

Metaphorical Symbols of Animals as Cultural Attributes of Wife-Giver and Wife-Taker in Affinal kinship of Manggarai Society

Fransiskus Bustan ^{a,1*}
 Alexander Home Kabelen ^{b,2}
 Florens Max Un Bria ^{c,3}
 Emanuel Je'e Maly ^{d,4}
 Aloysius E. Monteiro ^{e,5}

^{a,b}English Education Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Nusa Cendana University, Kupang, Indonesia

^{c,d,e}Pastoral College, Archdiocese of Kupang, Indonesia

¹frankybustando@gmail.com

²alexkabelen63@gmail.com

³florensunbria@yahoo.com

⁵Monteiro.louis13@gmail.com

KEYWORDS	ABSTRACT
animal metaphor, wife-giver, wife-taker, affinal kinship, Manggarai society	This study describes animal metaphorical symbols as cultural attributes of wife-giver and wife-taker in affinal kinship of Manggarai society. The study is descriptive-qualitative. The study is viewed from the perspective of cultural linguistics, one the new theoretical perspectives in cognitive linguistics exploring the relationship of language, culture, and conceptualization. The animal metaphorical symbols are reflected in linguistic phenomena used in the cultural discourse of marriage in Manggarai language, as seen in the following fragment: Eme ela, ela muing, eme manuk, manuk muing. Neka ela ngong manuk, neka manuk ngong ela 'If it is a pig, it must be a real pig, if it is a chicken, it must be a real chicken. Don't say a pig if it is a chicken, don't say a chicken if it is a pig'. The forms and meanings of linguistic phenomena are specific to Manggarai culture designating animal metaphorical symbols as cultural attributes of wife-giver and wife-taker in affinal kinship of Manggarai society. The kinds of animals used symbols are ela 'pig' as cultural attribute of the anak-rona as wife-giver and manuk 'chicken' as cultural attribute of the anak-wina as wife-taker. The meanings designate customary norms inherited from their ancestors that prohibit the sons of the anak-rona as wife-giver to get married with the girls of the anak-wina as wife-taker. The marriage of opposite direction is incest because it violates customary norms inherited from their ancestors. The animal metaphorical symbols are moral and ethical guidelines for Manggarai society to maintain harmonious relationship of affinal kinship and to enhance the stability of social system as a whole.

How to cite: Bustan, F., Kabelen, A., Bria, F.M.U., Maly, E., Monteiro, A. (2025). Metaphorical Symbols of Animals as Cultural Attributes of Wife-Giver and Wife-Taker in Affinal kinship of Manggarai Society. *SPARKLE Journal of Language, Education and Culture*, 7 (1) 39-53.

INTRODUCTION

It is a truism that there is close relationship between both language and culture belonging to a society as members of a social group and the relationship is manifested in conceptualization ascribed in their cognitive map as the source of reference for them in viewing and making sense of the world (Palmer, 1996; Langacker, 1999; Ungerer & Schmid, 2006; Palmer & Sharifian, 2007; Sharifian, 2011; Sharifian, 2015). The conceptualization is reflected, among other things, in metaphors or metaphorical expressions as the conceptions of human beings in thinking are almost always represented through the use of metaphors or metaphorical expressions. The metaphors are of various kinds depending on the contexts of discourses in which they are used and one of those kinds is nominal metaphor which appears in the form of a

noun or noun phrase. In terms of the noun used as the core word, one of the kinds of nominal metaphor is animal metaphor which indicated by the use of animals or the organs of an animal (Wahab, 1990; Bustan & Ludji, 2024).

This study addresses the relationship of Manggarai language and Manggarai culture belonging to Manggarai society along with their existence as members of Manggarai ethnic group residing in the region of Manggarai that lies in the western part of the island of Flores as one of the five big islands in the province of East Nusa Tenggara, Indonesia (Bustan, 2005; Bustan, 2006; Monteiro et al., 2024; Bustan & Ludji, 2024; Bustan, 2024; Bustan, 2025). The relationship is so complex and pervasive that the study focuses on animal metaphorical symbols as the cultural attributes of both wife-giver and wife-taker in the affinal kinship or marriage kinship of Manggarai society, with special reference to the forms and meanings of linguistic phenomena used in the cultural discourses of marriage in Manggarai language along with its function as the reflection of Manggarai culture as the identity marker of Manggarai society. Thus the study aims to describe the metaphorical symbols of animals as the cultural attributes of wife-giver and wife-taker in the affinal kinship of Manggarai society that signify the modes of social communication between both wife-giver and wife-taker to maintain the harmonious relationship of affinal kinship and to enhance the stability of social system as a whole in accordance with the customary norms inherited from their ancestors.

The study is conducted for the basic reason that the forms and meanings of linguistic phenomena used in the cultural discourses of marriage in Manggarai language are unique and specific to Manggarai culture as the parent culture in which Manggarai language is embedded. The meanings stored in the forms of linguistic phenomena used in the cultural discourses of marriage are distinctive as their contextual meanings are different from their textual meanings. The contextual meanings contain a set of customary norms or rules inherited from the ancestors of Manggarai society dealing with the animal metaphorical symbols epitomizing the cultural attributes of wife-giver and wife-taker in the affinal kinship. The customary norms serve as control mechanisms for both wife-giver and wife-taker in organizing their patterns of behavior when communicating each other in order, as mentioned earlier, to maintain the harmony of relationship as well as to enhance the stability of social system as a whole in accordance with the customary norms inherited from their ancestors. Due to the dynamics of Manggarai culture as the result of the dynamics of Manggarai society, however, it is found out that the customary norms regarding the animal metaphorical symbols as the cultural attributes of wife-giver and wife-taker in the affinal kinship of Manggarai society tend to be meaningless nowadays. There are married couples in Manggarai society who are in conflicts in their marriage relationships with the customary norms as the part of cultural patrimony passed down from their ancestors. The married couples seem to be at crossroads whether to break off their love relationships or to obey the customary norms inherited from their ancestors, as implied in the animal metaphorical symbols as the cultural attributes of wife-giver and wife-taker in affinal kinship.

