

THE FORMS AND MEANINGS OF ANTHROPOMORPHIC METAPHORS IN PAE LANGUAGE

¹Fransiskus Bustan*, ²Thresia Trivict Semiun, ³Ulinsa

¹Universitas Nusa Cendana, ²Universitas Timor, ³Universitas Tadulako

¹frankybustando@gmail.com*, ²semiunthresia@gmail.com, ³ulinsa.bahasaindonesia@gmail.com

Abstract

This study describes the forms and meanings of anthropomorphic metaphors in Pae dialect in view of cultural linguistics. This study is descriptive. The methods of data collection were observation, interview, and documentary study. The techniques of data collection were recording, elicitation, and note-taking. The sources of data were the native speakers of Pae language represented by two key informants. Data were analyzed qualitatively by using inductive method. The results of study show that the forms and meanings of anthropomorphic metaphor in Pae language have unique and specific characteristics, as can be seen in such terms as ulung wae, mata wae, kinga kue, wewa kue, nggolo kue, lime kerosi, tuka nepe, tedu nepe, wa'i woko, and tedu woko. The results of study might be beneficial to support the study of language as the mirror of culture shared by a people as members of an ethnic group with special reference to Pae language as the mirror of Pae culture serving both as the sense of identity and as the symbol of identity for Pae people as members of Pae ethnic group.

Keywords: form, meaning, anthropomorphic metaphor, Pae dialect

INTRODUCTION

Both language and culture belonging to a people as members of a social group are closely (Cassirer, 1987; Kramsch, 2001; Wardaugh, 2011) and the relationship is manifested in conceptualization ascribed in their cognitive map in viewing the world (Casson, 1981; Bustan, 2005; Bustan et al, 2017). The conception comes closest to the theory of linguistic relativity proposed by Sapir and Whorf, as quoted by Miller (1968), that the varying cultural concepts and categories inherent in different languages affect the cognitive classification of the experienced world in such a way that the speakers of different languages think and behave differently (Goodenough, 1964; Casson, 1981; Keesing, 1981). The relationship of language, culture, and conceptualization in viewing the world is reflected in metaphors or metaphoric expressions that the speakers of those languages employ when communicating or interacting with one another. Even though the use of metaphors is regarded as a universal phenomenon to all languages, cultures, and societies all over the world, the characteristics of metaphors employed by a society as members of a social group are unique and specific to culture they share (Kovecses, 2009). The unique and specific characteristics of metaphors they employ can be seen in anthropomorphic metaphor a kind of nominal metaphor indicated by using the organ of human body attached to nonhuman entity existing in physical environment. The attachment creates not only a new form

but also a new meaning as the extension of meaning from denotative to connotative meaning (Foley, 1997; Ulinsa, 2022).

Bearing the matters stated above in minds, this study explores the relationship of Pae language, Pae culture, and conceptualization of Pae people as members of Pae ethnic group living in Mbengan subdistrict, Kota Komba district, East Manggarai regency, East Nusa Tenggara province (Bustan, et al, 2017). However, as relationship of language, culture, and conceptualization of a people as members of an ethnic group is so complex that the study focuses on the forms and meanings of anthropomorphic metaphors in Pae language along with its existence of a dialect of Manggarai language. We are interested in conducting the study for the reason that the forms and meanings of anthropomorphic metaphors in Pae language are unique and specific in some respect to Pae culture designating the cultural conceptualization of Pae people in viewing the world. Another reason is that Pae language is a minority language in which its population is of about 3.000.000 people and, as such, this study is done in an attempt to maintain the existence of Pae language from its death due to the dynamics of Pae people in viewing the world as a result of globalization.

In general, this study is aimed at exploring the relationship of Pae language, Pae culture, and conceptualization of Pae people in viewing the world, as reflected in the forms and meanings of anthropomorphic metaphors. Along with the two related aspects as its main concerns, therefore, the objectives of this study are as follows: (1) to describe the forms of anthropomorphic metaphors in Pae language and (2) to describe the meanings of anthropomorphic metaphors in Pae language.

