



The Tide to Motherland for Manggaraian People

Lasarus Jehamat¹, Fransiskus Bustan², Natalia Tanti Bustan Do³

^{1,2}Lecturer of Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Nusa Cendana University Kupang

³Student of Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Nusa Cendana University Kupang

Article DOI: [10.55677/SSHBR/2025-3050-0304](https://doi.org/10.55677/SSHBR/2025-3050-0304)

DOI URL: <https://doi.org/10.55677/SSHBR/2025-3050-0304>

KEYWORDS: the tide to motherland, Manggaraian people

ABSTRACT: This study examines the relationship of both Manggaraian language and Manggaraian culture belonging to Manggaraian people, as reflected in the cultural conceptualization ascribed in their cognitive map regarding the tide to motherland. The study is viewed from the perspective of cultural linguistics, one of the new theoretical perspectives in cognitive linguistics exploring the relationship of language, culture, and conceptualization. The method is descriptive as the study aims to describe the cultural conceptualization of Manggaraian people regarding the tide to motherland. The result of study shows that one of the idiomatic expressions of Manggaraian language which is mostly used by Manggaraian people as the frame of reference for them in uncovering the cultural conceptualization ascribed in their cognitive map regarding the tide to motherland is Neka hemong kuni agu kalo 'Don't forget placenta and dadap three'. Even though the physical forms of linguistic phenomena used in the idiomatic expression seems short in its surface structure, the contents stored in the forms of linguistic phenomena used are very dense in meanings. The meanings remind Manggaraian people not to forget to their motherland, Manggarai, or their natal village when they go and live abroad because it was the first place of their presence on this earth.

Corresponding Author:

Fransiskus Bustan

Published:

March 19, 2025

License:

This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license:
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

INTRODUCTION

It is all agreed that different societies speak different languages and the differences are due to cultural differences because language used by a society as members of a social group is the reflection of culture they share. The function of language as the reflection of culture belonging to as a society as members of a social group can be seen in such cultural texts as folklore, ritual speech, proverbs, and idiomatic expression. The features or characteristics of linguistic phenomena used in the cultural texts are unique and specific to culture as the parent culture in which the cultural texts are embedded (Alshammari, 2018; Bustan et al., 2017; Bustan & Semiun, 2019; Bustan et al., 2024). The unique and specific features of linguistic phenomena used are reflected in their forms and meanings as the two poles of linguistic signs. The forms refer to physical features of linguistic phenomena and meanings refer to contents stored in the forms of linguistic phenomena.

Bearing the matters stated above in minds, in general, this study examines the relationship of Manggaraian language, Manggaraian culture, and conceptualization of Manggaraian people as members of Manggaraian ethnic group living in the region of Manggarai that occupies the western part of the island of Flores, one the five big islands in the Province of East Nusa Tenggara in Indonesia (Bustan, 2024; Bustan et al., 2017; Bustan & Semiun, 2019; Bustan et al., 2024). As the relationship is complex and pervasive that the study focuses on the idiomatic expression of Manggaraian language in which the contents stored in the forms of linguistic phenomena used imply a set of meanings which designate the cultural conceptualization ascribed in the cognitive map of Manggaraian people regarding the tide to motherland. Along with its scope, therefore, the study aims to describe the cultural conceptualization of Manggaraian people regarding the tide to motherland, as reflected in the forms and meanings of linguistic phenomena they employ in the idiomatic expression of Manggaraian language. We are interested in conducting the study for the basic reason that the features of linguistic phenomena in the idiomatic expression of Manggaraian language regarding the tide to motherland are unique and specific in their forms and meanings. Another reason is that, based on the results of previous studies, there has any study examining in more depth the cultural conceptualization of Manggaraian people regarding the tide to motherland in view of cultural linguistics as one of the new theoretical perspectives in cognitive linguistics.