FRAMEWORK

Language serves a pivotal role in the life of a society as members of a social group as, of so many different media of communication they employ to fulfill their basic needs as human beings, language is the most effective one because, in addition to expressing their thoughts, ideas, feelings, emotions, and desires, language they employ is also used to convey their experiences in the world. The world involves both the actual world or the material world and the

symbolic world which refers to the world in which the objects as the referents of language used are imaginative in nature as the objects are in their cognitions or minds (Berger & Luckman, 1967; Miller, 1968; Keesing, 1981; Casson, 1981; Grice, 1987; Cassirer, 1987; Suriasumantri, 2001; Whorf, 2001; Maslova, 2004; Abdikalyk et al., 2016; Sihotang, 2018).

Referring to the scope of its use, language is the reflection of culture (Sapir, 1949), as Brown (1994) propounded that culture is deeply ingrained part of the very fiber of our being as members of social group, but language is the most visible and available expression of culture. In line with the significance of language as the most visible and available expression of culture shared by a society as members of a social group, according to Kramsch (2001), language functions to express, to embody, and to symbolize cultural reality which refers to the shared understanding of the world, shaped by collective values and experiences, influencing their daily lives and aspirations. Language as a symbolic system that has the power to shape and create such cultural realities as norms, values, perceptions, and identities is expressed through discourse as its vehicle, especially cultural discourse which refers to any kind of discourse taking place in cultural domain (Gumperz, 1992; Hymes, 1974). The features of linguistic phenomena used in the texts of cultural discourses are specific in their forms and meanings. The meanings stated and implied in the forms of linguistic phenomena used designate a set of conceptualizations ascribed in their cognitive map as the sources of reference for them in viewing and making sense of the world. As culture is the worldview of a society as members of a social group, language they employ serves not only as the window of their world, but also as the window into their cognitions or minds (Bernstein, 1972; Palmer, 1996; Whorf, 2001; Ungerer & Schmid, 2006; Palmer & Sharifian, 2007; Sharifian, 2011).

The function of language as the reflection of culture shared by a society as members of an ethnic group is the main concern of study in the field of cultural linguistics as one of the new theoretical perspectives in cognitive linguistics which explores the relationship of language, culture, and conceptualization belonging to a society as members of a social group (Palmer, 1996; Langacker, 1999; Ungerer & Schmid, 2006; Palmer & Sharifian, 2007; Sharifian, 2011; Sharifian, 2015; Rahinova, 2020). This is in line with the idea of Abdikalyk et al. (2016) that concept as a *linguo-philosophical* unit of linguistics is the main concern of study of cognitive linguistics. In the framework of cognitive linguistics, concept refers to a semantic unit that has *linguo-cultural* features and characterizes the speakers of any chosen *ethnoculture*. As it reflects an ethnic mindset, a concept marks the ethnic language image as the so-called brick to build 'the house of their being' (Maslova, 2004). This implies that language used by a society as members of a speech community is defined not only as a product of their collective ways of thinking, but also as a means of communicating their thoughts in an attempt to make their lives as a whole meaningful.

In the perspective of cultural linguistics, language used by a society is explored through the lens of culture they share to uncover conceptualization ascribed in their cognitive map as the source of reference for them in viewing and making sense of the world (Palmer, 1996; Palmer & Sharifian, 2007; Sharifian, 2011; Sharifian, 2015). The conceptualization is manifested, among other things, in metaphor as the system of knowledge shared by a society as members of a social group that functions as a conceptual frame of reference for them to understand the world surrounding them. Metaphor is not just seen as a figure of speech that compares two unlike things by asserting one thing because, in addition to creating vivid imagery, metaphor also makes language more engaging by suggesting a resemblance between two things as a vehicle

to convey complex ideas or emotions in a more concise and impactful way (Ungerer & Schmid, 2006).

With respect to the fact that language as the most effective means of communication between and among members of a society as members of a social group is full of metaphors in viewing one experience on the basis of another experience, metaphor is also defined as a theory of society that contains their experiences on the world. It is said so because metaphor is one of the linguistic devices used to relate various domains of experiences and coherences between interrelated events (Miller, 1979; Wahab, 1990; Duranti, 2001). This conception implies that metaphor can be identified not only from the perspective of semantics as the transferences of name but also from the perspective of anthropology and philosophy. In the perspective of anthropology and philosophy, metaphor refers to the basic character of relationship between the human linguisticity and the world. As human linguisticity is always metaphorical in nature, all words and names are not given by nature, but the results of human creation in their contexts of living together as members of a social group for years or a long period of time and even transgenerations. Metaphor in this regard is defined as a part of cultural conceptualization emerging in cognition level (Palmer & Sharifian, 2007).

As a metaphorical symbol can't be understood its meaning without reference to the context of its use in discourse, metaphor can be classified into sentential metaphor, nominal metaphor, and predicative metaphor. Sentential metaphor can be understood its meaning on the basis of its relation with sentence preceding or following it. Both nominal metaphor and predicative metaphor can be understood their meanings by observing the contexts of sentences in which they are used. Sentential metaphor appears in the form of complete sentence, nominal metaphor appears in the form of noun or nominal phrase, and predicative metaphor appears in the form of predicate. Based on the kinds of nouns serving as its component parts, nominal metaphor can be identified into human, animal, and plant metaphor. Human metaphor which is also known as anthropomorphic metaphor refers to nominal metaphor indicated by the use of the organs of a human body attached to nonhuman entities existing in the physical environment. Animal metaphor refers to a kind of nominal metaphor indicated by the use of animals or the organs of an animal. Plant metaphor refers to nominal metaphor indicated by the use of plants or the parts of a plant (Miller, 1979; Wahab, 1990; Foley, 1997).

