

The Conceptualisation of Manggarai People as Arid Land Farmers on Mutual Cooperation

Fransiskus Bustan^{1,2}, Alexander H. Kabelen,³ Malkisedek Taneo

^{1,2,3}Lecturer at the Teaching and Education Faculty, Nusa Cendana University Kupang, East Nusa Tenggara Province, Indonesia

ABSTRACT: This study explores the conceptualisation of Manggarai people as arid land farmers on mutual cooperation with special reference to the forms and meanings of traditional expressions of Manggarai language as the mirror of Manggarai culture. The study is viewed from the perspective of cultural linguistics, one of the new theoretical perspectives in cognitive linguistics examining the relationship of language, culture, and conceptualisation of belonging to a society as members of a social group. This is a descriptive study as it describes the conceptualisation of Manggarai people as arid land farmers on mutual cooperation with special reference to the forms and meanings of traditional expressions of Manggarai language as the mirror of Manggarai culture. The results of the study show that there is a close relationship between the Manggarai language, Manggarai culture, and the conceptualisation of Manggarai people in viewing and making sense of their world as arid land farmers. The relationship is manifested in the forms and meanings of linguistic phenomena used the traditional expression of Manggarai language, *Duat gula cama rangka lama, we'e mane cama rangka riek* "Going to work in the morning is crowded like male monkeys, going back home in the afternoon is crowded like water birds". The meanings implied in the forms of linguistic phenomena used in the traditional expression are concerned with togetherness, hard work, and well-being.

Key words: conceptualisation, Manggarai people, arid land farmer, mutual cooperation

I. INTRODUCTION

Indonesia is the fourth largest pluralistic nation in the world as its population is made up of a relatively high degree of diversity. One of the prominent features indicating the diversity of Indonesia is the existence of various different ethnic groups widely spreading all over the archipelago of Indonesia. As every ethnic group has its local culture and local language, it is not surprising that Indonesia is known as a multiethnic, multicultural, and multilingual nation (Bustan et al, 2017; Bustan & Liunokas, 2019). The miniature of Indonesia as a multiethnic, multicultural, and multilingual nation can be seen in the province of East Nusa Tenggara because its population is made up of 18 ethnic groups widely spreading in a number of big islands and hundreds of small islands. One of the ethnic groups is Manggarai ethnic group residing in the land of Manggarai which occupies approximately one third of the length of the island of Flores, one of the big islands in the province of East Nusa Tenggara. The land of Manggarai which is densely peppered with mountains has also given rise to a considerable variation in culture between areas in the landscape of Manggarai (Erb, 1999). The variation in culture between areas in the landscape of Manggarai can be seen in variation in language that Manggarai people employ both in macro-interactional levels and in micro-interactional levels such as in certain speech events or speech acts (Bustan, 2005; Verheijen, 1991; Bustan & Liunokas, 2019; Bustan & Kabelen, 2023; Gunas et al, 2023).

The variation in language they employ can be identified into two kinds, including social variation and functional variation. In view of social variation in language they employ, according to Verheijen (1991), there are several dialects spoken in the land of Manggarai and one of the dialects is central Manggarai dialect which is spoken by those living in the central part of Manggarai region. As the central Manggarai dialect is used as the

lingua franca among members of Manggarai ethnic group, it has been regarded as the general language in Manggarai region known as Manggarai language (Bustan, 2005; Bustan, 2006; Bustan, 2009; Bustan et al, 2017; Bustan & Liunokas, 2019; Bustan & Kabelen, 2023). In view of functional variation in language they employ, there are various kinds of registers used in Manggarai language. The registers are reflected in such cultural texts as traditional expressions inherited from the ancestors of Manggarai ethnic group. The linguistic phenomena used in the traditional expressions of Manggarai language are specific to Manggarai culture as the parent culture or hosting culture in which Manggarai language is embedded. In terms of two poles of linguistic sign, the specific features of linguistic phenomena used in the traditional expressions of Manggarai language can be seen in their forms and meanings designating a set of conceptualizations ascribed in the cognitive map or cultural knowledge of Manggarai people as arid land farmers in viewing and making sense of their world (Bustan, 2005; Bustan & Kabelen, 2023).