This study is viewed from the perspective of cultural linguistics as one of the new theoretical perspectives in cognitive linguistics exploring the relationship between language, culture, and conceptualization (Palmer and Farzad, 2007). Cultural linguistics is a new paradigm or model in cognitive linguistics because the study is mainly aimed examining language used by a society as members of a social group through the lens or prism of culture they share (Bustan et al, 2017). The aim is set up on the basis of assumption that language used by a society as members of a social group is the mirror their culture and, at the same time, as culture is the worldview of a society, language they employ is also regarded as the window of their world (Foley, 1997; Bustan, 2005; Bustan et al, 2017).

As language can be defined differently, in the perspective of cultural linguistics, language is defined as a cultural activity and, at the same time, an instrument for organizing other cultural domains (Palmer, 1996; Bustan, 2005; Palmer and Farzad, 2007). This definition is based on the notion that, besides being shaped by special and general innate potentials of human beings, language is also shaped by physical and sociocultural experiences of its speakers in their contexts of living together for years (Palmer, 1996). 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 conceptualization of experiences faced by a society as members of a social group, as reflected in such aspects of cognitive structures as scheme, category, metaphor, and scripts. The way a society as members of a social group conceptualize their cultural experiences is called cultural conceptualization that contains their beliefs, norms, traditions, and values. Language in this light serves as a means of communicating and shaping cultural conceptualization (Palmer and Farzad, 2007; Bustan et al, 2017). Cultural conceptualizations distributed across the minds of a society as members of a cultural group representing cognition at the cultural level are called linguistic imagery. Linguistic imagery is not related to how human beings speak about objective reality, but how they speak about the world that they themselves imagine (Palmer, 1996; Cassirer, 1987; Palmer and Farzad, 2007).

Metaphor is one of the main concerns of study in cultural linguistics as it reflects the way a society as members of a social group think and know the world (Palmer and Farzad, 2007). Metaphor in this light deal with the use of reference towards a group of things that has certain relation to facilitate the difference of analogic relation with another group. Parallel to this conception, Badudu (1983) propounded that metaphor is concerned with the use of word which does not share true meaning as it is an analogy on the basis of certain similarities. More specifically, according to Verhaar (1999:393), metaphor deals with the use of word or verbal expression whose literal meaning refers implicitly to another meaning through comparison on the basis of similarity in feature, quality, and behavior. Apart from the creation of new form, one of the prominent features characterizing metaphor is marked by the extension of meaning from denotative or canonic meaning to connotative or noncanonic meaning.

Wahab (1991) propounded that, as metaphoric symbol can't be understood its meaning without reference to its context of use in discourse, metaphor can be identified into nominal, predicative, and sentential metaphor. Nominal metaphor and predicative metaphor can be understood their meanings by observing the contexts of sentences. Sentential metaphor can be understood its meaning on the basis of its relation with sentences preceding or following it. Nominal metaphor appears in the form of noun or noun phrase, predicative metaphor appears in the predicate of a sentence, and sentential metaphor appears in the form of complete sentence. Based on the kinds of nouns used as its component parts, nominal metaphor can be identified into several kinds involving, for instance, antropomorphic metaphor, animal metaphor, and plant metaphor. Apart from animal and plant metaphor, according to Bustan et al (2017) and Ulinsa et al (2022), antropomorphic metaphor is a kind of nominal metaphor indicated by using the organ of human body which is attached to nonhuman entity existing in physical environment (Foley, 1997; Palmer and Farzad, 2007; Bustan et al, 2017).

