THE CULTURAL CONCEPTUALIZATION OF THE MANGGARAIAN SPEECH COMMUNITY REGARDING THE OMNIPOTENCE OF GOD AS SUPERNATURAL POWER

Fransiskus Bustan (a, 1*)
Alexander Home Kabelen (b2)
Florens Maxi Un Bria (c3)
Aloyisius E. Monteiro (d4)
Hironimus Taolin (e5)

a, b: Faculty of Teacher Training and Educational Sciences, Nusa Cendana University Kupang
c, d: Pastoral Higher Education, Great Diocese of Kupang
e Linguistic Study Program, Postgraduate Program, Nusa Cendana University Kupang

1frankybustando@gmail.com
2alexkabelen63@gmail.com
3florensunbria@yahoo.com
4Monteiro.louis13@gmail.com
6hirothiotaolin@gmail.com

KEYWORDS	ABSTRACT
Cultural Conceptualization, Manggaraian Speech Community, God, Omnipotence	This study described the relationship between both the Manggaraian language and Manggaraian culture belonging to the Manggaraian speech community, as manifested in their cultural conceptualization regarding the omnipotence of God as a supernatural power, in view of the perspective of cultural linguistics. The study is descriptive in nature. The results of study reveal the cultural conceptualization of Manggaraian speech community regarding the omnipotence of God as supernatural power is reflected in the verbal expressions of Manggaraian language, Morin agu Ngaran and Jari agu Dedek, as the special names or attributes indicating the omnipotence God as supernatural power. The verbal expression, Morin agu Ngaran, designates the existence of God as the Supreme and the verbal expression, Jari agu Dedek, designates the existence of God as the Creator of the world as a whole and all its contents. The verbal expressions are the cultural intangible properties inherited from the ancestors of the Manggaraian speech community designating their system of belief or local religion before they come into contact with heavenly religions, especially the Catholic religion which is adhered to by most of today's Manggaraian speech community.

INTRODUCTION

There is no society living without language or, vice versa, there is no language living without society. The reason is clear and understandable that language makes the social life of a society meaningful (Berger & Luckman, 1967; Alshammari, 2018). The meaningfulness is reflected in the function and significance of language as a chief means of communication used by a society as members of a social group to express their thoughts or ideas, feelings, and experiences in the world that includes both the in the factual world and in the symbolic world. The scope of its use reveals that language is closely related to culture because culture is

concerned with the ways a society as members of a social group view and make sense of their world (Cassirer, 1987; Ochs, 1988; Bilal, 2005; Cakir, 2006; Alshammari, 2018). The relationship between both language and culture belonging to a society as members of a social group can be clearly seen not only in macro-interactional levels but also in micro-interactional levels like in certain speech events or speech acts. The features of linguistic phenomena they employ in micro-interactional levels are specific to the contexts in which the linguistic phenomena are used (Palmer, 1996; Duranti, 2001; Bustan, 2005; Palmer & Sharifian, 2007). In view of the two poles of linguistic sign, the specific features of linguistic phenomena used are reflected in their forms and meanings (Foley, 1997; Bustan, 2005).

Referring to the conceptions provided above in minds, this study describes the relationship between Manggaraian language and Manggaraian culture belonging to Manggaraian people as members of Manggaraian speech community residing in the region of Manggarai that lies in the western part of the island of Flores, one of the big islands in the province of East Nusa Tenggara as one of the provinces in Indonesia (Verheijen, 1991; Erb, 1999; Bustan, 2005: Bustan, 2006; Lawang, 1999; Bustan & Semiun, 2019; Bustan et al, 2020; Bustan et al, 2017; Bustan & Kabelen, 2023; Liunokas et al, 2023). They are identified as members of Manggaraian speech community because, in addition to speaking the same language, Manggaraian language, they also share the same norms of interaction when they use their language. As the relationship of both Manggaraian language and Manggaraian culture is so complex that the focus of attention is paid to the conceptualization of Manggaraian speech community regarding the omnipotence of God as supernatural power with special reference to the forms and meanings of linguistic phenomena in the verbal expressions of Manggaraian language used in the texts of ritual speeches or cultural discourses.