This study investigates the relationship between Manggarai language, Manggarai culture, and conceptualisation of Manggarai people as members of Manggarai ethnic group in viewing and making sense of their world as arid land farmers. As the relationship is so complex that the study focuses on the conceptualisation of Manggarai people as arid land farmers on mutual cooperation with special reference to the forms and meanings of linguistic phenomena they employ in the traditional expressions of Manggarai language as the mirror of Manggarai culture (Bagul, 1997; Erb, 1999; Bustan, 2005; Bustan, 2006; Bustan & Kabelen, 2023; Gunas et al, 2023). We are interested in conducting the study for the reason that the forms and meanings of linguistic phenomena used in the traditional expressions of Manggarai language designating the conceptualisation of Manggarai people as arid land farmers on mutual cooperation are specific to Manggarai culture as the parent culture or hosting culture in which Manggarai language is embedded. The conceptualisation of Manggarai people as arid land farmers on mutual cooperation is also recognized and accepted as one of the common cultural properties of Indonesian people. However, due to the dynamics of Manggarai people towards a more advanced and modern way of life according to the constellation of a developing world, their conceptualisation on mutual cooperation has been eroded at a certain degree by the framework of individualistic thought. The change can be seen in the replacement of non-monetary term principle which perpetuates mutual cooperation with monetary term principle as they are charged in the form of money after work. In this regard, many facts show that the daily wages for male workers are higher than the daily wages for female workers without taking account the productivity of the work they achieve. The difference in the wages of both male workers and female workers is a further embodiment of patriarchal system shared by Manggarai people which subordinates females or women or in various domains in which economic domains are no exception (Bustan, 2005; Bustan, 2006; Bustan & Kabelen, 2023).

II. FRAMEWORK

Along with the focus of attention, this study is viewed from the lens of cultural linguistics as one of the new theoretical perspectives in cognitive linguistics which explores the relationship between language, culture, and conceptualisation belonging to a people or society as members of a social group (Palmer and Sharifian, 2007; Palmer, 1996; Langacker, 1999). On the basis of premise that language, culture, and cognition are closely related (Cassirer, 1987; Casson, 1981; Stross, 1981; Whorf, 2001; Keesing, 1981; Alshammari, 2018; Boas, 1962; Grice, 1987), in the perspective of cultural linguistics, language used by a people as members of a social group is mainly explored through the prism of culture they share. The study is aimed at uncovering conceptualisation ascribed or imprinted in their cognitive map or cultural knowledge in viewing and making sense of their world, involving both the factual world and the symbolic world (Foley, 1997; Cassirer, 1997; Kaplan & Manners, 1999). The aim is also based on conception that language used by a people as members of a social group is the symbolic representation of culture they share (Bustan, 2005; Berger & Luckman, 1967; Kaplan & Manners, 1999; Cassirer, 1987; Bustan & Liunokas, 2019). The conception comes closest to the insight of Wardaugh (2011) that the culture of a people finds its reflection in the language they employ because when they value certain things and do them in a certain way, they come to use their language in ways that reflect what they value and what they do (Bustan & Kabelen, 2023). This is in line with the conception of

Brown (1994) that culture is deeply ingrained part of the very fiber of our being, but language - the means for communication among members of a culture - is the most visible and available expression of that culture. The use of language as the most visible and available expression of culture shared by a people as members of a social group is reflected in such cultural texts as traditional expressions inherited from their ancestors (Bustan, 2005; Bustan & Kabelen, 2023; Hall, 1997; Hogg & Abrams, 1988).

If we turn to its definition, the basic concepts that should be taken into account in the study of cultural linguistics are language, culture, and conceptualisation. As language can be defined differently, in the perspective of cultural linguistics, language is defined as a cultural activity and, at the same time, as an instrument for organizing other cultural domains. This is based on the fact that language used by a people as members of a social group is shaped not only by their special and general innate potentials as human beings, but also by their physical and sociocultural experiences through living together for years or for a long period of time and even transgenerations. Similar to language, as culture may mean different things for different people, in the perspective of cultural linguistics, culture is defined as the source of conceptualisation of experiences faced by a people as members of a social group in their contexts of living together. Culture serves as a display illustrating how they organize their ways of thinking about items, behaviors, and beliefs or events in cultural domains. The manifestation of such a relationship is reflected in their conceptualisation which refers to the way they conceptualise experiences in their minds or cognitions (Yu, 2007; Palmer & Sharifian, 2007; Malcolm, 2007). 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, it is noteworthy that determining what is sufficient, pertinent, and meaningful is often a matter of perspective and social position held by the participants as well. The determination 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 or hosting culture in which the language is embedded (Palmer & Sharifian, 2007; Gumperz, 1992; Spradley, 1997; Goodenough, 1964; Cassirer, 1997).

