

TABOO WORDS IN MANGGARAIAN LANGUAGE: SOCIO-PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS

Tobias Gunas¹

¹Universitas Katolik Indonesia Santu Paulus, Ruteng

e-mail: ¹tobgun74@gmail.com

Abstracts: Taboo words are generally recognized and spoken by speakers of any language in communication. However, taboo words richly vary in form, meaning, and use in societies in different languages. As with the case of taboo words, Manggaraian language employs some specific lexicons having different forms, meaning, reference, and use among its speakers. This research aims to explore taboo words in the Manggaraian language from the socio-pragmatic analysis. The descriptive qualitative research method was applied to account for taboo words in the Manggaraian language, whereas the primary data were naturally obtained through field observation, recording, and interview. The data were descriptively analyzed through three procedures, namely: reduction, display, and conclusion drawing. The data analysis is, furthermore, based on the theories of taboo language and socio-pragmatics. The results of the study reveal that taboo words in the Manggaraian language are generally classified into profanity, obscenity, epithet, and scatology. These types of taboo words serve some functions such as expressing feeling/emotion, cursing, swearing, closeness and humor, group identity/ethnicity, and drawing attention. The matters of the taboo words refer to sex, physical appearance, animal, waste, and metaphysical things. Socio-pragmatically, the use of taboo words is considered to be a deviant behavior of social norms and impolite words for Manggaraian speakers in daily communication. Taboo words are determined by socio-cultural aspects and contexts of communication.

Keywords: *Manggaraian language, socio-pragmatics, taboo words*

INTRODUCTION

Naturally, language is a key instrument for people to carry out communication for various purposes in a wide range of contexts. In one context, people use language to mutually exchange and negotiate meaning and messages concerning any issue around them. Yet, in another context language is employed to express people's feelings, emotions as well as other situations and conditions. For instance, a speaker may choose certain lexicons and expressions to express joy, anger, disappointment, or dissatisfaction to other participants in a particular context. In communication, speakers select specific lexicons and expressions that appropriately fit with every situation and context. It is, therefore, understood that every existing language in the world provides its speakers with so many different words and expressions to facilitate communication and interaction.

In social interaction, language is employed to deal with good things and bad ones. Take, for example, speakers interacting with others to build personal relationships or to carry out their jobs successfully. However, there is a particular situation and context where speakers use a language conveying a bad sense. It is often unavoidably expressed when someone sorts out specific words or forbidden lexicons to react toward other people's behavior as well as under pressured circumstances. It is such a kind of reaction to his perception of the surrounding environment (Tamos-Villadolid, Marilyn & Santos, 2019). The social environment is the factor affecting as well as driving speakers of any language to exploit certain offensive words in interaction.

Any language in the world has a system of lexicons that semantically contain positive meanings and negative ones. The lexicons having negative or 'bad' senses are generally considered to be offensive, forbidden, or rude. Those words are pragmatically concerned with impoliteness as they can threaten the face of other people as well as affect the relationship between a speaker and a hearer. According to Wijayana (2004) in Wibowo, (2020), the act of exploiting negative or rude language potentially brings discredit to people's personalities and self-image. Socio-culturally, using impolite words can be said to be deviant of social norms and cultural values since culture has a system of value representing what is allowed or unallowed, required or forbidden (Pilotti et al., 2012; Rosenberg & Garcia, 2017; Tamos-Villadolid, Marilyn & Santos, 2019). The phenomenon of bad language is categorized into what the so-called "taboo language".

As it is widely acknowledged that taboo language or words co-exist in a language. This is a part of language regardless of the lower frequency of use in social interaction. About the existence of taboo words, every language has its unique system of use and context. Manggaraian language is a local language spoken by a majority of people in west Flores, East Nusa Tenggara Province. The local language also functions as a lingua franca to people living in different parts of the Manggaraian region from west to east. As with other local languages, the Manggaraian language employs its distinctive system of taboo words. In the case of taboo words, Manggaraian speakers recognize some negative words or lexicons forbidden and avoided in social interaction. All the words labeled as “taboo” have a negative sense that causes an offense or impoliteness to Manggaraian speakers. It is more likely that taboo words in the Manggaraian language have deeply rooted in the socio-cultural context.