The study is conducted for the basic reason the forms and meanings of linguistic phenomena used in the verbal expressions of Manggaraian language in the texts of cultural discourses are specific to Manggaraian culture. The meanings stored in the forms of linguistic phenomena used in the verbal expressions of Manggaraian language in the texts of cultural discourses designate the cultural conceptualization of Manggaraian speech community regarding the omnipotence of God as supernatural power. The conceptualization is one of the main teachings in the system of belief or local religion inherited from the ancestors of Manggaraian speech community before they come into contact with heavenly religions, especially Catholic religion which is adhered to by most of them today. Nevertheless, the cultural conceptualization of Manggaraian speech community regarding the omnipotence of God as supernatural power is still maintained because it is considered similar on a certain level to the teaching of Catholic region as a heavenly religion (Bustan, 2005; Bustan, 2006; Bustan & Semiun, 2019; Bustan et al, 2020; Bustan et al, 2017; Bustan & Kabelen, 2023).

FRAMEWORK

This study is viewed from the perspective of cultural linguistics as one of the new theoretical perspectives in cognitive linguistics which is concerned with the study of the relationship between language, culture, and conceptualization. Along with its main concern, the study explores language used by a society as members of a speech community through the lens or prism of culture they share aimed uncovering conceptualization ascribed in their cognitive map in viewing and making sense of their world on the basis of premise that language

they employ is the window into their minds or cognitions. Cultural linguistics is defined as an emerging paradigm or model of cognitive linguistics because it draws on the combined resource of anthropological linguistics and cognitive linguistics in providing an account of the communicative behavior of a society as members of a social group. As it combines the resource of anthropological linguistics and cognitive linguistics, cultural linguistics is identified as an interdisciplinary field of study (Palmer, 1996; Bustan, 2005; Palmer & Sharifian, 2007; Sharifian, 2011; Malcolm, 2007).

In the perspective cultural linguistics, language is defined as a cultural activity and, at the same time, as an instrument for organizing other cultural domains. The definition is based on the fact that language used by members of a speech community is shaped not only by their special and general innate potentials as human beings but also by physical and sociocultural experiences they face in their contexts of living together for years or a long period of time and even transgenerations (Palmer, 1996; Palmer & Sharifian, 2007; Sharifian, 2007; Sharifian, 2011). As the definition and significance of culture vary from school to school (Ochs, 1988; Sudikan, 2001), in the perspective of cultural linguistics, culture is defined as the source of conceptualization of experiences faced by a society as members of a speech community in their contexts of living together for years or a long period of time (Palmer & Sharifian, 2007; Sharifian, 2011; Palmer, 1996; Wallace, 1981). This definition comes closest to the conception that culture is a cognitive map shared together by a society as members of a social group (Foley, 1997; Goodenough, 1964). Culture in this light serves as a display illustrating how they organize their ways of thinking about items, behaviors, and beliefs in cultural domains (Palmer & Sharifian, 2007; Sharifian, 2011).

As cultural concepts are embedded in language, the relationship of both language and culture belonging to a society as members of a speech community is reflected in their conceptualization which refers to fundamental cognitive processes which naturally lead to the development of schemas, categories, metaphors, and scripts. The ways they conceptualize their experiences in cultural domains are cultural conceptualizations that contains such cultural aspects as beliefs, norms, customs, traditions, and values. As cultural conceptualization and language are two intrinsic aspects of cultural cognition, the cultural conceptualizations have conceptual existence and linguistic encoding. Language as a central aspect of cultural cognition serves not only as a collective memory bank to store their past and present cultural conceptualizations, but also as a fluid vehicle to retransmit their socioculturally embodied cultural conceptualizations. This is because language they employ is shaped by cultural conceptualizations that have prevailed at different stages in their story and the different stages can leave their traces in current linguistic practices. In addition to storing cultural conceptualizations, language also serves as one of the primary mechanisms to communicate and embody the cultural conceptualizations. The cultural conceptualizations distributed accross the minds of a society as members of a social group representing their cognition at the cultural level are called linguistic imagery which is concerned with how they speak about the world that they themselves imagine (Palmer & Sharifian, 2007; Palmer, 1996; Scharifian, 2007; Sharifian, 2011; Bustan & Kabelen, 2023).