METHOD

This study is descriptive-qualitative as it describes the metaphorical symbols of animals as the cultural attributes of wife-giver and wife-taker in the affinal kinship of Manggarai society, as reflected in the forms and meanings of language they employ in the cultural discourses of marriage in Manggarai language as the reflection of Manggarai culture (Faisal, 1990; Muhadjir, 1995; Bungin, 2007; Afrizal, 2014; Yusuf, 2019; Moleong, 2021; Sugyono, 2018). The study was based on two sources of data, involving primary data and secondary data. The procedures of research were field research and library research. The field research was carried out to obtain the primary data regarding the metaphorical symbols of animals as cultural attributes of wife-giver and wife-taker in the affinal kinship of Manggarai society as members of Manggarai ethnic group, as reflected in the forms and meanings of language they employ in the cultural discourses of marriage in Manggarai language as the mirror of Manggarai culture. The field research was in the regency of Manggarai with the main location being in Pagal as the capital city of Cibal district that lies in the southern part of Manggarai region. The sources of the

primary data were Manggarai society, especially those residing in Pagal represented by four key informants selected on the basis of the ideal criteria put forward by Faisal (1990), Spradley (1997), Duranti (2001), Sudikan (2001), and Bungin (2007). The method of data collection was in-depth interview and the techniques of data collection were recording, elicitation, and note-taking. The library research aimed to obtain the secondary data relevant to the main concern of study. The method of data collection was documentary study. The kinds of documents 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 by using inductive method as the process of analysis was moved from the data to abstraction and local-ideographic concept/theory describing the metaphorical symbols of animals as the cultural attributes of wife-giver and wife-taker in the affinal kinship of Manggarai society.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Result

The result of study reveals that the relationship between both Manggarai language and Manggarai culture is manifested in conceptualization ascribed in the cognitive map of Manggarai society regarding the metaphorical symbols of animals as the cultural attributes of wife-giver known as *anak-rona* in Manggarai language and wife-taker known as *anak-wina* in Manggarai language in the affinal kinship of Manggarai society. Based on the result of data selection, the fragment of the cultural discourse of marriage in Manggarai language that contains the metaphorical symbols of animals that function as the cultural attributes of the *anak rona* as wife-giver and the *anak wina* as wife-taker in the affinal kinship of Manggarai society is as follows: *Eme ela, ela muing, eme manuk, manuk muing. Neka ela ngong manuk, neka manuk ngong ela* 'If it is a pig, it must be a real pig, if it is a chicken, it must be a real chicken. Don't say a pig, if it is a chicken, don't say a chicken, if it is a pig'. The forms and meanings of linguistic phenomena used in the fragment are unique and specific to Manggarai culture as the parent culture in which Manggarai language is embedded. The meanings stored in the forms of linguistic phenomena designate the differences of status held by the *anak-rona* as wife-giver and the *anak-wina* as wife-taker in the affinal kinship of Manggarai society. The two animals used as the referents are *ela* 'pig' as the cultural attribute of the *anak-rona* as wife-giver and *manuk* 'chicken' as the cultural attribute of the *anak-wina* as wife-taker. The basic reason is that both *ela* 'pig' and *manuk* 'chicken' as the two types of animals widely raised by most of Manggarai society epitomize prosperity, abundance, and fertility (Bustan, 2005). The two cultural attributes imply that the *anak rona* as wife-giver and the *anak wina* as wife-taker must behave as who they are when interacting with one another. The aim is twofold, that is to maintain the harmonious relationship of affinal kinship and to enhance the stability of social system as a whole from the likely conflicts occurring between the *anak-rona* as wife-giver and the *anak-wina* as wife-taker in their context of living together. The animal metaphorical symbols are included as the part of cultural conceptualization emerging in the cognition level of Manggarai society in viewing and making sense of the world in regard to the cultural attributes of the *anak-rona* as wife-giver and the *anak-wina* as wife-taker in the affinal kinship (Palmer & Sharifian, 2007).

Discussion

With special reference to the result of study provided above, this section discusses in more depth the forms and meanings of linguistic phenomena used in the fragment of marriage cultural discourse in Manggarai language that describe the animal metaphorical symbols as the cultural attributes of the *anak-rona* as wife-giver and the *anak-wina* as wife-taker in the affinal kinship of Manggarai society.

Forms

As seen in the physical features of linguistic phenomena used, the fragment consists of two sentences as its component parts. The two sentences serving as its component parts are as follows: (01) *Eme ela, ela muing, eme manuk, manuk muing* 'If it is a pig, it must be a real pig, if it is a chicken, it must be a real chicken' and (02) *Neka ela ngong manuk, neka manuk ngong ela* 'Don't say a pig, if it is a chicken, don't say a chicken, if it is a pig'. The linguistic phenomena used in the two sentences are closely related to each other in their forms and meanings regarding the metaphorical symbols of animals that function as the cultural attributes of both the *anak-rona* as wife-giver and the *anak-wina* as wife-taker in the affinal kinship of Manggarai society. The meanings stored in the forms of linguistic phenomena in the sentence (01) support and emphasize the meanings stored in the forms of linguistic phenomena used in the sentence (02).