FRAMEWORK

In an attempt to achieve its aim, as aforementioned, this study is viewed from the perspective of cultural linguistics as one of the new theoretical perspectives in cognitive linguistics exploring the relationship of language, culture, and conceptualization. Cultural linguistics is regarded as an emerging paradigm or model in cognitive linguistics as it draws on the combined resource of both anthropological linguistics and cognitive linguistics in providing an account of the communicative behavior of a people as members of a social group (Palmer, 1996; Palmer & Sharifian, 2007; Bustan et al., 2017; Bustan & Semiun, 2019; Bustan et al., 2024). In the perspective of cultural linguistics, language is explored through the lens of culture in an attempt to uncover conceptualization ascribed in the cognitive map of its speakers in viewing the world. The aim is based on premise that language in its use as a chief means of communication between and among a people as members of a social group is the window into their cognitions or minds (Yu, 2007; Palmer & Sharifian, 2007; Bustan et al., 2017; Bustan & Semiun, 2019; Bustan et al., 2024).

Cultural linguistics is an approach to identifying language differences on the basis of premise that the differences between languages are due to cultural differences shared by the speakers of those languages. This comes closest to the conception of Humboldt that the diversity of languages is not concerned with the diversity of signs and sounds, but the diversity of worldviews. The conception is reflected in the theory of linguistic relativity that the varying cultural concepts and categories inherent in different languages affect the cognitive classification of the experienced world in such a way that speakers of different languages think and behave differently. When we explore the differences between languages, therefore, the basic concept that should be taken into account is that we perceive the world in terms of categories and distinctions found in our native language and what is found in one language may not be found in another language because of cultural differences (Miller, 1968; Palmer, 1996; Foley, 1997; Alshammari, 2018; Bustan et al., 2017; Bustan & Semiun, 2019; Bustan et al., 2024).

However, 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 (Palmer & Sharifian, 2007; Sharifian, 2007). This is equated with the idea that culture is deeply ingrained part of the very fiber of our being, but language as the means for communication among members of a society is the most visible and available expression of culture they share. Similar to language, as culture may mean different things for different people (Kaplan & Manners, 1999), in the perspective of cultural linguistics, culture is defined as the source of conceptualization of experience encountered by a society in their context of living together as members of social group (Palmer & Sharifian, 2007; Sharifian, 2007; Sharifian, 2011; Palmer, 1996). In this regard, according to Foley (1997), culture is a cognitive map belonging to a society as members of a social group used as the source of reference for them in viewing the world. Culture is a display which illustrates how a society as members of a social group organize their ways of thinking about items, behaviors, and beliefs or events taking place in cultural domain (Palmer & Sharifian, 2007; Sharifian, 2011; Palmer, 1996; Bustan et al., 2017; Bustan & Semiun, 2019; Bustan et al., 2024).

The relationship of language and culture is manifested in conceptualization which refers to fundamental cognitive processes which naturally lead to the development of schemas, categories, metaphors, and scripts. The ways a society as members of a social group conceptualize their experiences in cultural domains are known as cultural conceptualizations which refer to how people from different cultures interpret their world that contains such cultural aspects as beliefs, norms, customs, traditions, and values. As cultural conceptualization and language are two intrinsic aspects of cultural cognition, cultural conceptualizations have conceptual existence and linguistic encoding. Language in this light can also be defined as a central aspect of cultural cognition as a collective memory bank for cultural conceptualizations, past and present. This is because language is shaped by cultural conceptualizations that have prevailed at different stages in the story of its speakers and the different stages can leave their traces in current linguistic practices. Language is one of the primary mechanisms that functions not only to store the cultural conceptualizations, but also to communicate the cultural conceptualizations in question. Language is a social-collective memory bank that serves as a fluid vehicle for the retransmission of the socioculturally embodied cultural conceptualizations (Palmer, 1996; Palmer & Sharifian, 2007; Sharifian, 2007; Sharifian, 2011; Bustan et al., 2017; Bustan & Semiun, 2019; Bustan et al., 2024).