As cultural linguistics is a meaning-based approach (Kovecses, 2009; Geertz, 1973; Schneider, 1976), it requires thick description because determining the meaning of language in use as the mirror of culture requires attention to the identities and histories of participants and

the previous history under interpretation as these are construed by the participants. Nevertheless, determining what is sufficient, pertinent, and meaningful is often a matter of perspective and social position held by the participants. The ddetermination of meaning must be interpretive, taking into account speakers' and listeners' own construal because language needs communities to live in which they develop and change through their use. This characteristically takes place in the social context of culture as the parent culture in which that language is embedded (Palmer & Farzad, 2007; Gumperz, 1992; Spradley, 1997; Goodenough, 1964).

The main approach of cultural linguistics is ethnography approach because it is aimed at describing the culture shared by the members of a speech community on the basis of language they employ as the window into their minds or cognitions. In an attempt to achieve the intended aim, the approach used in dialogic ethnography combined with emic perspective (Spradley, 1997; Sudikan, 2001; Duranti, 2001). Other than ethnography approach, cultural linguistics is also tied three approaches which are central to anthropological linguistics, including Boasian linguistics, ethnosemantics, and the ethnography of communication. As the three approaches are synthesized in cultural linguistics (Palmer& Farzad, 2007), cultural linguistics is regarded identical with anthropological linguistics. The reason is that the relationship of both language and culture belonging to a people as members of a speech community as the main concern of study in anthropological linguistics (Foley, 1991; Sharifian, 2011; Palmer & Sharifian, 2007; Foley, 1997; Bustan & Semiun, 2019). As both language and culture are inextricably interwined (Brown, 1994; Foley, 1997; Kramsch, 2001; Schneider, 1976), for the sake of analysis, the relationship can be viewed from three perspectives, that is language as an element of culture, language as an index of culture, and language as a symbol of culture. Apart from the function of language as an element and index of culture, the function of language of a symbol of culture shows that the differences between languages are due cultural differences shared by the speakers of those languages (Foley, 1997; Bustan, 2005; Alshammari, 2018).

METHOD

This is descriptive study as it is aimed at describing the cultural conceptualization of Manggaraian speech community regarding the omnipotence of God as supernatural power, as reflected in the forms and meanings of linguistic phenomena used in the texts of ritual speeches or cultural discourses in Manggaraian language (Muhadjir, 1995; Bustan, 2005; Afrizal, 2014; Sugyono, 2018; Bustan & Semiun, 2019; Yusuf, 2019; Moleong, 2021; Sugyono, 2022). In an attempt to achieve the intended aim, the study was based on two kinds of data, involving both primary data and secondary data. Along with the process of acquiring those two kinds of data, the procedures of research carried out were field and library research. The field research was aimed at obtaining the primary data dealing the cultural conceptualization of Manggaraian speech community on the omnipotence of God as supernatural power. The location of the field research was in the region of Manggarai, with the main location being in Ruteng town as the capital city of Manggarai regency. The sources of the primary data were the members of Manggaraian speech community residing in Ruteng town represented by eight key informants selected on the basis of the ideal criteria put forward by Faisal (1990), Spradley (1997), Duranti (2001), and Sukidan (2005). The methods of data collection were interviews which were then elaborated using recording, elicitation, and note-taking techniques (Bungin 2007). The library research was done to obtain the secondary data relevant to the main problem of the study with