Sentence (01): *Eme ela, ela muing, eme manuk, manuk muing*

As seen in the physical features of linguistic phenomena used in data (01), *Eme ela, ela muing, eme manuk, manuk muing* 'If it is a pig, it must be a real pig, if it is a chicken, it must be a real chicken', the sentence appears in the form of an imperative sentence of request type which provides request for the *anak-rona* as wife-giver and the *anak-wina* as wife-taker to show their real status when communicating each other in contexts of living together. Being the *anak-rona* as the wife-giver, their patterns of behavior should reveal that they hold status as the *anak-rona* as wife-giver when communicating with the *anak-wina* as wife-taker. Likewise, being the *anak-wina* as wife-taker, their patterns of behavior should reveal that they hold status as the *anak-wina* as wife-taker when communicating with the *anak-rona* as wife-giver. As aforementioned, the aim is not only to maintain the harmonious relationship of affinal kinship, but also to enhance the stability of social system as a whole from the likely conflicts occurring between the *anak-rona* as wife-giver and the *anak-wina* as wife-taker in the context of living together.

In terms of its component parts, the sentence (01) appears in the form of a compound sentence made up of two independent clauses or complete sentences. The two independent clauses serving as its component parts are as follows: (a) *Eme ela, ela muing* 'If it is a pig, it must be a real pig' and (b) *Eme manuk, manuk muing* 'If it is a chicken, it must be a real chicken'. The forms of linguistic phenomena used in the two independent clauses are closely related to each other as the independent clause (a) supports and emphasizes the independent clause (b) or, vice versa, the independent clause (b) supports and emphasizes the independent clause (a). The independent clause (a) provides request for the *anak-rona* as wife-giver that their patterns of behavior should reveal that they hold status as the *anak-rona* as wife-giver when communicating with the *anak-wina* as wife-taker. The independent clause (b) provides request for the *anak-wina* as wife-taker that their patterns of behavior should reveal that they hold status as the *anak-wina* as wife-taker when communicating with the *anak-rona* as wife-giver. As aforementioned earlier, the aim is to maintain the harmonious relationship of affinal kinship as

well as to enhance the stability of social system as a whole from the likely conflicts occurring between the *anak rona* as wife-giver and the *anak wina* as wife-taker.

The relationship of the two independent clauses forms an asyndeton construction as it is not linked by using the coordinating conjunction *agu* 'and' or *ko* 'or' as a lexical cohesive device. The coordinating conjunction is intentionally omitted in an attempt to maintain the harmony of tempo and rhythm when the sentence is spoken and listened to as the number of words in the two independent clauses is the same as four and the number of syllables in the words is also the same as two. Other than the use of syntactic parallelism, the beautiful forms of linguistic phenomena that invite sensory pleasures when the sentence is spoken or listened to is also indicated by the use of lexicosemantic parallelism appearing in the forms of repetitions of words as their lexical items. The forms of repetitions are marked by the repetition of the word (noun) *ela* 'pig' two times or twice in the independent clause (a) and the repetition of the word (noun) *manuk* 'chicken' two times or twice in the independent clause (b). The repetitions aim to emphasize the meanings stored in the forms of linguistic phenomena in the sentence (01) regarding the patterns of behavior that should be shown when the *anak rona* as wife-giver and the *anak wina* as wife-taker communicate each other in the context of living together.

As seen in the physical features of linguistic phenomena used, the independent clause (a), *Eme ela, ela muing* 'If it is a pig, it must be a real pig', consists of two clauses as its component parts. The two clauses serving as its component parts are as follows: (a.1) *Eme ela* 'If it is a pig' and (a.2) *Ela muing* 'It must be a real pig'. The clause (a.1), *Eme ela* 'If it is a pig', is a dependent clause or subordinate clause as it can't stand alone as a complete sentence. The word *eme* 'if' which distributes preceding the word (noun) *ela* 'pig' as the subjective complement shows that it is a conditional sentence or an if-clause. The clause (a.2), *Ela muing* 'It must be a real pig', is an independent clause as it can stand alone as a complete sentence that functions as the main clause. The real pig expected is indicated by the word *muing* 'real' that, in terms of its syntactic structure, it functions as the modifier (M) of the word (noun) *ela* 'pig' as the core word that functions as head (H). The word (noun) *ela* 'pig' as the head (H) is modified by the word *muing* 'real' as its modifier (M).

As mentioned earlier, the beautiful forms of linguistic phenomena that invite sensory pleasures when the two clauses are spoken and listened to are indicated by using syntactic parallelism as the number of words in the two clauses is the same as two and the number of syllables in each word is also the same as two. The use of syntactic parallelism, as mentioned earlier, aims to maintain the harmony of tempo and rhythm when the sentence is spoken and listened to. This is because the sentence provides request for the *anak rona* as wife-giver to behave as the *anak-rona* as wife-taker when communicating with the *anak-wina* as wife-taker. Other than the syntactic parallelism, the beautiful forms that invite sensory pleasures when the sentence is spoken or listened to are also indicated by lexicosemantic parallelism appearing in the repetition of word (noun) *ela* 'pig' as the cultural attribute of the *anak rona* as wife-giver.

Similar to independent clause (a), the physical features of linguistic phenomena used show that the independent clause (b), *Eme manuk, manuk muing* 'If it is a chicken, it must be a real chicken', consists of two clauses as its component parts. The two clauses serving as its component parts are as follows: (b.1) *Eme manuk* 'If it is a chicken' and (b.2) *Manuk muing* 'It must be a real chicken'. The clause (b.1) appears in the form of a dependent clause or subordinate clause as it can't stand alone as a complete sentence. The use of the word *eme* 'if'

which distributes preceding the word (noun) *manuk* 'chicken' as the subject (S) of the sentence shows that the sentence appears in the form of a conditional sentence or if-clause. The clause (b.2), *Manuk muing* 'It must be a real chicken', is an independent clause or complete sentence that functions as the main clause. The word (noun) *manuk* 'chicken' is an animal metaphorical symbol used as the cultural attribute of the *anak-wina* as wife-taker in the affinal kinship of Manggarai society. The real chicken expected is indicated by the word *muing* 'real' that, in terms of its syntactic structure, it functions as the modifier (M) of the word (noun) *manuk* 'chicken' as the core word that functions as its head (H).