As language serves as the mirror of culture in which that language is embedded, according to Duranti (2001), metaphor is the implementation of the system of knowledge shared by a society as members of a speech community functioning as a guide for them to understand the world (Casson, 1981). The conception is based on the fact that language in its use as a means of communication between and among members of a speech community is full of metaphors in viewing one experience on the basis of another experience. Metaphor in this light is defined as a theory of society containing their experiences on the world and, at the same time, functioning both as a conceptual frame to understand the world as well as a linguistic device that enables them to relate various domains of experiences and coherences between interrelated events. In line with its function, therefore, metaphor can be identified not only from semantic aspect as the transference of name but also from the perspective of anthropology and philosophy. In the perspective of anthropology and philosophy, metaphor serves as the basic character of relationship between both the human linguisticity and the world. As such, as human linguisticity is always metaphoric in nature, all words and names are the results of human creation and not given by nature. Therefore, metaphor in this regard is defined as a part of cultural conceptualization emerging in cognition level (Palmer and Farzad, 2007; Bustan et al, 2017).

On the ground of the forms and meanings of the linguistic phenomena used, metaphor can be classified into several kinds and one of them is antropomorphic metaphor. As its name implies, antropomorphic metaphor is a kind of nominal metaphor marked by the use of organs of human body attached to nonhuman entities existing in physical environment and the attachment creates a new form and meaning due to the extension of meaning from denotative or canonic to connotative or noncanonic meaning (Pateda, 2011). Similar to other kinds of metaphor, according to Bustan

et al (2017), the study of anthropomorphic metaphor covers two poles of linguistic sign, that is pairing of form (signifier or expression) and meaning (signified or content). Forms refer to the physical features of the linguistic phenomena used and meanings refer to contents stored in the forms of linguistic phenomena used (Foley, 1997).

METHOD

In terms of research design, this study is descriptive in nature on the basis of the perspective of phenomenological philosophy as it describes the forms and meanings of anthropomorphic metaphor in Pae language on the basis of data collected during the field study in Nunur village as the main location of field research. The methods of data collection were observation, interview, and documentary study, while the techniques of data collection were recording and note-taking. The sources of data (primary data) were Pae people as the native speakers of Pae language represented by two key informants selected on the basis of criteria provided by Faisal (1990), Spradley (1997), and Sudikan (2001). The collected data were analyzed then qualitatively by inductive method meaning that the process of analysis was started from data to abstraction and concept or theory of metaphor, especially the local theory of anthropomorphic metaphor in Pae language. The process of data analysis was done from the beginning of research until the final report of result finished. The results of study were also continuously negotiated and discussed with the two key informants as the sources of data in an attempt to cross-check with the conceptualization ascribed in their cognitive map and to keep the objectivity of data regarding the forms and meanings of anthropomorphic metaphor in Pae language.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The results of study show that the forms and meanings of anthropomorphic metaphor in Pae language have specific characteristics indicated by using the organs of human body attached to nonhuman entities existing in physical environment. The attachments create not only new forms but also new meanings due to the extension of meanings from denotative to connotative meanings through implied comparison and association on the basis of having certain similarities in feature, quality, and behavior. Based on data selection, several terms of Pae language as the corpus of data are as follows: (01) *ulung wae*, (02) *mata wae*, (03) *kinga kue*, (04) *wewa kue*, (05) *nggolo kue*, (06) *lime kerosi*, (07) *tuka nepe*, (08) *tedu nepe*, (09) *wa'i woko*, (10) *tedu woko*

In accordance with the results of study, this section discusses in more depth the forms and meanings of anthropomorphic metaphor in Pae language with special reference to the terms of Pae language as the corpus of data provided above.