The main approach used to achieve the aim of cultural linguistics is ethnography approach because it is aimed at describing the culture shared by a people as members of a social group on the basis of the conception that language they employ as the window into their minds or cognitions (Malcolm, 2007; Bernstein, 1972). In an attempt to achieve the intended aim, the kind of ethnography approach used in dialogic ethnography combined with emic perspective in its application. Other than ethnography, cultural linguistics is also tied three traditional approaches that are central to anthropological linguistics that include Boasian linguistics, ethnosemantics or ethnoscience, and the ethnography of communication. As the three approaches are synthesized in cultural linguistics (Palmer & Sharifian, 2007), it is true to say then cultural linguistics is identical with anthropological linguistics in some respect. The reason is clear and understandable that the relationship of both language and culture belonging to a people as members of a social group is the main concern or interest of study in anthropological linguistics (Foley, 1991; Sharifian, 2011; Palmer & Sharifian, 2007; Foley, 1997; Bustan & Semiun, 2019; Taneo et al, 2022). Another reason is that the use of three approaches is aimed at identifying (1) language differences due to cultural differences and (2) cultural elements of cultural knowledge such as cognitive schemas and cultural schemas. Language in this regard is defined as a symbol system belonging to a people as members of a social group which they use as a medium to conceptualise various experiences they face in the contexts of living through the process of socialization (Palmer, 1996; Sharifian, 2011; Bustan, 2005; Palmer & Sharifian, 2007; Bustan & Semiun, 2019). As both language and culture are inextricably intertwined (Brown, 1994; Foley, 1997; Kramsch, 2001), Hymes (1974) propounded that, 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 use of language as an index and symbol of culture, the use of language as an element of culture can be identified by looking at the two poles of linguistic sign, that is pairing of form and meaning, of linguistic phenomena that the speakers of that language employ in

cultural domains. The term 'form' and 'meaning' are identical with 'expression' and 'content' which are similar to 'signifier' and 'signified' in the terminology of Saussure (Bustan, 2005; Bustan & Kabelen, 2023).

The results of preliminary researches show that there have been many previous studies exploring the relationship between Manggarai language, Manggarai culture, and conceptualisation of Manggarai people as members of Manggarai ethnic group, but none explores in more depth the forms and meanings of traditional expressions in Manggarai language reflecting the conceptualisation ascribed in the cognitive map of Manggarai people as arid land farmers regarding mutual cooperation. Nevertheless, there are several studies which indirectly stimulate us to conduct this study. The study of Erb (1999) dealing with a guide to traditional lifestyles of Manggaraians sketched out a set of their conceptualisations in viewing and making sense of their world. However, the conceptualisations are viewed from anthropological perspective as the dominant theme of her study with the focus of attention is paid to the traditional house of Manggarai people known as *mbaru gendang* (drum house) in Manggarai language. Added to this, the study of Bustan (2005) on the cultural discourse of *tudak* in the *penti* ritual, that is agricultural-new year party in Manggarai culture, provides brief information regarding mutual cooperation. Nevertheless, the main concern of his study is concerned with the text of *tudak penti* cultural discourse in Manggarai language.

III. METHOD

In terms of its research design, this study is descriptive as it describes the forms and meanings of linguistic phenomena used in the traditional expressions of Manggarai language about mutual cooperation on the basis of conceptualisation ascribed in the cognitive map of Manggarai people as arid land farmers. The study was based on two kinds of data, involving both primary data and secondary data. Along with the process of data acquisition, the procedures of research carried out were field and library research (Muhadjir, 1995; Nusa Putra, 2011; Afrizal, 2014; Sugyono, 2018; Yusuf, 2019; Moleong, 2021; Sugyono, 2022). The field research was aimed at obtaining the primary data dealing with the forms and meanings of traditional expressions in Manggarai language which reveal the conceptualisation of Manggarai people as dry land farmers regarding mutual cooperation. The research location was in the region of Manggarai, with the main location being the city of Ruteng as the capital city of Manggarai regency. The sources of the primary data were the members of Manggarai people residing in the city of Ruteng represented by three people as key informants who were selected on the basis of the ideal criteria put forward by Faisal (1990), Spradley (1997), Duranti (1997), Nusa Putra (2011), and Sukidan (2005). The methods of data collection were interviews which were then elaborated using recording, elicitation, and note-taking techniques (Bungin 2007; Moleong, 2021; Yusuf, 2019; Sugyono, 2018; Sugyono, 2022). The library research was done to obtain the secondary data relevant to the main concern of the study with regard to the forms and meanings of the traditional expressions of Manggarai language about mutual cooperation, as reflected in the conceptualisation of Manggarai people as arid land farmers. 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 forms and meanings of linguistic phenomena used in the traditional expressions of Manggarai language designating the conceptualisation of Manggarai people as arid land farmers regarding mutual cooperation. The process of data analysis took place from the initial data collection until the research report was written. The results of data analysis were negotiated and discussed continuously with the key informants to obtain conformity with their conceptualisation regarding the forms and meanings of traditional expressions in Manggarai language about mutual cooperation (Bustan, 2005; Sudikan, 2005; Bustan, 2006; Bustan et al, 2019; Taneo et al, 2022; Sugyono, 2022).