Nevertheless, it is worth highlighting that cultural conceptualization may not be correlated objectively with external world because cultural conceptualization is the result of interaction between members of a culture carried out through a continuous process of negotiation and renegotiation taking place through time, space, and even across generations. The function of language in this light is twofold because, in addition to being a means for communicating cultural conceptualization, language also serves as a means for embodying cultural conceptualization. This is in line with the fact that language as a system of symbols is the vehicle for expressing the cultural identity of a people as members of a social group (Alshammari, 2018). The cultural conceptualizations distributed across the minds of a people as members of a social group representing their cognition at the cultural level are called linguistic imagery which is concerned with how they speak about the world that they themselves imagine. Nevertheless, the linguistic imagery can be examined from the physical forms of language and, as such, the meanings stored in the forms of language used should be interpreted along with the sociocultural context of its speakers as the frame of reference (Palmer & Sharifian, 2007; Sharifian, 2007; Sharifian, 2011; Bustan et al., 2017; Bustan & Semiun, 2019; Bustan et al., 2024).

Language in its use as a symbolic system with the power to shape and create such cultural realities as norms, values, perceptions, and identities is expressed through discourse as its vehicle (Bustan et al, 2024). The significance of discourse as the vehicle for expressing cultural realities can be clearly seen when the members of a speech community interact for particular purposes. To achieve the intended goals of interactions, they produce particular discourses as assemblies of meanings relating to particular subject matters. When the discourses present a conceptual framework within which significant subject matters are discussed in their culture and latent norms of conduct, discourses are seen as ideologies or worldviews and, as such, a discourse can be defined as a source of making meanings in a culture (Geertz, 1973; Schneider, 1976; Bustan et al., 2017; Bustan & Semiun, 2019; Bustan et al., 2024).

Meaning as fundamental to language and culture is realized in a cultural discourse, an umbrella term for any form of discourse which takes place in a cultural domain (Gumperz, 1992). While in terms of the meanings stored in the forms of language used, a cultural discourse contains a set of items, behaviors, and beliefs defined as belonging to the same category of things. As a cultural domain is a basic unit of meaning that shapes how a people as members of a social group conceptually organize their world, a cultural discourse is seen as the vehicle for the representation of cultural conceptualization (Gumperz, 1992). As the use of language as an essential instrument and component of culture is reflected in linguistic structure (Langacker, 1999), a cultural discourse is also defined as a repository of meanings stored in the forms of linguistic signs commonly shared by members of a culture (Kovecses, 2009). The features of linguistic phenomena used in a cultural discourse should be viewed from their forms and meanings as the two poles of linguistic signs. As aforementioned, the forms refer to the physical features of linguistic phenomena used, as reflected in the surface structure, while the meanings refer to the contents stored in the forms of linguistic phenomena used which reflect the cultural conceptualization ascribed in the cognitive map of its speakers regarding experience they faced in the contexts of living together for years or a long period of time and even transgenerations (Palmer & Sharifan, 2007; Sharifian, 2007; Bustan et al., 2017; Bustan & Semiun, 2019; Bustan et al., 2024).

METHOD

In terms of its design, this is a descriptive study as its aim is to describe the cultural conceptualization ascribed in the cognitive map of Manggaraian people regarding the tide to motherland (Muhadjir, 1995; Nusa Putra, 2011; Wahyuni, 2015; Sugiyono, 2020; Abdulsammad, 2021; Moleong, 2025). The sources of data were primary and secondary data. The field research was carried out in Pagal, Cibal, Manggarai as the main location. The approach to obtaining the required data was dialogic ethnography approach (Hymes, 1974; Gumperz, 1992; Spradley, 1997; Wahyuni, 2015; Sugiyono, 2020; Abdulsammad, 2021; Moleong, 2025). The methods of data collection were observation and interview. Based on the data of observation, the in-depth interviews were carried out with Manggaraian people, especially those residing in Pagal village as the main location of research. They were represented by three persons as the key informants selected on basis of the ideal criteria proposed by Faisal (1990), Spradley (1997), Sudikan (2001), Wahyuni (2015), Sugiyono (2020), Abdulsammad (2021), Moleong (2025). The techniques of data collection were recording, elicitation, and note-taking. The method used to collect the secondary data was documentary study. The documents used as the sources of data were general documents (books) and special documents (scientific articles, results of research, paper). The collected data were analyzed qualitatively by using inductive method as the analysis was started from the data to the concept/theory regarding the tide to motherland for Manggaraian people. The concept/theory applies to Manggaraian culture because the description was made on the basis of cultural conceptualization ascribed in their cognitive map, as reflected in the forms and meanings of linguistic phenomena they employed in the idiomatic expressions of Manggaraian (Spradley, 1987; Sudikan, 2001; Duranti, 2001; Bustan & Semiun, 2019; Wahyuni, 2015; Sugiyono, 2020; Abdulsammad, 2021; Moleong, 2025).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Result