Data (01): *ulung wae*

As can be seen in the physical features of the linguistic phenomena used in data (01), the term *ulung wae* is a nominal phrase made up of two words (nouns) as its component parts, including the word (noun) *ulung* 'head' as the core word functioning as HEAD (H) and the word (noun) *wae* 'water' as the attribute functioning as its MODIFIER (M). The term is identified as a form of anthropomorphic metaphor because

of attaching the word (noun) *wae* 'water' as a nonhuman entity existing in physical environment to the word (noun) *ulung* 'head' as the organ of human body. Besides creating a new form, the attachment also creates a new meaning marked by the extension from denotative to connotative meaning. Referring to the meanings of its lexical items, the denotative meaning of the term *ulung wae* is 'water head' or 'the head of water'. The word (noun) *wae* 'water' here refers to 'river', as in the river of *Nggereng* known as *Wae Nggereng* and the river of *Mapar* known as *Wae Mapar* in Pae language. As conceptualized in the cognitive map of the *Pae* people, the term *ulung wae* refers to the source of water for a river because, on the basis of implied comparison and association, the upper part of a river has certain similarities in feature, quality, and behavior with 'head' as the organ of human body located on the upper part of human's body as the source of water, in this case tears, when someone is crying, for instance.

Data (02): *mata wae*

As can be seen in the physical features of linguistic phenomena used in data (02), the term *mata wae* is a nominal phrase made up of two words (nouns) as its component parts, including the word (noun) *mata* 'eyes' as the core word functioning as HEAD (H) and the word (noun) *wae* 'water' as attribute functioning as its MODIFIER (M). The term is identified as a form of anthropomorphic metaphor because of attaching the word (noun) *wae* 'water' as a nonhuman entity existing in physical environment to the word (noun) *mata* 'eyes' as the organs of human body. The attachment creates not only a new form, but also a new meaning marked by the extension from denotative to connotative meaning. Referring to the meanings of its lexical items, the denotative meaning of the term *mata wae* is 'eyes water' or 'the eyes of water'. Based on implied comparison and association, the upper part of a river regarded having certain similarities in feature, quality, and behavior with 'eyes' as the organ of human body located on the upper part of human's body as the source of tears when someone is crying. As conceptualized in the cognitive map of the *Pae* people, the term *mata wae* refers to water spring.

Data (03): *kinga kue*

As can be seen in the physical features of linguistic phenomena used in data (03), the term *kinga kue* is a nominal phrase made up of two words (nouns) as its component parts, including the word (noun) *kinga* 'ears' as the core word functioning as HEAD (H) and the word (noun) *kue* 'pot' as the attribute functioning as its MODIFIER (M). The term is identified as an anthropomorphic metaphor because of attaching the word (noun) *kue* 'pot' as a nonhuman entity existing in physical environment to the word (noun) *kinga* 'ears' as the organs of human body. Besides creating a new form, the attachment also creates new meaning marked by the extension from denotative to connotative meaning. Along with the meanings of its lexical items, the denotative meaning of the term *kinga kue* is 'pot's ears' or 'the ears of a pot'. Along with implied comparison and association, it is conceptualized in the cognitive map of *Pae* people, the parts of a *kue* 'pot' that lay on its left and right side have certain similarities in feature, quality, and behavior in some respect with *kinga* 'ears' as the organs of human body located on the left and right side of the human's head. Due to the attachment of the word (noun) *kue* 'pot' to the word (noun) *kinga* 'ears', the term *kinga kue* extends its meaning from denotative to connotative meaning which refers to the parts of a pot located on its left and right side like the ears of a human being.

Data (04): *wewa kue*

As can be seen in the physical features of linguistic units used in data (04), the term *wewa kue* is a nominal phrase made up of two words (nouns) as its component parts, including the word (noun) *wewa* ‘mouth’ as the core word functioning as HEAD (H) and the word (noun) *kue* ‘pot’ as the attribute functioning as its MODIFIER (M). It is identified as an anthropomorphic metaphor because of attaching the word (noun) *kue* as a nonhuman entity existing in physical environment to the word (noun) *wewa* ‘mouth’ as the organ of human body. The attachment creates not only a new form, but also a new meaning marked by the extension from denotative to connotative meaning. Along with the meanings of its lexical items, the denotative meaning of the term *wewa kue* is ‘pot mouth’ or ‘the mouth of a pot’. On the basis of implied comparison and association, the term *kue* ‘pot’ has certain similarities in feature, quality, and behavior in some respect with *wewa* ‘mouth’. As conceptualized in the cognitive map of Pae people, the connotative meaning of the term *wewa kue* refers to the upper part of a pot that can be opened and shut like the mouth of a human being that can be opened and shut as well.