IV. Results

Based on the results of the study, it is found out that there is a close relationship between Manggarai language, Manggarai culture, and conceptualisation of Manggarai people as members of Manggarai ethnic group in viewing and making sense of their world as arid land farmers. The relationship is manifested in the conceptualisation of Manggarai people as dry land farmers on mutual cooperation known as *leles* in Manggarai language. More specifically, the conceptualisation is reflected the forms and meanings of linguistic phenomena used in the traditional expressions of Manggarai language as the mirror of Manggarai culture. On the basis of data selection, one of the most prominent traditional expressions of Manggarai language designating the conceptualisation of Manggarai people as arid land farmers on mutual cooperation is as follows: *Duat gula cama rangka lama, we'e mane cama rangka ruek* 'Going to work in the farming land in the morning is crowded like male monkeys, coming home from work in the farming land in the afternoon is crowded like water birds'. The linguistic phenomena used in the traditional expression are specific in their forms and meanings designating the conceptualisation of Manggarai people as dry land farmers on mutual cooperation. The meanings stored in the forms of linguistic phenomena used in the traditional expression imply a set of local wisdoms inherited from the ancestors of Manggarai people in viewing and making sense of their world as dry land farmers.

V. Discussion

With special reference to the corpus of data presented above, this section discusses in more depth the forms and meanings of linguistic phenomena used in the traditional expression of Manggarai language as the source of conceptualisation ascribed in the cognitive map of Manggarai people as dry land farmers regarding mutual cooperation as one of the local wisdoms inherited from their ancestors.

Forms

As can be seen in the physical features of linguistic phenomena used, *Duat gula cama rangka lama, we'e mane cama rangka ruek* 'Going to work in the farming land in the morning is crowded like male monkeys, coming home from work in the farming land in the afternoon is crowded like water birds', the traditional expression 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 or complete sentences as its component parts are as follows: (1) *Duat gula cama rangka lama* 'Going to work in the farming land in the morning is crowded like male monkeys' and (2) *We'e mane cama rangka ruek* 'Going home from work in the farming land in the afternoon is crowded like water birds'. The two independent clauses appear as declarative sentences providing information regarding the nature and application of mutual cooperation in the social life of Manggarai people in the past when they lived as dry land farmers. While in terms of its syntactic structure, the relationship of the two independent clauses forms an asyndeton construction because it is not linked by using the word (function word) *agu* 'and' or *ko* 'or' as the coordinating conjunction. The coordinating conjunction is omitted because the traditional expression is a fixed form of linguistic phenomena commonly used by Manggarai people as arid land farmers in the texts of cultural discourses related to agricultural rituals in Manggarai language. Along with its feature as a fixed form, the omission of the coordinating conjunction is aimed at keeping and maintaining balance and harmony in the tempo when the traditional expression is spoken and listened to. The balance and harmony in the tempo are also reflected in the number of words used in the two independent clauses is of four words.

The traditional expression combines several figures of speech, including comparison, repetition, and contradiction. The comparison figure of speech is marked by the use of the word (function word) *cama* 'like' in the two independent clauses which are distributed before the verbal phrase *rangka lama* 'crowded male monkeys' in the independent clause (1) or distributed before the verbal phrase *rangka ruek* 'crowded water birds' in the independent clause (2). The repetition figure of speech is marked by the repetition of the word (function word) *like* 'like' and the word (verb) *rangka* 'crowded' in the independent clause (1) and in the independent clause (2). The contradiction figure of speech is characterized by the use of several words which have

antonymous meanings, as in the following: (a) the word (verb) *duat* 'work in the farming land' in the verbal phrase *duat gula* 'going to work in the farming land in the morning' in the independent clause (1) which is an antonym with the word (verb) *we'e* 'come home' in the verbal phrase *we'e mane* 'coming home from work in the farming land in the afternoon' in the independent clauses (2) and (b) the word (adverb of time) *gula* 'morning' as temporal marker in the verbal phrase *duat gula* 'going to work in the farming land in the morning' in the independent clause (1) which is an antonym with the word (adverb of time) *mane* 'in the afternoon' as temporal marker in the verbal phrase *we'e mane* 'going home from work in the farming land in the afternoon' in the independent clause (2).