The result of study shows there are many idiomatic expressions of Manggaraian language designating the cultural conceptualizations of Manggaraian people regarding the tide to motherland. Based on the result of data selection, one of the idiomatic expressions of Manggaraian language which is mostly used by Manggaraian people as the frame of reference is as follows: Neka hemong kuni agu kalo 'Don't forget placenta and dadap three'. Even though the physical forms of linguistic phenomena used in the idiomatic expression seems short in its surface structure, the contents stored in the forms of linguistic phenomena used are very dense in meanings which designate the cultural conceptualization ascribed in the cognitive map of Manggaraian people regarding to the tide to motherland. The meanings stored in the forms of linguistic phenomena used in the idiomatic expression remind Manggaraian people not to forget to their motherland or natal village when they go and live abroad. This also implies that, even though they go and live abroad for life, they should be still Manggaraians in some respect because Manggaraian culture is their sense of identity as well as symbol of identity.

Discussion

As seen in the physical features of linguistic phenomena used, the idiomatic expression appears as an imperative-negative sentence indicated by using the word neka 'not as a form of negative marker which distributes preceding the word (verb) hemong 'forget' that functions as the predicate and the group of words kuni agu kalo 'placenta and dadap tree' that functions as the object

complement. As seen in the physical feature of language used, the group of words kuni agu kalo 'placenta and dadap tree' is a coordinative phrase made up of two words as its component parts. The two words as its component parts are the word (noun) kuni 'placenta' and the word (noun) kalo 'dadap tree' linked by using the coordinating conjunction agu 'and'. The phrase appears in the form of polysyndention style as the two words (nouns) serving as its component parts are linked by using the word (coordinating conjunction) agu 'and'.

Referring to the lexical meanings of its words, the textual meaning of the idiomatic expression is as follows: 'Don't forget placenta and dadap tree'. While along with social and cultural context of Manggaraian people as the native speakers of Manggaraian language, the contextual meaning of the idiomatic expression is as follows: "Don't forget motherland". The motherland is symbolized by the word (noun) kuni 'placenta' and the word (noun) kalo 'dadap tree' because, in the past, the kuni 'placenta' of a baby was buried in a special place known as compang in Manggaraian language which refers to a sacred altar located in the center of the village close to the kalo 'dadap tree' planted close to the compang.

The contents stored in the forms of linguistic phenomena used in the idiomatic expression imply a set of meanings regarding the ways Manggaraian people as members of Manggaraian speech community in viewing and making sense of the world. In accordance with the social convention inherited from their ancestors, as reflected in the cultural conceptualization ascribed in their cognitive map, the idiomatic expression implies advice for Manggaraian people not to forget their natal village as their motherland when they go or live abroad because it was the first place of their presence on this earth. The advice is also reflected in the verbal expression of Manggaraian language, Neka hemong tana bate dading 'Don't forget your motherland'. The noun phrase tana bate dading 'land where you were born' as the object complement refers to motherland which is equated with natal village symbolized by both the word kuni 'placenta' and the word kalo 'dadap tree'.

The meaningfulness of the idiomatic expression can be manifested by Manggaraian people in various ways. One way is that, if the live abroad, they are expected to go home to meet face to face with family members who live in the natal village and, if possible, carry out the ritual of teing hang, a special ritual of offering foods for ancestors as a sign of gratitude for all their blessings. At the same time, the idiomatic expression also reminds Manggaraian people to still love their natal village where they were born, regardless its strengths and weaknesses, because the natal village was the first place of their presence on this earth (tana bate dading). If for some reason they cannot return home, they must not forget to send news to their family members in the natal village as the guardians of the village where they were born.