Linguistically, the phenomenon of taboo words or language has long drawn the interest and attention of linguists to investigate it more deeply and comprehensively. The investigation of taboo words in different languages and a variety of contexts has been widely conducted, for instance, taboo words in English (Jay, 2009; Putri, Derli Elsa, Sembiring, 2019; Rosenberg & Garcia, 2017; Sugara, Ria Dewi Hudayani, and Saparianingsih, 2020), Indonesian language (Samosir, Widya Nola, Meisuri & Putri, 2020; Wibowo, 2020), Balinese (Apriani, 2017), and other languages (Lidbäck, 2020; Njoroge, 2014). The investigations have revealed the significance of taboo words to be understood from a socio-cultural and pragmatic standpoint. More specifically, the exploration of taboo words in local languages is more potential and rich as it uncovers diverse socio-cultural backgrounds. However, unfortunately, there have not been sufficient studies concerning taboo words in local languages including the Manggaraian language in west Flores.

Realizing that there is a lack of study regarding taboo words in local languages, this research aims to explore taboo words in the Manggaraian language. There are three questions addressed in the discussion of taboo words, namely: (1) what are the types of taboo words and references? (2) how are taboo words used in interaction? And (3) what are the functions of taboo words used in interaction? To answer those three problems, socio-pragmatics theory and taboo theory are applied in this analysis.

LITERATURE REVIEW

As previously stated, several studies have been carried out to investigate taboo words in different languages. Some of the researches are reviewed as the basis of developing this investigation. They are briefly summarized below.

Ranus (2019) analyzed swearing words in the Manggaraian language, particularly Colol dialect of East Manggarai. The study was designed in descriptive qualitative focusing on the description of types of swearing words, referents, meaning, and context of use. Semantics and Sociolinguistics were the main theories used to account for swearing words in the Manggaraian language. The findings reveal that the Manggaraian language in Colol dialect has some lexicons or words used to express swearing. The swearing words are categorized into eleven kinds based on the referents. Some factors underlie the employment of swearing words among speakers of the Manggaraian language in Colol dialect such as intimacy, feeling, insulting, and social equality. However, Apriani (2017) researched swearing words in Balinese in terms of forms and referents. The analysis was qualitatively done from a sociolinguistic approach. The study indicates that Balinese has particular swearing words. In the case of form, the swearing words are syntactically constructed in word and phrase. The words are noun, verb, adjective. In the case of referents, furthermore, those swearing words refer to a condition, animal, parts of the body, supernatural spirit, objects, kinship, activity, and profession. Sociolinguistically, swearing words are considered to be rude and negative; therefore, they should be avoided and forbidden in interaction.

Still in the case of the local language, Samosir, Widya Nola, Meisuri & Putri (2020) particularly focused on the investigation of taboo words in Batak Toba language used in the conversation between seller and buyer. The analysis was qualitatively done in terms of types of taboo words, perceptions as well impacts. The study uncovers some significant findings, namely: (1) Batak sellers employed five different types of taboo words in interacting with buyers such as insult and slurs, scatology, epithets, vulgarity, and obscenity; (2) Concerning the use of taboo words by Batak sellers, most people have negative perceptions as it is too rude and offensive, and (3) taboo words have bad impacts to others in conversation such as causing offense and anger; and (4) Batak society refuse to use taboo words in the interaction between sellers and buyers. These findings are related to and support the previous study by Apriani (2017).

In their investigation, Rosenberg & Garcia (2017) have found the relationship of taboo words in terms of intensity and frequency by applying statistical analysis toward the relationship of three key components; Affective, Behaviour, and Cognitive. The results of the analysis found a slight change in which taboo words

people use in everyday life. The results suggest that the level of offensiveness of taboo words (A) predicts the usage of the words (B) that are part of a person's natural language (C): the ABC-hypothesis of taboo words.

The phenomenon of taboo words employed in social interaction can be analyzed from socio-pragmatics. Socio-pragmatics is concerned with the relationship between language and society as well as language use in context (Leech, 2014; Levinson, 1983). In this interdisciplinary approach, taboo words are investigated in a particular society and the context in which speakers exploit them in the context of interaction such as speech acts and utterances. Three key aspects need to be addressed to understand language as social behavior or act, namely: speech acts, utterances, and context. Those aspects are closely connected. Yule (1996) stated that speech act deals with the act performed via utterances. By such a definition, it is clear that speech acts are carried out through utterances. On any occasion, the utterances produced contain three interrelated acts: locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary act. Therefore, the speech act contains utterances serving various functions. Taboo words can be analysed in speech act and utterances as they occur in an interaction where a speaker and a hearer engage in.