The linguistic phenomena used in traditional expression contain some beautiful forms that invite sensory pleasure when spoken and listened to. Apart from the use of the figures of speech, the beautiful forms of linguistic phenomena that invite sensory pleasure when spoken and listened to are marked by using resonant word pairs which appear in the forms of assonance. In terms of their structures, the forms of assonance are of two kinds, including symmetrical assonance and asymmetrical assonance structure. The symmetrical assonance structure is indicated by using the same vocal phoneme, *a – a*, in the word (verb) *rangka* 'crowded' and the word (noun) *lama* 'male monkeys' as the conversion of the word (noun phrase) *kode lama* 'male monkeys' by omitting the word (noun) *kode* 'monkeys' in the independent clause (1). The asymmetric assonance structure is characterized by using unequal vocal phonemes, *u – a*, in the word (verb) *duat* 'going to work in the farming land' and the word (adverb of time) *gula* 'morning' as temporal marker in the independent clause (2). The manifestation of aesthetic dimension is further strengthened by the fact that the words used in the independent clause (1) and the independent clause (2) are equally four in number so that there is balance and harmony in the tempo when the traditional expression is spoken and listened to. The choice of words and the way of expressing the aesthetic dimension that contains the beautiful forms of linguistic phenomena that invite sensory pleasure when spoken or listened to, as described above, is one aspect characterizing the ritual piety of linguistic phenomena used in the texts of cultural discourses in Manggarai language. As conceptualized in the cognitive map of Manggarai people, the reason of using the beautiful forms is that the communication done through the traditional expression as a segment or fragment of cultural discourse is directed to the God, ancestors, and natural spirits as supernatural powers.

Meanings

Based on the conceptualisation of Manggarai people as dry land farmers, the forms of linguistic phenomena used in the traditional expressions of Manggarai language imply a set of meanings which designate the ways Manggarai people view and make sense of their world as dry land farmers. Based on the contents stored in the forms of linguistic phenomena used, the meanings are concerned with togetherness, hard work, and well-being.

Togetherness

The meaning of togetherness is the most prominent meaning implied in the forms of linguistic phenomena used in the traditional expression of Manggarai language above. The meaning of togetherness does not only unite in speeches or words, but should also be manifested empirically in actions (Bustan, 2005; Taneo et al, 2022). In accordance with the contents stored in the forms of linguistic phenomena used in the traditional expression, when they go to work in the farming land in the morning, they always walk together and, similarly, when they come home from work in the farming land in the afternoon, they always walk together so it's no wonder that the atmosphere is so crowded and lively. The description of the hustle and bustle when they go to work in the farming land in the morning (*duat gula*) is similarly compared with to the noises and excitements of male monkeys (*cama rangka lama*) in the morning when welcoming the morning sun. The description of the atmosphere of crowds and excitements when they come home from work in the farming land or when they return to their homes or villages in the afternoon (*we'e mane*) is comparatively analogous to the crowds of water birds (*cama rangka riek*) when flying back to their cages in the late afternoon. The comparative analogy of togetherness behavior is indicated by the use of the word (function word) *cama* 'same' which is distributed in the middle position between the verbal phrase *duat gula* and the verbal phrases *cama rangka lama* in the

independent clause (1) and between the verbal phrase *we'e mane* and the verbal phrase *cama rangka ruek* in the independent clause (2).