regard to cultural conceptualization of Manggaraian speech community on the omnipotence of God as supernatural power. The method of data collection was documentary study in the form of tracing the data available in various media including printed and electronic media. The types of documents used as the sources of reference were general references such as books and specific references such as research results, scientific articles, and papers. The collected data were then analyzed qualitatively using the inductive method because the analysis moved from data to abstraction and concept/theory, that is local-ideographic theory as it describes the cultural conceptualization of Manggaraian speech community regarding the omnipotence of God as supernatural power, as reflected in the forms and meanings of linguistic phenomena used in the texts of ritual speeches or cultural discourses in Manggaraian language. The process of data analysis took place from the initial data collection until the research report was written. The results of data analysis made by researchers were negotiated and discussed continuously with the key informants as the primary data sources in order to obtain conformity with their cultural knowledge regarding the cultural conceptualization of Manggaraian speech community on the omnipotence of God as supernatural power, as reflected in the forms and meanings of linguistic phenomena used in the texts of ritual speeches or cultural discourses in Manggaraian language (Sudikan, 2005; Nusa Putera, 2011; Sugyono, 2018; Yusuf, 2019; Sugyono, 2022) .

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

On the basis of the results of study conducted, there is a close relationship between both Manggaraian language and Manggaraian culture belonging to Manggaraian society as members of Manggaraian speech community. The manifestation of such a relationship is reflected in the cultural conceptualization of Manggaraian speech community regarding their belief on the omnipotence of God as supernatural power. More specifically, the cultural conceptualization is reflected in the verbal expressions used in the texts of ritual speeches or cultural discourses in Manggaraian language (original text in Manggaraian and its lexical translation in English), as in the following fragment: *Denge di'a Lite Morin agu Ngaran, Jari agu Dedek, Tanan wa Awangn Eta, Parn awo Kolepn sale, Ulungn le Wa'ing lau* 'Listen well you God as the Owner and the Owner, the Creator and the Creator, the earth below the sky above, the head in the north the foot in the south, the sunrise in the east the sunset in the west'.

More specifically, the cultural conceptualization of Manggaraian speech community regarding the omnipotence of God as supernatural power is reflected in the forms and meanings of linguistic phenomena used in the following verbal expressions, *Morin agu Ngaran* 'the Owner and the Owner' and *Jari agu Dedek* 'the Creator and the Creator'. The verbal expressions are the special names or attributes used by Manggaraian speech community to convey their cultural conceptualization regarding the omnipotence God as supernatural power (Erb, 1999; Lawang, 1999; Bustan, 2005). In terms of the two poles of linguistic sign that is pairing of forms and meanings the features of linguistic phenomena used in the verbal expressions are specific to Manggaraian culture as the parent culture or hosting culture in which Manggaraian language that functions as the window into the minds or cognitions of Manggaraian speech community is embedded. The verbal expressions are the cultural intangible properties inherited from the ancestors of Manggaraian speech community designating their system of belief or local religion before they come into contact with heavenly religions, especially Catholic religion which is adhered to by most of them today.

As seen in its surface structure, *Morin agu Ngaran* 'the Owner and the Owner', the verbal expression is a group of words appearing in the form of a nominal phrase made up two words as its component parts or immediate constituents. The two words as its parts or immediate constituents are (a) *Morin* and (b) *Ngaran* appearing in the forms nominal phrases as well. The nominal phrase (a), *Morin*, is formed from two words as its component parts or immediate constituents, including the word (noun) *Mori* 'the Owner' as the main word that functions as the HEAD (H) and the suffix *–n* 'his' that functions as its MODIFIER (M). The word *Mori* is a free morpheme as it can stand alone as a single word and the suffix *–n* 'his' is a bound morpheme appearing in the form of a suffix that cannot stand alone as a single word in which its grammatical meaning is bound to the word *Mori* as the hosting word. Likewise the nominal phrase (b), *Ngaran*, is formed from two words as its component parts or immediate constituents, including the word (deverbal noun) *Ngara* 'the Owner' as the core word that functions as the HEAD (H) and the suffix *–n* 'his' that functions as its MODIFIER (M). The word *Ngara* is a free morpheme as it can stand alone as a single word and the suffix *–n* 'his' is a bound morpheme appearing in the form of a suffix that cannot stand alone as a single word in which its grammatical meaning is bound to the word *Ngara* as the hosting word.