Speech acts and utterances occur in the context of interaction. Context plays a vital role in making a meaningful interpretation. Hence, any speech acts and utterances are context-bound or context-dependent (Leech, 2014; Levinson, 1983; Yule, 1996). Context sets the background of speech acts and utterances. Pragmatically, Levinson (1983) emphasized that context is related to participants, background, proposition, belief, motive (ends), and assumptions that underlie speech acts and utterances. Context roughly consists of some key elements such as participants (who), topic (what), time and place (when and where), and manners (how) (Holmes, 2001). These components of context have been more comprehensively developed in Hymes' theory of ethnography of communication coined as SPEAKING mnemonics (Wardhaugh, 1992). In addition, concerning the understanding of taboo words in speech acts and utterances, context is a crucial element to be much considered. For instance, culture-specific context is an indispensable part of defining and explaining taboo words in social interaction (Klerk, 1992 in Wene & Ena, 2020). Pragmatically, context affects the level of offensiveness of taboo words such as speaker-hearer relationship, social-physical setting (Jay, 2009).

Taboo words are widely recognized as a forbidden language in society. Yule (2014) maintained that taboo words are related to words and phrases that are inappropriate for use in social communities; those are sacred, prohibited, or just inappropriate (Wene & Ena, 2020). Taboo words contain, by nature, negative, rude, and offensive meanings. Proscription of taboo words reflects social restriction upon the personal behavior that brings about the bad impact such as discomfort, harm, or injury (Keith & Burrige, 2006). More seriously, taboo words can even provoke a conflict between groups of people in society (Wene & Ena, 2020). Therefore, it suggests that taboo words are avoided and strongly banned in both interpersonal and social interaction. As what is addressed by (Jay, 2009) is that taboo words are prohibited or eschewed institutionally and individually due to the potentiality of harm. Taboo words cover various matters covering sex, parts of the body, sacred objects, animals, excretion, physical performance, death, and supernatural things. Tabooed subjects are found to be highly varied depending on socio-cultural contexts set in social interaction (Wardhaugh, 1992). Moreover, the content of taboo words indicates different referents. Based on the referents, taboo words are subsumed under some types, namely: obscenity, profanity and blasphemy, scatology, insult and slur (Jay, 2009). The other category of taboo words was proposed by Battistella (2005); those are of four types, namely epithet, profanity, vulgarity, and obscenity (Sari, 2020). Both theories of taboo word types have been widely applied in several previous analyses and the present research (e.g., Ranus, 2019; Samosir, Widya Nola, Meisuri & Putri, 2020; Sari, 2020; Wene & Ena, 2020; Wibowo, 2020).

Taboo words are often violated in interaction in which people tend to exploit them unintentionally. Some reasons and functions are likely to drive speakers to employ taboo words in their speech acts and utterances. Wardhaugh (1992) contended that taboo language is spoken to address some reasons and functions such as drawing attention, showing contempt (cursing), being aggressive or provocative, mocking (swearing) authority. Similarly, these reasons and functions are pointed out in the study conducted by Putri, Sembiring & Imranuddin (2019). In other research findings, some other reasons for using taboo words in the speech or utterances were also revealed in the research findings of Wene & Ena (2020), where the psychological condition was the most dominant reason among others such as humor, ethnic group identity, and social class. However, Lidbäck (2020) demonstrated different reasons for taboo words as joke, appreciation, disclaimer, and reference. In brief, it seems reasonable that a variety of reasons arise from context variability of taboo words in interaction

RESEARCH METHOD

This research is a qualitative study in which the data source was taken from the speech acts and utterances of the Manggaraian speakers containing taboo words. The data are primarily the words spoken by the

Manggaraian speakers in interaction in Langke Rembong District and other surrounding areas. State the research design used in the study.

The study involved twenty Participants who are native speakers of the Manggaraian language. The participants were purposively taken as the source of the data when they were speaking the Manggaraian language in daily interaction. Ten of the participants were those from the older ages around 45 to 50 while the rest of them were those from the younger ages around 17-21.