Data (05): *nggolo kue*

As can be seen in the physical features of linguistic phenomena used in data (05), the term *nggolo kue* is a nominal phrase in Pae language made up of two words (nouns) as its component parts, including the word (noun) *nggolo* ‘butt’ as the core word functioning as HEAD (H) and the word (noun) *kue* ‘pot’ as the attribute functioning as its MODIFIER (M). The term is identified as an anthropomorphic metaphor because of attaching the word (noun) *kue* ‘pot’ as a nonhuman entity existing in physical environment to the word (noun) *nggolo* ‘butt’ as the organs of human body. Besides creating a new form, the attachment also creates new meaning marked by the extension from denotative to connotative meaning. Along with the meanings of its lexical items, the denotative meaning of the term *nggolo kue* is ‘pot butt’ or ‘the butt of a pot’. Along with implied comparison and association, it is conceptualized in the cognitive map of Pae people, the part of a *kue* that lies on the bottom part has certain similarities in feature, quality, and behavior in some respect with *nggolo* ‘butt’ as the organs of human body located on the bottom part. Due to the attachment of the word (noun) *kue* ‘pot’ to the word (noun) *nggolo* ‘butt’, the term *nggolo kue* extends its meaning from denotative to connotative meaning which is referred to the part of a pot located on the bottom part like a human butt.

Data (06): *lime kerosi*

As can be seen in the physical features of linguistic phenomena used in data (06), the term *lime kerosi* is a nominal phrase made up of two words (nouns) as its component parts, including the word (noun) *lime* ‘arm’ as the core word functioning as HEAD (H) and the word (noun) *kerosi* ‘chair’ as the attribute functioning as its MODIFIER (M). It is identified as an anthropomorphic metaphor because of attaching the word (noun) *kerosi* ‘chair’ as a nonhuman entity existing in physical environment to the word (noun) *lime* ‘arms’ as the organs of human body. Besides creating a new form, the attachment also creates new meaning marked by the extension from denotative to connotative meaning. Along with the meanings of its lexical items, the denotative meaning of the term *lime kerosi* is ‘arms’ chair’ or ‘the arms of a chair’. Along with implied comparison and association, it is conceptualized in the cognitive map of Pae people, the parts of *kerosi* ‘chair’ that lay on its left or right side have certain similarities in feature, quality, and behavior in some respect with *lime* ‘arm’ as the organs of human body located on the left and right side. Due to the attachment

of the word (noun) *kerosi* ‘chair’ to the word (noun) *lime* ‘arms’, the term *lime kerosi* extends its meaning from denotative to connotative meaning which refers to the parts of a chair located on the left and right side like human arms.

Data (07): *tuka nepe*

As can be seen in the physical features of linguistic phenomena used in data (07), the term *tuka nepe* is a nominal phrase made up of two words (nouns) as its component parts, including the word (noun) *tuka* ‘stomach’ as the core word functioning as HEAD (H) and the word (noun) *nepe* ‘chair’ the attribute functioning as its MODIFIER (M). The term is identified as an anthropomorphic metaphor because of attaching the word (noun) *nepe* ‘mat’ as a nonhuman entity existing in physical environment to the word (noun) *tuka* ‘stomach’ as the organ of human body. Besides creating a new form, the attachment also creates new meaning marked by the extension from denotative to connotative meaning. Along with the meanings of its lexical items, the denotative meaning of the term *tuka nepe* is ‘mat stomach’ or ‘the stomach of a mat’. Along with implied comparison and association, it is conceptualized in the cognitive map of Pae people as the native speakers of Pae language, the part of a *nepe* ‘mat’ that lies on the front part have certain similarities in feature, quality, and behavior in some respect with *tuka* ‘stomach’ as the organ of a human body located on the front part. Due to the attachment of the word (noun) *nepe* ‘mat’ as a nonhuman entity existing in physical environment to the word (noun) *tuka* ‘stomach’ as the organ of a human body, the term *tuka nepe* extends its meaning from denotative to connotative meaning which refers to the front part of a mat like a human’s stomach.

