the independent clause (2) at the front and the independent clause (1) at the back. As mentioned earlier, it is because the verbal expression is regarded as a fixed form of verbal expression in Manggaraian language inherited from the ancestors of Manggaraian society designating their conceptualization regarding the relationship between both traditional house and communal farming land as cultural properties of clan.

The independent clause (1), *Gendangn one* 'Drum inside', is made up of two words as its component parts, including the word (noun) *gendangn* that functions as the subject (S) and the word (adverb of place) *one* 'inside' that functions as the predicate (P). The word (noun) *gendangn* as the subject (S) is an inflected word made up of two morphemes, including the word (noun) *gendang* as a free morpheme and the suffix *-n* is a bound morpheme. The word (noun) *gendang* is defined as a free morpheme because it can stand alone as a single word, while the suffix *-n* is a bound morpheme as it cannot stand alone as a single word. In line with the context of its use, the suffix *-n* is bound to the word (noun) *gendang* as the conversion of the term *mbaru gendang* as the origin house of the *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan which is marked by the omission of the word (noun) *mbaru* 'house'. The suffix *-n* is a clitic form of the possessive form of the third singular person *diha*. As it distributes at the end of the word, the suffix *-n* is identified as an enclitic form of the third singular person *diha*. The suffix emphasizes the relationship between both the *mbaru gendang* and the *lingko randang* as cultural properties of the *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan in Manggaraian society. The word (adverb of place) *one* 'inside' is the locative marker functioning as the predicate (P) which refers to the *mbaru gendang* that lies in the *beo* 'village' as a unilocal settlement unit of the *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan who owns the *mbaru gendang*. This locative marker emphasizes the relationship between both the *mbaru gendang* as the traditional house of the *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan living in one *beo* and the *lingko randang* as the communal farming land belonging to the *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan.

The contents stored in the forms of linguistic phenomena used in the verbal expression provided above designate the conceptualization of Manggaraian society regarding the ownership of both the *mbaru gendang* as the origin house of the *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan living in one village and the *lingko randang* as common farming land belonging to the *wa'u* as the source of their life welfare as dry land farmers. In addition, the conceptualization also designates that the forms of linguistic phenomena used in the verbal expression imply multiple meanings that include social, economy, juridical, historical, and religious meanings. The verbal expression is a cultural text inherited from the ancestors of Manggaraian society designating the existence of the *wa'u* as patrilineal-genealogic clan as a house-based community whose livelihood is as dry land farmers.

Due to the dynamics of Manggaraian society, however, the verbal expression of Manggaraian language designating the conceptualization of Manggaraian society regarding the ownership of both the *mbaru gendang* as the origin house of the *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan is regarded as a frozen form of cultural text in today's Manggaraian society.

## V. CONCLUSION

The relationship of the *mbaru gendang* and the *lingko randang* as the cultural properties of the *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan in Manggaraian society is reflected in the verbal expression of Manggaraian language, *Gendangn one, lingkon pe'ang*. The forms and meanings of linguistic phenomena used in the verbal expression designate the conceptualization of Manggaraian society regarding the ownership of both the *mbaru gendang* as the origin house of the *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan living in one village and the *lingko randang* as common farming land belonging to the *wa'u* as the source of their life welfare as dry land farmers. The conceptualization reveals that the *mbaru gendang* and the *lingko randang* serve as the identity markers of the *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan living in one village. Along with the dynamics of Manggaraian culture, the relationship of the *mbaru gendang* and the *lingko randang* as the identity markers of the *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan living in one village has been changed at a certain degree. As a result, the verbal expression of Manggaraian language designating the conceptualization of Manggaraian society regarding the ownership of both the *mbaru gendang* as the origin house of the *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogic clan and the *lingko randang* as common farming land as the source of their life welfare as dry land farmers becomes a frozen form of cultural text in today's Manggaraian society.

### **Acknowledgement:**

There is no conflict among authors.

## REFERENCES

- Alshammari, S. H. (2018). "The relationship between language, identity, and cultural differences". *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*. Vol. 8, No. 4, 2018. 98-101.
- Berger, P. L. & Luckman, T. (1967). *The Social Construction of Reality*. Hammondswoth, United Kingdom: Penguin
- Bernstein, B. (1972). *A Sociolinguistic Approach to Socialization with Some Reference to Educability: The Ethnography of Communication*. Edited by John Joseph Gumperz and Dell H. Hymes. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Birx, J. H. (2011). *21st Century Anthropology: A Reference Handbook*. Edited by James H. Birx. London: Sagepub.
- Boas, F. (1962). *Anthropology and Modern Life*. New York: The Norton Library. W. W. Norton & company.