The data for this analysis were obtained through an observation sheet, field note, and audio tape recorder. These instruments were applied to gather sufficient data regarding taboo words spoken by the twenty participants of the Manggaraian speakers during the interaction. In addition, the data were more naturally collected by the instruments. Observation sheets and field-note were employed to get the data directly from the utterances produced by the participants as well as those related to the context of interaction. An Audio-tape recorder was simultaneously used to record the data more completely when the participants were uttering words, phrases, or sentences in interaction.

The data were qualitatively analyzed through three interactive procedures, namely data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing. In the first procedure, the data were identified and classified into form, meaning, and referents. the analysis was based on the theory of taboo language. The results of data analysis were then displayed in the table in the second procedure. In the third procedure, the data were expounded in the light of socio-pragmatic theories. The theories were applied to explore and elucidate the context of using taboo words in interaction. Based on the interpretation, the conclusion was drawn and arrived at the points concerning the employment of taboo words in the Manggaraian language.

RESULTS

Manggaraian language recognizes the word *iréng* as the general term referring to taboo word. Such a term covers taboo words conveying negative, rude, and offensive meanings. In the case of form, taboo words are formed as words and phrases. The following data present some examples of taboo words in word and phrase.

Form of Taboo Words

Taboo words are formed as a word indicating negative, rude, and offensive meanings. The given data demonstrate the examples of taboo words in form of words and phrases found in the Manggaraian language.

Table 1. Form of Taboo Words

Form of Taboo Words	Examples
1. Word	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Laé</i> diong keta hot pande rusak barang daku? - <i>Puki!</i>neka sangge toko agu rona data. - Lorong taran ne, neho keta ranga de <i>kodé</i>. - Neka neho <i>ela</i>, sangge hang taung so manga one meja. - <i>Acu</i>, toe di'a gauk agu tombo sangge ngoeng. - Do bail mboros, berat ne ho keta <i>ntung!</i> - <i>Haro</i>, mese taka domong hau e. - <i>Ringgas</i>, neho keta <i>lawo</i> bambo. - Lor keta <i>bontong</i>, eme oto maeng kartu. - <i>Bambo</i> anak koe so ta, ngonde keta bail. - <i>Wengit!</i> co tara toe mai du adak saung ta de lopos. - <i>Lontek</i> diong keta hot pande kaco rame ho. - <i>Nibok</i> kaut baran, bom manga panden bao mai. - <i>Oe rucuk!</i> Mberes koe hang e. - Woko <i>rigit</i> wuk, dat kole gauk'n. - Paca kaut ine winan hot <i>mbiset</i>, pika taungs kaba de eman. - <i>Mpedal</i> lut keta kuru caci. - Rei hi <i>berat</i> hitu lau le kraeng. - <i>Mbulak</i> neho mata de poti. - <i>Dongki!</i> Toe keta kop pande dehau ta.
2. Phrase	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Lae acu dehau</i>, mese taka tombom. - <i>Domong dehau</i>, neka mbucak bail tombo agu ata tua.

-
- *Puki mai*, ngonde kaut ngo sina kios.
 - *Kido demam!* Mberes keta tombo ngasang data.
 - *Puki de endem*. One pisa kaku tako seng dehau.
 - *Kaba dongong*, reak sot wengkel bail.
 - Ho keta di ita rangan *lawo mbambo* ho.
 - *Poti wolo*, sangge lako kaut wie eros.
 - *Laé wulu*, nakal keta bail.
 - *Com mata olo*, eme ngonde kerja.
 - *Mata ba le emam*. Sangge keta aus tombo anak data.
 - *Kokong koe* so, labar mane rep taungs.
 - *Nggilek mata dehau*, lako sangge ledas kaut.
 - *Puki nden*. Ngo nia lawang ho.
 - Nahe *hang le poti*.
 - *Rimpe Rampet!* Neho keta tara de kode.
 - *Manga bae le Morin*, sanggen pande daat dehau latang
 - Haer *lawo bambo*, toe manga molor kerja.
 - *Otak de ela*, tombo toe olong nuk.
-

As demonstrated in the given data above, taboo words are formed both in word and phrase. In the case of a word, all taboo words are base form and categorized as a noun. Further, in the case of phrase, taboo word functions as the head. In the context of social interaction among Manggaraian speakers, both taboo words and phrases are exploited to express a variety of functions.