At the same time, it is worth noting that the suffix *–n* used in the two nominal phrases is the clitic form of the third possessive personal pronoun *diha* 'his'. As it distributes at the end of the main words, in this case *Morin* and *Ngaran*, the suffix *–n* is identified as an enclitic form. It is worth noting that the word *diha* is made up of the word (preposition) *de* 'of' as the prefix and the word (third singular personal pronoun) *hia* 'he', that is *dehia* 'his'. The attachment of the prefix *de-* to the word (third singular personal pronoun) *hia* 'he' causes some morphological changes. The vocal phoneme /e/ in the prefix *–de* is deleted and replaced by the vocal phoneme /i/ as that becomes *di-* 'of'. The vocal phoneme /i/ in the word (third singular personal pronoun) *hia* 'he' is deleted as that becomes *-ha*. Due to the morphological process, the combination of the prefix *di-* to the word (third singular personal pronoun) *-ha* 'he' becomes *diha*.

The combination of the two nominal phrases as its component parts or immediate constituents forms a polysindenton construction. This is because the relationship of the two nominal phrases as its component parts or immediate constituents is linked by the coordinating conjunction *agu* 'and' as a lexical cohesive device. The use of the coordinating conjunction intensifies the meaning of linguistic phenomena used in the verbal expression as both the word (nominal phrase) *Morin* and the word (nominal phrase) *Ngaran* are synonymous in terms of their semantic relations. Even though they are synonymous in terms of semantic relations, the structure of the words cannot be changed by putting forward the word *Ngaran* or, vice versa, by putting backward the word *Morin* so the structure of the verbal expression becomes *Ngaran agu Morin*. Likewise the word *agu* as the coordinating conjunction cannot be omitted so the structure of the verbal expression becomes *Morin Ngaran*.

The basic reason is that the verbal expression is regarded as the fixed forms of linguistic phenomena used in the texts of ritual speeches or cultural discourses in Manggaraian language designating the cultural conceptualization ascribed in the cognitive map of Manggaraian speech community regarding the existence of God as the Supreme. In addition, the verbal expression is one of the cultural intangible properties inherited from their ancestors as one of the teachings in their system of belief or local religion before they come into contact with heavenly religions, especially Catholic religion which is adhered to by most of them today. The meanings stored in

the forms of linguistic phenomena used in the verbal expression designate the cultural conceptualization ascribed in the cognitive map of Manggaraian speech community that there is no supernatural power other than God as the Supreme who owns and rules the entire universe, both visible and invisible.

As seen in its surface structure, the verbal expression, *Jari agu Dedek* 'the Creator and the Creator', is group of words appearing in the form of a nominal phrase made up of two words as its component parts or immediate constituents, including the word (deverbal noun) *Jari* 'the Creator' and the word (deverbal noun) *Dedek* 'the Creator'. The combination of the two words as its component parts or immediate constituents forms a polysindenton construction as the relationship is linked by using the coordinating conjunction *agu* 'and' as a lexical cohesive device. The use of the coordinating conjunction intensifies the meaning of the verbal expression, *Jari agu Dedek*, because the two words as its component parts or immediate constituents are synonymous in terms of their semantic relations.

Even though they are synonymous in terms of semantic relations, the structure of the words cannot be changed by putting forward the word *Dedek* or, vice versa, by putting backward the word *Jari* so the structure of the verbal expression becomes *Dedek agu Jari*. Likewise the word *agu* as the coordinating conjunction cannot be omitted so the structure of the verbal expression becomes *Jari Dedek*. The basic reason is that the verbal expression is regarded as the fixed forms of linguistic phenomena used in the texts of ritual speeches or cultural discourses in Manggaraian language designating the cultural conceptualization of Manggaraian speech community regarding the existence of God as the Creator of the world as a whole and all its contents. Another reason is that, as mentioned earlier, the verbal expression is one of the cultural intangible properties inherited from their ancestors as one of the teachings in their system of belief or local religion before they come into contact with heavenly religions, especially Catholic religion which is adhered to by most of them today.