The meaning of togetherness is also related to the conceptualisation of Manggarai people that as blood relatives or blood descendants who are bound in one *wa'u* as a patrilineal-genealogical clan, they should be always faithful in words and deeds. The manifestation of hope for fidelity in words unites in the process of planning mutual cooperation, as reflected in the traditional expression of Manggarai language, *Bantang cama, reje leles* 'Agree together, agree mutual cooperate'. The contents stored in the forms of linguistic phenomena used show that the process and mechanism of mutual cooperation in the social life of Manggarai people in the past was based on the results of mutual agreement and consensus. The manifestation of their hopes for loyalty should be seen in actions in the sense that the actions should be empirically proven in the implementation of agricultural land cultivation. In accordance with the conceptualisation of Manggarai people, the essence of mutual cooperation is that they work together and help each other selflessly when they work on agricultural land in order to achieve household economic well-being which is marked, among other things, by the availability of abundant corn and rice as their staple food throughout the year (Bustan, 2005; Bustan, 2006). The meaning of togetherness conveyed through the forms of linguistic phenomena used in the traditional expression of Manggarai language is one of the local wisdoms inherited from the ancestors of Manggarai people that should be maintained and preserved in their social life. This is because it serves as a control mechanism or blue print for Manggarai people in organizing their patterns of behavior in order to keep and maintain social harmony, social solidarity, and social cohesion as well.

Hard Work

The forms of linguistic phenomena used in the traditional expression imply the meaning of hard work. The meaning is reflected in the verbal phrase of *duat gula* 'go to work in the farming land in the morning' in the independent clause (1) in comparison with the verbal phrase of *we'e mane* 'come home from work in the farming land in the afternoon' in the independent clause (2). The two verbal phrases show that they work in the farming land all day long, starting in the morning when the sun begins to rise on the eastern horizon (*du parn mata lesa*) until late in the afternoon when the sun is about to set on the western horizon (*du kolepn mata lesa sale*). Based on the custom inherited from their ancestors, they only rest briefly in the hut (*sekang*) or under the shade of a shady tree (*mbau haju*) (Bustan et al, 2020). The meaning of hard work is also reflected in the traditional expression of Manggarai language, *Dempul wuku, tela toni* 'Broken nails, split backs'. Based on the lexical meanings of its words, the forms of linguistic phenomena used in the traditional expression show that they work hard in the farming land all day long until their fingernails become dull (*dempul wuku*) and the skin on their back is split (*tela toni*) in the heat of the sun. On the other side, the forms of linguistic phenomena used imply an important meaning that should be taken into account by Manggarai people is that the prosperity of their life is impossible to achieve without hard work (Bustan, 2005; Bustan, 2006). This is one of the local wisdoms inherited from their ancestors that should be preserved in their social life because it is concerned with work ethic as one of the keys to succeed in an attempt to achieve the condition of social-economic welfare.

Well-being

Although not stated explicitly, the forms of linguistic phenomena used in the traditional expression imply the meaning of well-being which is associated with the condition of physical natural environment in Manggarai region in the past which was densely forested (*pong*) and partly interspersed with swamps (*temek*) (Bustan, 2005; Bustan, 2006; Bustan et al, 2020). The condition of the densely forested natural physical environment is implied through the use of the word (noun) *lama* 'male' as a conversion from the noun phrase *kode lama* 'male monkeys', as mentioned earlier, because monkeys can enjoy their lives freely in large populations in such natural environment. The condition of the physical natural environment in swampy areas is indicated by the use of the word (noun) *ruek* 'water bird' because the place where water birds live is swamps (Bustan et al, 2020). The ecological meaning is intertextually related to the traditional expression, *Temekn wa, mbaun eta* 'The

swamps are below, the leafy leaves are above'. This traditional expression implies an ecological meaning regarding the condition of a densely forested natural environment which is marked by the growth of shady leafy trees (*mbaun eta*) as a place for male monkeys (*kode lama*) to play in the day and underneath there are swamps (*temekn wa*) as a place for water birds (*ruek*) to live. The meaning is one of the local wisdoms inherited from the ancestors of Manggarai people that should be maintained because it deals with the conservation of natural environment, especially the sustainability of forest as the source of rain.

VI. CONCLUSION

In summary, the conceptualisation of Manggarai people as arid land farmers regarding mutual cooperation is reflected in the traditional expression of Manggarai language, *Duat gula cama rangka lama, we'e mane cama rangka ruek* 'Going to work in the farming land in the morning is crowded like male monkeys, coming home from work in the farming land in the afternoon is crowded like water birds'. The forms and meanings of linguistic phenomena used in the traditional expression are specific to Manggarai culture as the parent culture or hosting culture in which Manggarai language is embedded. The traditional expression appears in the form of compound sentence made up of two independent clauses or complete sentences as its component parts, including *Duat gula cama rangka lama* 'Going to work in the farming land in the morning is crowded like male monkeys' and *We'e mane cama rangka ruek* 'Coming home from work in the farming land in the afternoon is crowded like water birds'. The forms of linguistic phenomena used in the traditional expression imply a set of meanings, including the meaning of togetherness or solidarity, the meaning of hard work, and the meaning of ecology. The meanings local wisdoms that should be maintained in today's life of Manggarai people even though they no longer live on as arid land farmers.