Types of Taboo Words and Referents

Taboo words have some types. Regarding the category of taboo words by Battistella (2005) and Jay (2009), some types of taboo words are also shown in the Manggaraian language as presented in the data below.

Table 2. Types of Taboo Words and Referents

Types of Taboo Words	Examples	Referents
Epithet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Mpedal</i> lut keta kuru caci. - <i>Rei hi berat</i> hitu lau le kraeng. - <i>Mbulak</i> neho mata de pot - <i>Nggilek mata dehau</i>, lako sangge ledas kaut - <i>Paca</i> kaut ine winan hot <i>mbiset</i>, pika taungs kaba de eman - <i>Dongki!</i> Toe keta kop pande dehau ta - <i>Nibok</i> kaut baran, bom manga panden bao mai. - <i>Oe rucuk!</i> Mberes koe hang e. - <i>Woko rigit</i> wuk, dat kole gauk'n. - <i>Nggilek mata dehau</i>, lako sangge ledas kaut 	Physical appearance/parts of body
Obscenity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Puki mai</i>, ngonde kaut ngo sina kios. - <i>Kido demam!</i> Mberes keta tombo ngasang data. - <i>Puki de endem</i>. One pisa kaku tako seng dehau - <i>Laé wulu</i>, nakal keta bail - <i>Puki nden</i>. Ngo nia lawang ho 	Sexuality/genital parts

	- <i>Laé</i> diong keta hot pande rusak barang daku?	
	- <i>Puki!</i> neka sangge toko agu rona data	
Scatology	- <i>Acu</i> , toe di'a gauk agu toambo sangge ngoeng.	Animal,
	- Do bail mboros, berat ne ho keta <i>ntung</i>	excretion
	- <i>Tai acu</i> , mesen keta bora dehau ko!	
	- <i>Kaba dongong</i> , reak sot wengkel bail	
	- <i>Rimpe Rampet!</i> Neho keta tara de <i>kode</i>	
Profanity	- <i>Manga bae le Morin</i> , sanggen pande daat dehau latang	
	- <i>Poti wolo</i> , sangge lako kaut wie eros.	Sacred/supernatural /metaphysical things
	- <i>Nahe hang le poti</i>	
	- <i>Kokong koe</i> so, labar mane rep taungs.	
	- <i>Com mata olo</i> , eme ngonde bail kerja.	
	- <i>Mata ba le emam</i> . Sangge keta aus toambo anak data.	

The types of taboo words and referents as demonstrated in the above data contain specific subjects. The subjects are mainly concerned with sexuality, physical appearance/parts of the body, death, animal, excretion, and sacred/metaphysical things. Such topics are related to Wardhaugh (1992) who stated similar matters of taboo words. There is a difference in the case of profanity in that it covers both sacred things (*Morin*) and other metaphysical objects such as ghost spirit (*poti wolo*, *kokong koe*, *mata*). The word “morin” is a generic word referring to God which is often used in the expression of religious cursing. Yet, there is no such specific name employed in the religious taboo words or phrases like in the English language. Additionally, the level of offensiveness of the tabooed subjects relatively ranges from profanity, obscenity, scatology, and epithet. However, the context of interaction directly determines the degree of offensiveness.

Functions and Factors of Using Taboo Words

Taboo words are employed to convey various functions depending mainly on the context of interaction. Generally, taboo words are spoken to state some functions feeling or emotion, cursing, insulting, swearing, being aggressive or provocative. Based on the data, taboo words of the Manggarai language reveal some functions as presented below.