Data (08): *tedu nepe*

As can be seen in the physical features of linguistic phenomena used in data (08), the term *tedu nepe* is a nominal phrase made up of two words (nouns) as its component parts, including the word (noun) *tedu* ‘back’ as the core word functioning as HEAD (H) and the word (noun) *nepe* ‘mat’ as the attribute functioning as its MODIFIER (M). The term is identified as an anthropomorphic metaphor because of attaching the word (noun) *nepe* ‘mat’ as a nonhuman entity existing in physical environment to the word (noun) *back* ‘back’ as the organ of human body. Besides creating a new form, the attachment also creates new meaning marked by the extension from denotative to connotative meaning. Along with the meanings of its lexical items, the denotative meaning of the term *tedu nepe* is ‘back mat’ or ‘the back of a mat’. Along with implied comparison and association, it is conceptualized in the cognitive map of Pae people, the part of a *nepe* ‘mat’ that lies on the back part have certain similarities in feature, quality, and behavior in some respect with *tedu* ‘back’ as the organ of human body located on the back part. Due to the attachment of the word (noun) *nepe* ‘mat’ to the word (noun) *tedu* ‘back’ to the word (noun), the term *tedu nepe* extends its meaning from denotative to connotative meaning which refers to the back part of a mat.

Data (09): *wa’i woko*

As can be seen in the physical features of linguistic phenomena used in data (09), the term *wa’i woko* is a nominal phrase made up of two words (nouns) as its component parts, including the word (noun) *wa’i* ‘foot’ as the core word functioning as HEAD (H) and the word (noun) *woko* ‘mountain’ as the attribute functioning as its MODIFIER (M). The term is identified as an

anthropomorphic metaphor because of attaching the word (noun) *woko* ‘mountain’ as a nonhuman entity existing in physical environment to the word (noun) *wa’i* ‘foot’ as the organ of human body. Besides creating a new form, the attachment also creates new meaning marked by the extension from denotative to connotative meaning. Along with the meanings of its lexical items, the denotative meaning of the term *wa’i woko* is ‘mountain foot’ or ‘the foot of a mountain’. Along with implied comparison and association, it is conceptualized in the cognitive map of Pae people, the lower part of a *woko* has certain similarities in feature, quality, and behavior in some respect with *wa’i* ‘foot’ as the organ of human body located on the bottom part. Due to the attachment of the word (noun) *woko* ‘mountain’ to the word (noun) *wa’i* ‘foot’ as the word (noun), the term *wa’i woko* extends its meaning from denotative to connotative meaning which refers to the bottom part of a mountain.

Data (10): *tedu woko*

As can be seen in the physical features of linguistic phenomena used in data (09), the term *tedu woko* is a nominal phrase made up of two words (nouns) as its component parts, including the word (noun) *tedu* ‘back’ as the core word functioning as HEAD (H) and the word (noun) *woko* ‘mountain’ the attribute functioning as its MODIFIER (M). The term is identified as an anthropomorphic metaphor because of attaching the word (noun) *woko* ‘mountain’ as a nonhuman entity existing in physical environment to the word (noun) *tedu* ‘back’ as the organ of human body. Besides creating a new form, the attachment also creates new meaning marked by the extension from denotative to connotative meaning. Along with the meanings of its lexical items, the denotative meaning of the term *tedu woko* is ‘mountain back’ or ‘the back of a mountain’. Along with implied comparison and association, it is conceptualized in the cognitive map of Pae people, the lower part of a *woko* has certain similarities in feature, quality, and behavior in some respect with *tedu* ‘back’ as the organ of human body located on the bottom part. Due to the attachment of the word (noun) *woko* ‘mountain’ as a nonhuman entity existing in physical environment to the word (noun) *tedu* ‘back’ as the organ of human body to the word (noun), the term *tedu woko* extends its meaning from denotative to connotative meaning which refers to the back part of a mountain like the back part of human body.