- Brown, H. D. (1994). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. The USA: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Bustan, F. (2005). "Wacana budaya *tudak* dalam ritual *penti* pada kelompok etnik Manggarai di Flores Barat: sebuah kajian linguistik budaya". *Disertasi*. Denpasar: Program Doktor (S3) Linguistik Universitas Udayana.
- Bustan, F. (2006). *Etnografi Budaya Manggarai Selayang Pandang*. Kupang: Publikasi Khusus LSM Agricola Kupang.
- Bustan, F. (2018). *Fitur organisasi sosial dalam kebudayaan Manggarai di Flores*. Kupang: Lembaga Penelitian, Universitas Nusa Cendana Kupang
- Bustan, F., Bire, Y., Semiun, A. (2017). *The Features of Anthropomorphic Metaphor in the Manggarai language*. Balti: LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing.
- Bustan, F. & Bire, J. (2018). "The forms and meanings of baby birth cultural discourse in Manggarai language". In *Opcion Revista de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales*. Ano 34. Especial No. 14, 2018.
- Bustan, F. & Kabelen, A. H. (2023). "The cultural conceptualization of Manggarai society regarding economic welfare in the field of animal husbandry". *SPARKLE: Journal of Language, Education, and Culture*, 2 (1), 1-8.
- Cassirer, E. (1987). *Manusia dan Kebudayaan: Sebuah Esai tentang Manusia*. Diterjemahkan oleh Alois A. Nugroho. Jakarta: Gramedia.
- Casson, R. W. (1981). *Language, Culture, and Cognition: Anthropological Perspectives*. New York: Macmillan.
- Dillitone, F. W. (2002). *The Power of Symbols*. Diterjemahkan oleh A. Wydiamartaya. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- Erb, M. (1999). *The Manggaraians: A Guide to Traditional Lifestyles*. Singapore: Times Editions.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Language and Power: Relasi Bahasa, Kekuasaan, dan Ideologi*. Diterjemahkan oleh Indah Rohmani-Komunitas Ambarawa. Malang: Boyan Publishing.
- Faisal, S. (1990). *Penelitian Kualitatif: Dasar-dasar dan Aplikasi*. Malang: Yayasan Asih Asah Asuh (YA3).
- Foley, W. A. (1997). *Anthropological Linguistics: an Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Culture: Selected Essays*. New York: Basic Books
- Goodenough, W. H. (1964). "Cultural anthropology and linguistics. In *Language in Culture and Society: A Reader in Linguistics and Anthropology*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Gumperz, J. (1992). "Contextualization of language". In *The Contextualization of Language*. Edited by Aldo di Luzio and Peter Aus. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Grice, G. W. (1987). *The Linguistic Construction of Reality*. London: Croom Helm.
- Gunas, T., Bustan, F., Menggo, S., & Jem, H. Y. (2023). "Politeness in *Tiba Meka* ritual in Manggarai language and culture, Eastern Indonesia". In *Interdisciplinary Journal of Sociality Studies*. Vol. 3 (2023), 61-71.
- Hall, S. (1997). *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. London: Sage.
- Hasan, R. (1988). *Linguistics, Language, and Verbal Art*. Victoria: Deakin University.

- Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Keesing, R. M. (1981). "Theories of culture." Dalam *Language, Culture, and Cognition: Anthropological Perspectives*. Edited by Ronald W. Casson. New York: Macmillan.
- Kovecses, Z. (2009). "Metaphorical meaning making: discourse, language, and culture". *Quaerens de Filologia. Studis Linguistics*. Vol. XIV (2009) 135-151.
- Kramsch, K. (2001). *Language and Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Langacker, R. (1999). "Assessing the cognitive linguistic enterprise". In *Cognitive Linguistics: Foundation, Scope, and Methodology*. Edited by Janssen and G. Redeker. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lawang, M. E. (1999). *Konflik Tanah di Manggarai: Pendekatan Sosiologik*. Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia Press.
- Liunokas, Y., Bustan, F., Huan, E. (2023). 'The forms of marriage in Manggarai society'. *International Journal of Arts and Social Science* ISSN: 2581 -7922, Volume 6 Issue 8, August 2023.
- Miller, R. L. (1968). *The Linguistic Relativity Principle and Humboldtian Ethnolinguistics: A History and Appraisal*. Paris: The Hague
- Muhadjir, N. (1995). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif: Telaah Positivistik, Rasionalistik, Fenomenologik, Realisme Metaphisik*. Yogyakarta: Rake Sarasin.
- Ochs, E. (1988). *Culture and Language Development: Language Acquisition and Language Socialization in a Samoan Village*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Palmer, G. B. (1996). *Toward a Theory of Cultural Linguistics*. Austin: The University of Texas Press.
- Palmer, G. B., and Sharifian, F. (2007). "Applied cultural linguistics: an emerging paradigm." In *Applied Cultural Linguistics*. Edited by Farzard Sharifian and Gary B. Palmer. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.
- Schneider, D. (1976). "Notes toward a theory of culture". In *Meaning in Anthropology*. Edited by Keith H. Basso and Henry A. Selby. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Spradley, J. P. (1997). *Metode Etnografi*. Diterjemahkan oleh Misbah Zulfa Elizabeth. Yogyakarta: Tiara Wacana Yogya.
- Stross, B. (1981). "Language, culture, and cognition." In *Language, Culture, and Cognition: Anthropological Perspectives*. Edited by Ronald W. Casson. New York: Macmillan.
- Sudikan, S. Y. (2001). *Metode Penelitian Kebudayaan*. Surabaya: Unesa Unipress bekerjasama dengan Citra Wacana.
- Suriasumantri, J. S. (2001). *Filsafat Ilmu: Sebuah Pengantar Populer*. Jakarta: Pustaka Sinar Harapan.
- Wallace, A. F. C. (1981). "Culture and cognition." Dalam *Language, Culture, and Cognition: Anthropological Perspectives*. Edited by Ronald W. Casson. New York: Macmillan.
- Wardhaugh, R. (2011). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. New Jersey, United States: Wiley-Blackwell.

- Whorf, B. L. (2001). "The relationship of habitual thought and behavior to language".  
In *Linguistic Anthropology: A Reader*. Edited by Alessandro Duranti.  
Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1991). *Cross-cultural Pragmatics: The Semantics of Human Interaction*.  
New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Verheijen, A. J. (1991). *Manggarai dan Wujud Tertinggi*. Diterjemahkan oleh Alex  
Beding dan Marsel Beding. Jakarta: LIPI-RUL.