Table 3. Functions and Factors of Using Taboo Words

Functions	Factors
1. Expressing feeling/emotion	1. Psychological condition
2. Cursing	2. Speaker-hearer relationship
3. Swearing	3. Social-physical setting
4. Closeness and Humor	4. Authority
5. Group identity/ethnics	
6. Drawing attention	

Those functions are often conveyed when speakers of the Manggarai language speak of taboo words in their utterances. Each function can be identified from taboo words and phrases used in the context of interaction. Therefore, the context of interaction directly and significantly affects the choice of taboo words and phrases expressing different functions. On one occasion or situation, a speaker uses taboo words to state her strong feeling or emotion, while he could address cursing as well as swearing on one another occasion. In the case of context,

there are some factors causing speakers to employ taboo words such as psychological condition, speaker-hearer relationship, social-physical setting, and authority. Among these factors, the psychological condition is much more dominant driving an individual speaker to exploit taboo words in utterances or speech acts. However, in a broader context of social interaction, taboo words have arisen from social-physical settings and authority (Finn, 2017; Jay, 2009; Njoroge, 2014).

DISCUSSION

Taboo words are closely bound with social settings and interactional context. In Manggaraian language, taboo words are exploited by speakers in a different social setting and context of interaction. These two aspects are related to each other underlying the appearance of taboo words in utterances or speech acts. See the following example.

Ema : *manga bae le Morin*, sangged pande daat dehau.
Ase : ole, asi nggitu bail tombo.

The interaction occurred between two speakers: a father and his brother. The speaker used the phrase *manga bae le Morin*. It is considered taboo words because the referent is a sacred thing, that is God (morin). Additionally, this taboo word was employed by the speaker to convey religious cursing toward his brother's bad behavior. "Morin" is believed to be the highest, powerful, sacred, and glorious. It is the value contained in the word. The word is forbidden to be used for wrong matters. In this interaction, the use of the word is inappropriate to religious and social norms. Socio-culturally, when a speaker exploits the word "morin" in a wrong way as in the given example, his language sounds rude *per se*, but it is taboo.

The other examples of taboo words which are extremely sensitive and offensive are those referring to sexuality, animal, and excretion. Sexuality (genital parts of the body) is a vital part of the human body that is covered and secret. It cannot be directly mentioned, or it is strongly banned and avoidable in interaction. Look at the example below.

- (1) Aleks : *Lae* diong keta hot pande rusak barang daku?
Agus: Toe baen ge.
- (2) Dina : *Puki* mai! Ngonde kaut ngo sina kios.
Dedi : Bo eme inung kopi tong. Sua gelas.

In examples (1) and (2) above, the speakers' employed taboo words showing the sexuality of females and males. The word *lae* refers to the male genital organ which is biologically used to excrete water from the body and in sexual activity, whereas the word *puki* is a female genital organ that serves a similar function to male. These taboo words are very sensitive, rude, and offensive as they share not only negative meanings but also have derogative content. In both interactions, these taboo words were exploited to express their emotion/feeling as well as to swear the unfavorable behavior. The speakers' psychological condition, like under pressure and disappointment, is the factor that affects the exploitation of the sexual taboo words. The sexual taboo words, categorized as obscenity, have some bad impact on self-image, face, and interpersonal relationships. At its worst extent, they can provoke harm and a social conflict in the broader social setting.

Taboo words are also related to animals and excretion. In the Manggaraian language, animal and excretion are generally regarded as taboo words such as *acu*, *ela*, *kode*, *lawo*, *ntung*, *kaba*, *tai*. These taboo words are categorized into scatology. The animal and excretion taboo words are metaphorically used to swear a person with unfavorable appearance, bad behavior, and conduct. Look at the examples below.

- (1) Kani : neho keta hang de *ela*, taung kat hang agu ute one lewing.
Winus : cait manga kid ata toe di hang.
- (2) Lipus : Reba neho keta tara de *kode*.
Radus : tung keta de tombo hitu e.
- (3) Frida : Sangge tombo kaut ine wai *acu* ho.
Sinta : itup leng, neka sangge aus kaut tombo.

In interactions (1), (2) and (3), it was found out that the speakers employed the animal taboo words, namely: *ela*, *kode*, *acu*. These words are rude and taboo because they compare human's appearance, character, behavior, and conduct to the animals. In interaction (1), the speaker employed the word "ela" (pig) to swear his

counterpart with greedy behavior; (2) the speaker applied the word “kode” (monkey) to swear another person with ugly physical appearance; and (3) the speaker used the word “acu” (dog) to swear another person with unfavorable behavior. The animal taboo words are impolite to be spoken as they humiliate and discredit other people.