CONCLUSION

There is a close relationship between Pae language, Pae culture, and conceptualization of Pae people as members of Pae ethnic group in viewing the world. The relationship is reflected in the forms and meanings of linguistic phenomena used in anthropomorphic metaphors which have unique and specific features marked by using the organs of human body attached to nonhuman entities existing in physical environment. The attachments cause the extension of meanings from denotative to connotative meanings on the basis of implied comparison and association because of having certain similarities in feature, quality, and behavior in some respect. Several terms in Pae language that reveal the unique and specific features in the forms and meanings of linguistic phenomena used in anthropomorphic metaphors are as follows: *uhung wae*, *mata wae*, *kinga kue*, *wewa kue*, *nggolo kue*, *lime kerosi*, *tuka nepe*, *tedu nepe*, *wa’i woko*, and *tedu woko*. The results of study might be beneficial to support the study of language belonging to a society as members of a social group or members of an ethnic group, especially Pae people along with the function and significance of Pae language they employ as the mirror of Pae culture as well as the window of the world for Pae people as the native speakers of Pae language.

REFERENCES

- Badudu, J. S. (1983). *Sari Kesusastraan Indonesia*. Bandung: Pustaka Prima.
- Bustan, F. (2005). “Wacana budaya *tudak* dalam ritual *pentu* pada kelompok etnik Manggarai di Flores Barat: sebuah kajian linguistik budaya”. Disertasi. Denpasar: Program Doktor (S3) Linguistik Universitas Udayana.
- Bustan, F., Bire, J., Semiun, A. (2017). *The Features of Anthropomorphic Metaphor in the Manggarai Language*. Germany: LAP LAMBERT ACADEMIC PUBLISHING.
- 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. (1997). *Linguistic Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Faisal, S. (1990). *Penelitian Kualitatif: Dasar-dasar dan Aplikasi*. Malang: Yayasan Asih Asah Asuh (YA3).
- Foley, W. A. (1997). *Anthropological Linguistics: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Goodenough, W. H. (1964). “Cultural anthropology and linguistics. In *Language in Culture and Society: A Reader in Linguistics and Anthropology*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Keesing, 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”. *Quardens de Filologia. Estudis Linguistics*. Vol. XIV (2009) 135-151.
- Kramsch, K. (2001). *Language and Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Miller, R. L. (1968). *The Linguistic Relativity Principle and Humboldtian Ethnolinguistics: A History and AppPaesal*. Paris: The Hague
- Muhadjir, N. (1995). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif: Telaah Positivistik, Rasionalistik, Phenomenologik, Realisme Metaphisik*. Yogyakarta: Rake Sarasin.
- Palmer, G. B. (1996). *Towards a Theory of Cultural Linguistics*. Austin: The University of Texas Press.
- Palmer, G. B. and Farzad, F. (2007). “Applied cultural linguistics: an emerging paradigm”. In *Applied Cultural Linguistics*. Edited by Farzad Sharifian and Gary B. Palmer. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.
- Pateda, M. (2011). *Semantik Leksikal*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- 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.
- Ulinsa, Bustan F., Bire, J. (2022). “The features of human metaphors in the Rai dialect”. *International Journal of Advance and Innovative Research*. Volume 9, Issue 1 (IV) January – March 2022.
- Verhaar, J. W. M. (1999). *Pengantar Linguistik*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Wahab, A. (1990). *Butir-butir Linguistik*. Surabaya: Airlangga University Press.
- Wardaugh, R. (2011). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. New Jersey: Wiley-Blackwell.