As mentioned earlier, the beautiful forms of linguistic phenomena that invite sensory pleasures when the two clauses are spoken and listened to are indicated by syntactic parallelism as the number of words in the two clauses is the same as two and the number of syllables in each word is also the same as two. The main aim of using the syntactic parallelism, as aforementioned, is to maintain the harmony of tempo and rhythm when the sentence is spoken and listened to. This is because the sentence provides request for the *anak wina* as wife-taker to behave as the *anak-wina* as wife-taker when communicating with the *anak-rona* as wife-giver. The beautiful forms of linguistic phenomena that invite sensory pleasures when the sentence is spoken or listened to are also indicated by semantic parallelism appearing in the form of repetition, the repetition of the word (noun) *manuk* 'chicken' as the cultural attribute of the *anak wina* as wife-taker.

Data (02): *Neka ela ngong manuk, neka manuk ngong ela*

As seen in the physical features of linguistic phenomena used in data (02), *Neka ela ngong manuk, neka manuk ngong ela* 'Don't say a pig, if it is a chicken, don't say a chicken, if it is a pig', the sentence appears in the form of a negative-imperative sentence of request type as it provides request for the *anak-rona* as wife-giver and the *anak-wina* as wife-taker not to change their real status when communicating each other. Being the *anak-rona*, their patterns of behavior should reveal that they hold status as the *anak-rona* as wife-giver when communicating with the *anak-wina* as wife-taker. Likewise, being the *anak-wina*, their patterns of behavior should reveal that they hold status as the *anak-wina* as wife-taker when communicating with the members of the *anak-rona* as wife-giver. It is prohibited for the *anak-rona* as wife-giver to say that they hold status as the *anak-wina* as wife-taker when communicating each other in the context of living together and, at the same time, it is also prohibited for the *anak-wina* as wife-taker to say that they hold status as the *anak-rona* as wife-giver when communicating each other in the context of living together. The prohibition is reflected in the use of negative marker *neka* 'not' as the function word which distributes preceding the word (noun) *ela* 'pig' and the word (noun) *manuk* 'chicken'.

The independent clause (02) appears in the form of a compound sentence made up of two independent clauses or complete sentences as its component parts. The two independent clauses serving as its component parts are as follows: (a) *Neka ela ngong manuk* 'Don't say a pig if it is a chicken' and (b) *Neka manuk ngong ela* 'Don't say a chicken if it is a pig'. The features of linguistic phenomena used are closely related in their forms and meanings as the independent clause (a) supports and emphasizes the independent clause (b), or vice versa. The relationship of the two independent clauses forms an asyndeton construction as it is not linked by the coordinating conjunction *agu* 'and' or *ko* 'or' as a lexical cohesive device. As aforementioned, the coordinating conjunction is intentionally omitted to maintain the harmony of

tempo and rhythm when the clause is spoken and listened to as the number of words in the two clauses is the same as four and the number of syllables in each word is the same as two as well.

The independent clause (a), *Neka ela ngong manuk* 'Don't say a pig if it is a chicken', implies that if they hold status as the *anak-wina* as wife-taker, they must say that they are the *anak-wina* as wife-taker and, as such, they are prohibited to say that they are the *anak-rona* as wife-giver if they hold status as the *anak-wina* as wife-taker. The independent clause supports and emphasizes the independent clause (1.a) implying that they are prohibited to say that they are the *anak-rona* as wife-giver if they are the *anak-wina* as wife-taker. The prohibition is indicated by using the word (function word) *neka* 'not' as a form of negative maker which distributes preceding the word (noun) *ela* 'pig' as the subjective complement to designate the cultural attribute of the *anak-rona* as wife-giver. As mentioned earlier, the metaphorical symbol of animal as the cultural attribute of the *anak-rona* as wife-giver is *ela* 'pig' and the metaphorical symbol of animal as the cultural attribute of the *anak-wina* as wife-taker is *manuk* 'chicken'.

Whatever the reason, they should reveal their real status when communicating each other in the context of living together, whether they are the *anak-rona* as wife-giver or they are the *anak-wina* as wife-taker. The metaphorical symbols of animals, *ela* 'pig' as the cultural attribute of the *anak-rona* as wife-giver and *manuk* 'chicken' as the cultural attribute of the *anak-wina* as wife-taker, in the affinal kinship of Manggarai society are the part of cultural norms inherited from their ancestors. The status differences between the *anak-rona* as wife-giver and the *anak-wina* as wife-taker should manifested in words and deeds because the metaphorical symbols of animals, that is *ela* 'pig' as the cultural attribute of the *anak-rona* as wife-giver and *manuk* 'chicken' as the cultural attribute of the *anak-wina* as wife-taker, in the affinal kinship of Manggarai society are meaningless if they don't manifest in their deeds in the context of living together.

The independent clause (b), *Neka manuk ngong ela* 'Don't say a chicken if it is a pig', implies that if they hold the status as the *anak-rona* as wife-giver, they must say that they are the *anak-rona* as wife-giver and not to say that they are the *anak-wina* as wife-taker if they are the *anak-rona* as wife-giver. The prohibition is indicated by the word *neka* 'not' as a negative maker that distributes preceding the word (noun) *manuk* 'chicken' as the subjective complement of the clause along with its functions as the cultural attribute of the *anak-wina* as wife-taker. The reason is that, as mentioned earlier, the metaphorical symbol of animal as the cultural attribute of the *anak-rona* as wife-giver is *ela* 'pig' and the metaphorical symbol of animal as the cultural attribute of the *anak-wina* as wife-taker is *manuk* 'chicken'. Whatever the reason, as mentioned earlier, they must show their real status when communicating each other so that it can be seen whether they are the *anak-rona* as wife-giver or they are the *anak-wina* as wife-taker. The differences of their status must be reflected not only in words, but also in deeds because the metaphorical symbols of animal, that is *ela* 'pig' as the cultural attribute of the *anak-rona* as wife-giver and *manuk* 'chicken' as the cultural attribute of the *anak-wina* as wife-taker, are meaningless if they do not manifest the cultural attributes in deeds in their context of living together.