CONCLUSION

As a piece of linguistic evidence and reality, taboo words (language) exist in any language around the world. This kind of language is generally perceived as rude, negative, offensive, and impolite. It brings about bad impacts on speaker-hearer relationships, self-image/respect, and even conflict. Therefore, it is strongly avoidable and forbidden in interaction. Manggaraian language has a repertoire of taboo words; they are formed in words and phrases. Related to taboo words in the Manggaraian language, some points are drawn as the conclusion. First, in terms of types, taboo words are categorized into four types, namely: *profanity*, *epithet*, *obscenity*, and *scatology*. Second, taboo words address some functions such as expressing feeling/emotion, cursing, swearing, closeness and humor, showing group identity/ethnicity, and drawing attention. Third, taboo words also have some referents, namely sexuality, sacred/supernatural/metaphysical things, animal/excretion, physical appearance/parts of the body. Fourth, the employment of taboo words is triggered by some factors: psychological condition, speaker-hearer relationship, social-physical setting, and authority. Socio-cultural context determines the proscription of taboo words, in this case, socio-cultural and religious norms. Further, recognizing taboo words in the Manggaraian language is vitally important for both native speakers and speakers from other languages to reduce the risk of harm, conflict, and main impoliteness

REFERENCES

- Allan, Keith & Burridge, K. (2006). *Forbidden Words: Taboo and the Censoring of Language* (First). Cambridge University Press.
- Apriani, N. W. (2017). *Bentuk dan Referensi Kata Makian Dalam Bahasa Bali*.
- Finn, E. (2017). Swearing: The good, the bad & the ugly. *ORTESOL*, 34, 26.
- Jay, T. (2009). The Utility and Ubiquity of Taboo Words. *The Association of Psychological Science*, 4(2), 153–161.
- Leech, G. (2014). *The pragmatics of Politeness*. Oxford University.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics* (First edition). Cambridge University.
- Lidbäck, J. (2020). *Functions of taboo expressions in YouTube discourse: The case of iDubbbzTV*. Karlstad University.
- Njoroge, R. N. (2014). *Euphemisms And Taboo Words: A Case Of Kikuyu' S Kabete Dialect*. The University of Nairobi.
- Pilotti, M., Almand, J., & Martinez, M. (2012). Taboo Words in Expressive Language: Do Sex and Primary Language Matter? *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, 2(2), 17–26.
- Putri, Derli Elsa, Sembiring, B. & I. (2019). An Analysis of Taboo Words in Rich Brian's Song Lyrics. *Journal of English Education and Teaching*, 3(2), 143–155.
- Ranus, M. J. G. W. (2019). *Makian Dalam Bahasa Manggarai Dialek Colol Manggarai Timur*. Sanata Dharma.
- Rosenberg, P., & Garcia, D. (2017). *The A (ffective) B (ehavioral) C (ognitive) of Taboo Words in Natural Language: The Relationship Between Taboo Words' Intensity and Frequency*. May. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X16660830>
- Samosir, Widya Nola, Meisuri & Putri, C. A. (2020). Taboo Language Expression Between Seller and Buyer In Traditional Market. *Linguistica*, 09(04), 396–402.
- Sari, Y. P. (2020). An Analysis of Types of Taboo Words in Parker Movie. *Humanis: Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 24(3), 232–237. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.24843/JH.2020.v24.i03.p01>
- Sugara, Ria Dewi Hidayani and Saparianingsih, R. (2020). English Cursing Analysis of Millennial Generation in Social Media Investigate. *Atlantis Press*, 512(Icoflex 2019), 271–274.
- Tamos-Villadolid, Marilyn & Santos, A. L. (2019). Euphemisms for Taboo Words: Ili ganon's Sociolinguistical Approach for Social Harmony. *Journal of Education & Social Policy*, 6(4), 50–57. <https://doi.org/10.30845/jesp.v6n4p7>
- Wene, I. W., & Ena, O. T. (2020). Cursing, Sexual Harassment, Profanity, Obscenity and Epithet in Dallas Buyers Club Movie. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literature*, 5(1), 71–87. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.33369/joall.v5i1.8920>

Wibowo, R. M. (2020). *Leksikon Makian Dalam Pertuturan Bahasa Indonesia: Kajian Sosio-Pragmatik*. 21(2), 70–81.

Yule, G. (1996). Pragmatics. In *Pragmatic*. Oxford: Oxford University.