CONCLUSION

There is an intimated study relationship between both Manggaraian language and Manggaraian culture belonging to Manggaraian people and the relationship is reflected in the cultural conceptualization ascribed in their cognitive map regarding the tide to motherland. One of the idiomatic expressions of Manggaraian language mostly used by Manggaraian people as the frame of reference for them in uncovering their cultural conceptualization regarding the tide to motherland is Neka hemong kuni agu kalo 'Don't forget placenta and dadap tree'. The meanings stored in the forms of linguistic phenomena used in the idiomatic expression advise Manggaraian people not to forget their motherland or natal village when they go and live abroad because it was the first place of their presence on this earth.

REFERENCES

1. Abdulsammad, Z. (2021). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif*. Makassar: Syakir Media Press.
2. Afrizal. (2014). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif: Sebuah Upaya Mendukung Penggunaan Penelitian Kualitatif dalam Berbagai Disiplin Ilmu*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. Bungin, B. (2007). *Penelitian Kualitatif: Komunikasi, Ekonomi, Kebijakan Publik dan Ilmu Sosial Lainnya*. Jakarta: Prenada Media.
6. Bustan, F. (2024). *Pelangi Budaya Pertanian Lahan Kering Masyarakat Manggarai di Flores*. Yogyakarta: Jejak Pustaka.
7. Bustan, F., Semiun, A., Bire, J. (2017). *The Characteristics of Anthropomorphic Metaphor in the Manggarai language*. Balti: LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing.
8. Bustan, F., Semiun, A. (2019). *The Cultural Discourse of Baby Birth in Manggarai Speech Community*. Germany: LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing.
9. Bustan, F., Bria, F. M. U., Sumitri, N. W. (2024). "The nature and solution of family conflict in a patrilineal genealogical clan of Manggaraian society". *Global Journal of Arts Humanity and Social Sciences*. Volume 4, Issue 1, Jan 2024.
10. Duranti, A. (2001). *Linguistic Anthropology: A Reader*. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers.
11. Faisal, S. (1990). *Penelitian Kualitatif: Dasar-dasar dan Aplikasi*. Malang: Yayasan Asih Asah Asuh (YA3).

12. Foley, W. A. (1997). *Anthropological Linguistics: an Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
13. Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Culture: Selected Essays*. New York: Basic Books
14. Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
15. Kaplan, D., Manners, A. A. (1999). *Teori Budaya*. Diterjemahkan oleh L. Simatupang. Yogyakarta: Pusat Pelajar.
16. Keesing, R. M. (1981). "Theories of culture". In *Language, Culture and Cognition: Anthropological Perspectives*. Edited by Ronald W. Casson. New York: Macmillan.
17. Moleong, L. J. (2025). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. (Edisi Revisi). Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
18. Muhadjir, N. (1995). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif: Telaah Positivistik, Rasionalistik, Fenomenologik, Realisme Metaphisik*. Yogyakarta: Rake Sarasin.
19. Nusa Putra. (2011). *Penelitian Kualitatif: Proses dan Aplikasi*. Jakarta: Indeks.
20. Ochs, E. (1988). *Culture and Language Development: Language Acquisition and Language Socialization in Samoan Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
21. Palmer, G. B., Sharifian, F. (2007). "Applied cultural linguistics: an emerging paradigm." In *Applied Cultural Linguistics*. Edited by Farzard Sharifian and Gary B. Palmer. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.
22. 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.
23. Spradley, J. P. (1997). *Metode Etnografi*. Diterjemahkan oleh Misbah Zulfa Elizabeth. Yogyakarta: Tiara Wacana Yogya.
24. Sudikan, S. Y. (2001). *Metode Penelitian Kebudayaan*. Surabaya: Unesa Unipress bekerjasama dengan Citra Wacana.
25. Sugiyono. (2020). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R& D*. Bandung: Alfabeta
26. Wahyuni, S. (2015). *Qualitative Research Method: Theory and Practice*. 2nd Edition. Jakarta: Salemba Empat.
27. 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.