In some situational contexts, the word *Jari* is used as a single word designating the cultural conceptualization of Manggaraian speech community regarding the existence of God as the Creator, as reflected in the following: *Kaba naring Jari* 'The buffalo to honor the Creator'. However, the word *Jari* is never used as a single word to reveal the cultural conceptualization of Manggaraian speech community regarding the existence of God as the Creator in the texts of ritual speeches or cultural discourses in Manggaraian language. As mentioned earlier, the basic reason is that the verbal expression is the fixed forms of linguistic phenomena used in the texts of ritual speeches or cultural discourses in Manggaraian language to designate the cultural conceptualization of Manggaraian speech community regarding the existence of God as the Creator of the world as a whole and all its contents. As mentioned earlier, the verbal expression is one of the cultural intangible products and properties inherited from the ancestors of Manggaraian speech community designating their system of belief or local religion before they come into contact with heavenly religions, especially Catholic religion which is adhered to by most of them today.

The meanings stored in the forms of the linguistic phenomena used in the verbal expression designate that, in the cultural conceptualization of Manggaraian speech community, there is no supernatural power other than God as the Creator of the world as a whole and all its contents. The expanse of God's territory as the Creator of the world as a whole and all its

contents is reflected in the forms and meanings of linguistic phenomena used in the following verbal expressions: (1) *tanan wa awangn eta* 'the land below and the sky above' which refers to the earth that implies meaning that the expanse of God's territory as the Creator includes the earth as a whole; (2) *parn awo kolepn sale* 'the sunrise in the east and the sunset in the west' which refers to the sun that implies meaning that the expanse of God's territory as the Creator is from the east to the west, and (3) the downstream in the south and the upstream in the north (*ulungn le waingn lau*) which refers to the river that implies meaning that the expanse of God's territory is from the south to the north. The structures of the words cannot be changed because the verbal expressions are the fixed forms of linguistic phenomena used in the texts of ritual speeches or cultural discourses in Manggaraian language to uncover the cultural conceptualization of Manggaraian speech community regarding the existence of God as the Creator of the world as a whole and all its contents. Similar to the previous verbal expressions, the verbal expressions are the cultural intangible properties inherited from their ancestors as one of the teachings in their system of belief or local religion before they come into contact with heavenly religions, especially Catholic religion which is adhered to by most of them today.

CONCLUSION

There is a close relationship between both Manggaraian language and Manggaraian culture belonging to Manggaraian society as members of Manggaraian speech community, as manifested in the cultural conceptualization of Manggaraian speech community regarding the omnipotence of God as supernatural power. The cultural conceptualization is reflected in the forms and meanings of linguistic phenomena used in the verbal expressions, *Morin agu Ngaran* and *Jari agu Dedek,* as the special names or attributes revealing the omnipotence God as supernatural power. The verbal expression, *Morin agu Ngaran*, designates the cultural conceptualization of Manggaraian speech community on the existence of God as the Supreme. The verbal expression, *Jari agu Dedek,* designates the cultural conceptualization of Manggaraian speech community on the existence of God as the Creator of the world as a whole and all its contents. The verbal expressions are the cultural intangible properties inherited from the ancestors of Manggaraian speech community designating their system of belief or local religion before they come into contact with heavenly religions, especially Catholic religion which is adhered to by most of them today.

REFERENCES

Afrizal. (2014). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif: Sebuah Upaya Mendukung Penggunaan Penelitian Kualitatif dalam Berbagai Disiplin Ilmu*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.

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*. Hammondsworth, 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.

Bilal, G., Bada, E. (2005). "Culture in language learning and teaching". *The Reading Matrix*. Vol. 5, No. 1, April 2005.

Bustan, F. (2005). "Wacana budaya *tudak* dalam ritual *penti* pada kelompok etnik Manggaraian 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. and Semiun, A. (2019). *The Cultural Discourse of Baby Birth in Manggarai Speech Community*. Balti: LAP LAMBERT ACADEMIC PUBLISHING.