REFERENCES

- [1.] Afrizal. (2014). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif: Sebuah Upaya Mendukung Penggunaan Penelitian Kualitatif dalam Berbagai Disiplin Ilmu*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.
- [2.] Alshammari, S. H. (2018). 'The relationship between language, identity and cultural differences'. In *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*. Vol. 8, No. 4, 2018. Pp. 98 – 101.
- [3.] Bagul, A. B. (1997). *Kebudayaan Manggarai sebagai salah satu Khasanah Kebudayaan Nasional*. Surabaya: Ubhara Press.
- [4.] Berger, P. L. & Luckman, T. (1967). *The Social Construction of Reality*. Hammondsworth, United Kingdom: Penguin
- [5.] 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.
- [6.] Boas, F. (1962). *Anthropology and Modern Life*. New York: The Norton Library. W. W. Norton & company.
- [7.] Brown, H. D. (1994). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. The USA: Prentice Hall Regents.
- [8.] Bungin, B. (2007). *Penelitian Kualitatif: Komunikasi, Ekonomi, Kebijakan Publik dan Ilmu Sosial Lainnya*. Jakarta: Prenada Media.
- [9.] 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.
- [10.] Bustan, F. (2006). *Etnografi Budaya Manggarai Selayang Pandang*. Kupang: Publikasi Khusus LSM Agricola Kupang.
- [11.] Bustan, F. & Semiun, A. (2019). *The Cultural Discourse of Baby Birth in Manggarai Speech Community*. Balti: LAP LAMBERT ACADEMIC PUBLISHING.
- [12.] Bustan, F., Semiun, A., & Bire, J. (2017). *The Features of Anthropomorphic Metaphors in the Manggarai Language*. Balti: LAP LAMBERT ACADEMIC PUBLISHING.
- [13.] Bustan, F. & Liunokas Y. (2019). "The forms and meanings of verbal expressions on the existence of

- God as a supernatural power in Manggarai language (a cultural linguistic analysis)". *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity, and Change*. www.ijicc.net. Volume 5, Issue 3, 2019. Special Edition: Science, Applied Science, Teaching and Education
- [14.] Bustan, F., Mahur, A., & Kabelen, A. H. (2020). "Karakteristik dan dinamika sistem pertanian lahan kering dalam kebudayaan Manggarai". *Jurnal Lazuardi* 3 (1), 344 – 367.
- [15.] Bustan, F. & Kabelen, A. H. (2023). 'The cultural conceptualization of Manggarai ethnic group regarding economic welfare in the field of animal husbandry'. *SPARKLE: Journal of Language, Education, and Culture*, 2 (1), 1-8.
- [16.] Cassirer, E. (1987). *Manusia dan Kebudayaan: Sebuah Esai tentang Manusia*. Diterjemahkan oleh Alois A. Nugroho. Jakarta: Gramedia.
- [17.] Casson, R. W. (1981). *Language, Culture, and Cognition: Anthropological Perspectives*. New York: Macmillan.
- [18.] Duranti, A. (2001). *Linguistic Anthropology: A Reader*. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers.
- [19.] Erb, M. (1999). *The Manggaraians: A Guide to Traditional Lifestyles*. Singapore: Times Editions.
- [20.] Fairclough, N. (2003). *Language and Power: Relasi Bahasa, Kekuasaan, dan Ideologi*. Diterjemahkan oleh Indah Rohmani-Komunitas Ambarawa. Malang: Boyan Publishing.
- [21.] Faisal, S. (1990). *Penelitian Kualitatif: Dasar-dasar dan Aplikasi*. Malang: Yayasan Asih Asah Asuh (YA3).
- [22.] Foley, W. A. (1997). *Anthropological Linguistics: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- [23.] Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Culture: Selected Essays*. New York: Basic Books
- [24.] Goodenough, W. H. (1964). "Cultural anthropology and linguistics. In *Language in Culture and People: A Reader in Linguistics and Anthropology*. New York: Harper & Row.
- [25.] Grice, G. W. (1987). *The Linguistic Construction of Reality*. London: Croom Helm.
- [26.] Gumperz, J. (1992). "Contextualization of language". In *The Contextualization of Language*. Edited by Aldo di Luzio and Peter Aus. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benyamins.
- [28.] Gunas, T., Bustan, F., Menggo, S., & Jem, H. Y. (2023). "Politeness in *Tiba Meka* ritual in Manggarai language and culture, Eastern Indonesia". *Interdisciplinary Journal of Sociality Studies*. Vol. 3 (2023), 61-71.
- [29.] Hall, S. (1997). *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. London: Sage.
- [30.] Hogg, M. and Abrams, D. (1988). *Social Identifications: A Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations and Group Processes*. London: Routledge.
- [31.] Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- [32.] Kaplan, D. & Manners, A. A. (1999). *Teori Budaya*. Diterjemahkan oleh L. Simatupang. Yogyakarta: Pusat Pelajar.
- [33.] Keesing, R. M. (1981). "Theories of culture." In *Language, Culture and Cognition: Anthropological Perspectives*. Edited by Ronald W. Casson. New York: Macmillan.
- [34.] Kovecses, Z. (2009). "Metaphorical meaning making: discourse, language and culture". *Quardens de Filologia. Estudis Linguistics*. Vol. XIV (2009) 135-151.
- [35.] Kramsch, K. (2001). *Language and Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [36.] 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.
- [37.] Lawang, M. Z. R. (1999). *Konflik Tanah di Manggarai: Pendekatan Sosiologik*. Jakarta: Penerbit Universitas Indonesia.
- [38.] Malcolm, G. I. (2007). "Cultural linguistics and bidialectal education". In *Applied Cultural Linguistics*. Edited by Farzard Sharifian and Gary B. Palmer. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.
- [39.] Miller, R. L. (1968). *The Linguistic Relativity Principle and Humboldtian Ethnolinguistics: A History and Appraisal*. Paris: The Hague
- [40.] Moleong, L. J. (2021). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. Edisi Revisi. Bandung: Rosda.