Meanings

The meanings are complex and pervasive because the fragment is distinctive in nature as it appears as an idiomatic expression in which the deeper meanings or conceptual meanings of its words are greatly different from their literal or lexical meanings. The word (noun) *ela* 'pig' as the cultural attribute of the *anak-rona* as wife-giver and the word (noun) *manuk* 'chicken' as the cultural attribute of the *anak-wina* as wife-taker are the metaphorical symbols of animals that epitomize or represent deeper meanings. The word (noun) *ela* 'pig' and the word (noun) *manuk* are the two words (nouns) that stand for the conceptualization ascribed in the cognitive map of Manggarai society regarding the cultural attributes of the *anak-rona* as wife-giver and the *anak-wina* as wife-taker in their affinal kinship. The status differences they hold should be manifested both in words and in deeds because the metaphorical symbols of animals are regarded as meaningless worlds if they don't manifest in their deeds.

Along with the conceptualization ascribed in the cognitive map of Manggarai society, the deeper meanings implied in the forms of linguistic phenomena in the fragment reveal the differences of status held by the *anak-rona* as wife-giver and the *anak-wina* as wife-giver as the two main families having main roles in the affinal kinship of Manggarai society. The differences of their status should be reflected in their patterns of behavior when communicating each other in the contexts of living together to maintain the harmonious relationship of affinal kinship and to enhance the stability of their social system in accordance with the customary norms inherited from their ancestors. The patterns of behavior should be reflected in words and deeds because the words are meaningless if they are not realized in their deeds because the customary norms are the part of cultural knowledge inherited from their ancestors that function as moral and ethical guidelines for the *anak-rona* as wife-giver and the *anak-wina* as wife-taker in the context of living together to maintain the harmonious relationship of affinal kinship and to enhance the stability of their social system as a whole.

As conceptualized in the cognitive map of Manggarai society, the *anak-rona* as wife-giver is embedded with the term *ela* 'pig' as the metaphorical symbol of animal serving as their cultural attribute imply deeper the meaning that the sons of the *anak-rona* as wife-giver are prohibited to get married with the girls of the *anak-wina* as wife-taker, or vice versa, the girls of the *anak-wina* as wife-giver are prohibited to get married with the sons of the *anak-rona* as wife-giver. The prohibitions are the parts of customary norms inherited from the ancestors of Manggarai society that function as moral and ethical guideline for the *anak-rona* as wife-giver and the *anak-wina* as wife-taker. If the marriage relationship from the two opposite directions happens, the marriage relationship is known as *wali elar* 'reversed blisters' in Manggarai language. The word (noun) *elar* 'blister' is a conceptual metaphorical symbol representing the part of cultural norms in the affinal kinship of Manggarai society inherited from their ancestors.

On the other side, the marriage relationship of the two opposite directions is also known as *toko toe kop* 'inappropriate sleep' in Manggarai language as the marriage relationship is inappropriate to the customary norms inherited from the ancestors of Manggarai society. The marriage relationship from two opposite directions violates the customary norms inherited from ancestors and, as such, the violation is seen not only as incest, but also as a sin. In accordance with the customary norms inherited from the ancestors of Manggarai society, as mentioned earlier, the appropriate sleep is only allowed if the sons of the *anak-wina* as wife-taker must be the husbands and the girls of the *anak-rona* as wife-giver must be the wives. The customary norms are the parts of social conventions inherited from the ancestors of Manggarai society that function as the ethical and moral guidelines for them in organizing their patterns of behavior to maintain the harmony of marriage relationships as well as to enhance the stability of social

system as a whole. The patterns of behavior should be manifested in words and deeds because the cultural attributes are regarded as meaningless words if they don't manifest in their deeds in the context of living together.

Based on the traditions inherited from their ancestors, if their love relationship is separated, the boy is subject to social sanction carried out in the form of carrying banana peel in the front of the community in the village known as *pola munak* 'carry banana peel' in Manggarai language for a deterrent effect. While cutting the banana peel, he promises not to repeat the act of violating the ancestral norms and, as such, others should not commit the same act as the marriage relationship from two opposite directions destroys the social harmony of marriage relationships in an extended family realm. The couples who deliberately violate the customary norms inherited from their ancestors are subject to social sanctions in the form of excommunication from family membership. The excommunication is carried out through a special ritual known as *keti manuk miteng* 'cutting the neck of a black chicken' in Manggarai language taking place in the mouth of a river. The neck-cut black chicken is then thrown into the river so that, as conceptualized in the cognitive map of Manggarai society, the sin they commit do not affect the family members as a whole and they will be free from various disasters and calamities in the forms of sanctions and curses from their ancestors. The act of violating the customary norms inherited from their ancestors is a form of disrespecting their ancestors as the original sources of the customary norms.