Bustan, F., Mahur, A., & Kabelen, A. H. (2020). "Karakteristik dan dinamika sistem pertanian lahan kering dalam kebudayaan Manggarai". *Jurnal Lazuardi* 3 (1), 344 – 367.

Bustan, F., Semiun, A., Bire, J. (2017). *The Features of Anthropomorhic Metaphors in the Manggarai Language*. Balti, Germany: LAP LAMBERT ACADEMIC PUBLISHING.

Bustan, F., Kabelen, H. A. (2023). "The cultural conceptualization of Manggarai ethnic group regarding economic welfare in the field of animal husbandry". *SPARKLE: Journal of Language, Education and Culture*. Volume 2, Number 1, May 2023.

Cakir. I. (2006). "Developing cultural awareness in foreign language teaching". Turkish *Online Journal of Distance Education – TODJE.* July, 2006, Volume: 7 Number: 3

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.

Duranti, A. (2001). *Linguistic Anthropology*: *A Reader*. Massachussets: Blackwell Publishers.

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.

Grice, G. W. (1987). *The Linguistic Construction of Reality*. London: Croom Helm.

Gumperz, J. (1992). "Contextualization of language". In *The Contextualization of Language*. Edited by Aldo di Luzio and Peter Aus. Amsterdam/Philadephia: Benyamins.

Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*. Philedelphia: University of Pensylvania Press.

Keesing, R. M. (1981). "Theories of culture." In *Language, Culture and Cognition*: *Anthropological Perspectives*. Edited by Ronald W. Casson. New York: Macmilan.

Kovecses, Z. (2009). "Metaphorical meaning making: discourse, language, and culture". *Quardens de Filologia. Estudis 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.

Malcolm, G. I. (2007). "Cultural linguistics and bidialectal education". In *Applied Cultural Linguistics*. Edited by Farzard Sharifian and Gary B. Palmer. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.

Miller, R. L. (1968). *The Linguistic Relativity Principle and Humboldtian Ethnolinguistics*: *A History and Appraisal*. Paris: The Hague

Moleong, L. J. (2021). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif.* Edisi Revisi. Bandung: Rosda.

Muhadjir, N. (1995). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*: *Telaah Positivistik, Rasionalistik, Phenomenologik, Realisme Metaphisik*. Yogyakarta: Rake Sarasin.

Nusa Putra. (2011). *Penelitian Kualitatif: Proses dan Aplikasi*. Jakarta: Indeks.

Ochs, E. (1988). *Culture and Language Development: Language Acquisition and Language Socialization in a Samoan Village*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Palmer, G. B. (1996). *Towards a Theory of Cultural Linguistics*. Austin: The University of Texas Press.

Palmer, G. B. & 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.

Sharifian, F. (2007). "L1 cultural conceptualization in L2 learning: the case of Persian-speaking learners of English". In *Applied Cultural Linguistics*. Edited by Farzad Sharifian and Gary B. Palmer. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.

Sharifian, F. (2011). *Cultural Conceptualizations and Language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

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: Macmilan.

Sudikan, S. Y. (2001). *Metode Penelitian Kebudayaan*. Surabaya: Unesa Unipress bekerjasama dengan Citra Wacana.

Sugyono. (2018). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan Kombinasi* (*Mixed Methods*). Cetakan ke-10. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Sugyono. (2022). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif*. Cetakan Kelima. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Wallace, A. F. C. (1981). "Culture and cognition." In *Language, Culture, and Cognition: Anthropological Perspectives*. Edited by Ronald W. Casson. New York: Macmilan.

Whorf, B. L. (2001). "The relationship of habitual thought and behavior to language". In *Linguistic Anthropology*: *A Reader*. Edited by Alessandro Duranti. Massachussets: Blackwell Publishers.

Yu, N. (2007). "The Chinese conceptualization of the heart and its cultural context: implications for second language learning". In *Applied Cultural Linguistics*. Edited by Farzad Sharifian and Gary B. Palmer. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.

Yusuf, A. M. (2019). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan Penelitian Gabungan*. Jakarta: Kencana.