- [41.] Muhadjir, N. (1995). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif: Telaah Positivistik, Rasionalistik, Fenomenologik, Realisme Metaphisik*. Yogyakarta: Rake Sarasin.
- [42.] Nusa Putra. (2011). *Penelitian Kualitatif: Proses dan Aplikasi*. Jakarta: Indeks.
- [43.] Occi, D. J. (2007). "Using cultural linguistics to teach English language inferential schemas used in archeology to Japanese university students". In *Applied Cultural Linguistics*. Edited by Farzad Sharifian and Gary B. Palmer. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.
- [44.] Palmer, G. B. (1996). *Towards a Theory of Cultural Linguistics*. Austin: The University of Texas Press.
- [45.] 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.
- [46.] Sapir, E. (1949). *Selected Writings in Language, Culture, and Personality*. D. Mandelbaum (ed.). Berkeley CA: University of California Press.
- [47.] 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.
- [48.] 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.
- [49.] Sharifian, F. (2011). *Cultural Conceptualisations and Language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- [50.] Spradley, J. P. (1997). *Metode Etnografi*. Diterjemahkan oleh Misbah Zulfa Elizabeth. Yogyakarta: Tiara Wacana Yogya.
- [51.] Stross, B. (1981). "Language, culture, and cognition." In *Language, Culture and Cognition: Anthropological Perspectives*. Edited by Ronald W. Casson. New York: Macmillan.
- [52.] Sudikan, S. Y. (2005). *Metode Penelitian Kebudayaan*. Surabaya: Unesa Unipress bekerjasama dengan Citra Wacana.
- [53.] Sugyono. (2018). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan Kombinasi (Mixed Methods)*. Cetakan ke-10. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- [54.] Sugyono. (2022). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif*. Cetakan Kelima. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- [55.] Taneo, M., Bustan, F., & Basri, K. "Makna pesta sekolah dalam masyarakat Manggarai di Flores". *Haumeni Journal of Education* 2 (1), 27-35, 2022.
- [56.] Wallace, A. F. C. (1981). "Culture and cognition." In *Language, Culture, and Cognition: Anthropological Perspectives*. Edited by Ronald W. Casson. New York: Macmillan.
- [57.] Wardaugh
- [58.] Whorf, B. L. (2001). "The relationship of habitual thought and behavior to language". In *Linguistic Anthropology: A Reader*. Edited by Alessandro Duranti. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers.
- [59.] Verheijen, A. J. (1991). *Manggarai dan Wujud Tertinggi*. Diterjemahkan oleh Alex Beding dan Marsel Beding. Jakarta: LIPI-RUL.
- [60.] 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.
- [61.] Yusuf, A. M. (2019). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan Penelitian Gabungan*. Jakarta: Kencana.