It is also conceptualized in the cognitive map of Manggarai society that the customary norms inherited from their ancestors should be manifested in the context of traditional ceremony in which the families acting as main participants are the members of the *anak-rona* as wife-giver and the members of the *anak-wina* as wife-taker. Based on the customary norms inherited from the ancestors of Manggarai society, the side dishes that should be served for the members of the *anak-rona* as wife giver are chicken meat, while the side dishes that should be served for the members of the *anak-wina* as wife taker are pig meat or pork, as reflected in the clauses, *eme ela*, *ela muing* and *neka ela ngong manuk*. Meanwhile, the members of the *anak-wina* as wife taker are prohibited to eat chicken meat as their side dishes, as reflected in the clause *eme manuk*, *manuk muing* and in the clause *neka manuk ngong ela*. If the prohibition is intentionally violated, it is conceptualized in the cognitive map of Manggarai society that both the *anak-rona* as wife-giver and the *anak-wina* as wife-taker will receive sanctions from their ancestors in the form of suffering such skin diseases as scabies.

As conceptualized in the cognitive map of Manggarai society, the metaphorical symbol of *ela* 'pig' as the cultural attribute of the *anak-rona* as wife-giver symbolizes physical and spiritual well-being for the *anak-wina* as wife-taker. In this regard, the *anak-rona* as wife-giver is conceptualized in the cognitive map of Manggarai society as the sources of blessing for the *anak-wina* as wife-taker. The conceptualization is reflected in the verbal expression *ulu wa'e* 'head of water' as a form of human or anthropomorphic metaphor in Manggarai language used as the cultural attribute of the *anak-rona* as wife-giver as water source or spring. The *anak-rona* as wife-giver is defined as water source or spring for the *anak-wina* as wife-taker because, without giving a girl to be a wife for a son of the *anak-wina* as wife-giver, there is no life on the part of the *anak-wina* as wife-taker. In line with the use of the word (noun) *wae* 'water', the term *ulu wae* implies deeper meaning that the metaphorical symbol of *ela* 'pig' as the cultural attribute of the *anak rona* as wife-giver epitomizes the source of prosperity, abundance, and fertility for the *anak wina* as wife-taker. Therefore, as mentioned earlier, it is required for the

anak-wina as wife-taker must always respect to the *anak-rona* as wife-giver, including the prohibition to get married in two opposite directions in which the sons of the *anak-rona* as wife-giver get married with the girls of the *anak-wina* as wife-taker (Bustan, 2005; Bustan, 2006).

In line with the use of the term *ulu wae* as the cultural attribute for the *anak rona* as wife-giver, it is also found out that the *anak-rona* as the wife-giver is attributed with the term *Mori Kraeng ata itan one lino* 'God as the Almighty Creator that can be seen on the earth' by the *anak-wina* as wife-taker (Bustan, 2005; Bustan, 2006). This is because, as mentioned earlier, without giving a girl to be a wife for a son of the *anak-wina* as wife-giver, there is no life on the part of the *anak-wina* as wife-taker. The conceptualization implies deeper meaning that giving a daughter from the *anak-rona* as wife-giver is not just giving a wife, but also giving life for the *anak-wina* as wife-taker marked by the birth of children, especially sons as continuation of the lineage as Manggarai society adhere to patriarchal culture. The attribute supports the idea that the metaphorical symbol of *ela* 'pig' as the cultural attribute of the *anak rona* as wife-giver, as mentioned earlier, represents prosperity, abundance, and fertility for the *anak wina* as wife-taker. Along with that conceptualization, it is not surprising that, in the past, if a couple had no children or the children were only sons, the husband was permitted to by custom to add another wife to have a son or sons as a continuation of the lineage. Because of the influence of the Catholic teachings that most of Manggarai society adhere to, the custom of taking another wife to have a son or sons as a continuation of the lineage no longer applies today.

However, along with the dynamics of both Manggarai society and Manggarai culture, the forms of linguistic phenomena used in the cultural discourse of marriage in Manggarai language tend to be meaningless. There have been married couples of young generations in Manggarai society who are in conflicts with the customary norms inherited from their ancestors. They seem to be at the crossroads whether to break off their love relationships or obey the customary norms inherited from their ancestors. Likewise, the prohibition of eating pig meat or pork for the *anak-rona* as wife giver and prohibition of eating chicken meat for the *anak-wina* as wife taker in the contexts of traditional ceremonies are often violated deliberately just because they cannot control their appetite, apart from because of the customary norms inherited from the ancestors are irrational. Another reason is that, there is no rationally acceptable interconnection between the skin diseases they are likely to suffer from and the violation of ancestral prohibitions regarding the differentiation of side dishes for the *anak-rona* as wife giver and for the *anak-wina* as wife taker in the context of traditional ceremony. This is one of the controversial issues for the younger generation of Manggarai society nowadays because the customary norms inherited from their ancestors are defined irrational in view of modern perspective as the impact of educational levels pursued and as the result of intercultural communication.

CONCLUSION

The relationship of both Manggarai language and Manggarai culture is manifested in conceptualization ascribed in the cognitive map of Manggarai society regarding animal metaphorical symbols as the cultural attributes of the *anak-rona* as wife-giver and the *anak-wina* as wife-taker in the affinal kinship of Manggarai society. The animal metaphorical symbols are *ela* 'pig' serving as the cultural attribute of the *anak-rona* as wife-giver and *manuk* 'chicken' serving as cultural attribute of the *anak-wina* as wife-taker. The cultural attributes imply deeper meaning that the sons of the *anak-rona* as wife-giver are prohibited to get married with the girls of the *anak-wina* as wife-taker. The marriage relationship from the opposite direction is

forbidden as it violates the customary norms inherited from their ancestors and the violation is considered as an incest or sin in Manggarai culture. The couples who deliberately violate the customary norms inherited from their ancestors are subject to social sanctions in the form of excommunication from their family membership. The customary norms can also be seen in the contexts of ritual ceremonies in which the side dishes served for the *anak-rona* as wife-giver are chicken meat, while the side dishes served for the *anak-wina* as wife-taker are pig meat or pork. The *anak-rona* as wife-giver are prohibited to eat pig meat as their side dishes and the *anak-wina* as wife taker are prohibited to eat chicken meat as their side dishes. If they intentionally violate the customary norms inherited from their ancestors, it is culturally assumed that they will receive sanctions in the form of suffering such skin diseases as scabies. As conceptualized in the cognitive map of Manggarai society, the deeper meanings implied in the metaphorical symbol of *ela* 'pig' as the cultural attribute of the *anak rona* as wife-giver represents prosperity, abundance, and fertility for the *anak wina* as wife-taker. The cultural attributes of the *anak-rona* as wife-giver and the *anak-wina* as wife taker, as reflected in the animal metaphorical symbols of both *ela* 'pig' and *manuk* 'chicken', tend to be meaningless nowadays. There have been violations done by the younger generation of Manggarai society as the customary norms inherited from their ancestors are irrational in view of the perspective of modern life as the impact of education. The animal metaphorical symbols, *ela* 'pig' as the cultural attribute of the *anak-rona* as wife-giver and *manuk* 'chicken' as the cultural attribute of the *anak-wina* as wife-taker, become one of the controversial issues for the younger generation of Manggarai society whether they obey or ignore the customary norms inherited from their ancestors as something irrational in view of the modern perspective as the impact of education levels pursued and as the result of intercultural communication.

REFERENCES

- Abdikalyk, S. K., Abitzhanova, A. Z., Otarbekova, K. Z., Kaidarova, K. G., & Seidullayeva, A. G. (2016). "Concept as the main research object of cognitive linguistics". *International Journal of Environmental & Science Education*. 2016, Vol. 11, No. 10, 3167-3178.
- 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*. Hammondsorth, 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. Norton & company.
- Brown, H. D. (1994). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Bungin, B. (2007). *Penelitian Kualitatif: Komunikasi, Ekonomi, Kebijakan Publik dan Ilmu Sosial Lainnya*. Jakarta: Prenada Media.

- Bustan, F. (2005). "Wacana budaya *tudak* dalam ritual *penti* pada kelompok etnik Manggarai di Flores Barat: sebuah kajian linguistik kebudayaan". *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.
- Bustan, F. (2024). *Pelangi Budaya Pertanian Lahan Kering Masyarakat Manggarai di Flores*. Yogyakarta: Jejak Pustaka.
- Bustan, F. (2025). *Mosaik Kearifan Lokal Warisan Leluhur Orang Manggarai*. Yogyakarta: Jejak Pustaka.
- Bustan, F. & Ludji, A. D., (2024). "The features of human metaphor regarding social solidarity in family realm in Manggarai language". *International Journal of Arts and Social Sciences*. Volume 7 Issue 5, May 2024.
- 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*. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers.
- Faisal, S. (1990). *Penelitian Kualitatif: Dasar-dasar dan Aplikasi*. Malang: Yayasan Asih Asah Asuh (YA3).
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Language and Power: Relasi Bahasa, Kekuasaan dan Ideologi*. Diterjemahkan oleh Indah Rohmani-Komunitas Ambarawa. Malang: Boyan Publishing.
- 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*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Hall, S. (1997). *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. London: Sage.
- Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Kaplan, D. dan Manners, A. A. (1999). *Teori Budaya*. Diterjemahkan oleh L. Simatupang. Yogyakarta: Pusat Pelajar.
- Keessing, R. M. (1981). "Theories of culture." In *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*. Estudos 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.
- Maslova, V. A. (2004). *Cognitive Linguistics*. Minsk: Tetra Systems.
- Miller, G. A. (1979). "Images and models, similes, and metaphors". In *Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- 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.
- Monteiro, A. E., Je'eMaly, E. I. D., & Bustan, F. (2024). "The features of animal metaphor as a source of learning motivation to achieve success in pursuing school education". *International Journal of Arts and Social Sciences*. Volume 7 Issue 3, March 2024.
- Muhadjir, N. (1995). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif: Telaah Positivistik, Rasionalistik, Fenomenologik, Realisme Metaphisik*. Yogyakarta: Rake Sarasin.
- Palmer, G. B. (1996). *Toward 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 Farzad Sharifian and Gary B. Palmer. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.
- Rahimowa, I. (2020). The Foundation of Cultural Linguistics. *EJAR*. Volume 4, Issue: 7: Special Issue (EJAR). 197-180.
- Sapir, E. (1949). *Selected Writings in Language, Culture, and Personality*. D. Mandelbaum (ed.). Berkeley CA: University of California Press.
- 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. (2011). *Cultural Conceptualizations and Language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Sharifian, F. (2015). "Cultural linguistics and world Englishes". *World English*, doi: 10.1111/weng.12156.
- Sihotang, K. (2018). *Filsafat Manusia: Jendela Mengungkap Humanisme*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- Spradley, J. P. (1997). *Metode Etnografi*. Diterjemahkan oleh Misbah Zulfa Elizabeth. Yogyakarta: Tiara Wacana Yogya.
- Sudikan, S. Y. (2001). *Metode Penelitian Kebudayaan*. Surabaya: Unesa Unipress bekerjasama dengan Citra Wacana.
- Sugyono. (2018). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan Kombinasi (Mixed Methods)*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Suriasumantri, J. S. (2001). *Filsafat Ilmu: Sebuah Pengantar Populer*. Jakarta: Pustaka Sinar Harapan.
- Ungerer, F. & Schmid. (2006). *An Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics*. Oxfordshire: Routledge.
- Wahab, A. (1990). *Butir-butir Linguistik*. Surabaya: Airlangga University Press.
- Wardaugh, R. (2011). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. New Jersey: Wiley-Blackwell.
- 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.
- Yusuf, A. M. (2019). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan Penelitian Gabungan*. Jakarta: Kencana.