

IMPOLITENESS OF TABOO WORDS IN MANGGARAIAN LANGUAGE: INTERCULTURAL PRAGMATICS LENS

Tobias Gunas ^{1*}, Ignatius Semana ², Manik Warmadewi³
Universitas Katolik Indonesia Santu Paulus Ruteng
Universitas Warmadewa Denpasar, Bali

tobgun74@gmail.com, ignassemana@gmail.com,
manikwarmadewi@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Taboo words are considered offensive language. In any language, taboo words convey a rude meaning that threatens interlocutors' face in interaction. In particular, the Manggaraian language employs several words referring to taboo sense. Those taboo words have form, meaning, and reference. However, exploiting taboo words in interaction violates social norms and culture. This research aims to explore the impoliteness of taboo words in the Manggaraian language from a pragmatic intercultural perspective. The qualitative research method was entirely applied to account for taboo words in the Manggaraian language, whereas the primary data were naturally obtained through field observation and recording. The data were qualitatively analyzed through three procedures: condensation, display, and conclusion drawing. The interpretation of data was based on three main theories: impoliteness, taboo, and intercultural pragmatics. The study results reveal that taboo words in the Manggaraian language are generally classified into profanity, obscenity, epithet, and scatology. These 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. The impoliteness strategies were bald-on strategy, positive impoliteness strategy, and negative impoliteness strategy. The use of the impoliteness strategies has flouted some maxims of politeness, particularly the maxim of tact, the maxim of approbation, the maxim of modesty, the maxim of generosity, and the maxim of agreement. Socio-culturally, taboo words are considered deviant behavior of social norms and impolite words for Manggaraian speakers in social interaction.

Keywords: *impoliteness; intercultural pragmatics; taboo words; manggaraian language*

INTRODUCTION

Typically, impoliteness is against what people use conventionally, violating social norms and cultures. It is, as such, forbidden and should be avoidable in social interaction. The reason is that impoliteness as a part of language behavior is at risk of humiliating and threatening people's feelings and public self-image.

Interlocutors feel offended and disrespected in interaction due to impolite language, as Culpeper and Hardaker (2017) have strikingly stressed that impoliteness contains negative sense. Conversely, language is not merely used to convey positive meaning as a means of social interaction. In one context, speakers may unconsciously sort out impolite

words such as taboo expressing emotion, mocking, or showing dissatisfaction toward other actions. In other words, rude language is, as in the case of impoliteness, often required for communication per se. It is often expressed when someone sorts out specific words or forbidden lexicon to react to other people's behavior under pressure circumstances. It is such a kind of reaction to the speaker's perception of the surrounding environment (Tampos-Villadolid & Santos, 2019). To this extent, the social environment affects and drives speakers of any language to exploit various impolite words.

Impoliteness is a piece of linguistic evidence and reality driving a great interest to look at it more precisely. In the view of Culpeper (1996), impoliteness has an antagonistic nuance and a confrontational sense. It is an act of communication attacking people's faces, feelings, or public-self image in interaction. Leech (1983) contends that some communicative acts are inherently impolite, such as giving orders, criticizing, and disagreeing. These acts are potentially at risk of threatening positive and negative faces. In this case, impoliteness occurs in two different circumstances: the first circumstance is unequal power and relationship, social distance, and status, and the second one is of showing intimacy. In those situations, impoliteness is realized inherently and superficially. Inherently, impoliteness co-exists with its opposing counterpart in the communicative act in an imperative form, while superficially, it takes the form of mock impoliteness. As a part of the pragmatic analysis, impoliteness is

employed through some strategies. The strategies have the opposing orientation to attack face. Drawing upon the theory of FTA, Brown & Levinson (1987) propose four strategies to convey impoliteness, namely: *Bald-on impoliteness strategy*, *positive impoliteness strategy*, *negative impoliteness strategy*, and *sarcasm or mock impoliteness strategy*. *Bald-on impoliteness strategy* is conducted in the most direct, clear, unambiguous, and concise without minimizing face. A positive impoliteness strategy is employed to attack or damage a cheerful face, and so is negative impoliteness. Sarcasm or mock impoliteness strategy is performed by using politeness strategy insincerely. This kind of strategy remains a superficial realization. Those impoliteness strategies have "face-damaging implications" (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Culpeper and Hardaker, 2017).

Taboo word is a part of a language that is often exploited in social interaction. Using taboo words brings about impoliteness. At its risk, it can raise a conflict among interlocutors and failure of communication. The act of exploiting hostile or rude language potential brings discredit to people's personalities and self-image (Wibowo, 2020). Socio-culturally, employing taboo words violates social norms and cultural values since culture has a system of values representing what is allowed or unallowed, required or forbidden (Pilotti and Martinez, 2012; Rosenberg and Garcia, 2017). Taboo words are widely recognized as a forbidden language in society. Yule (2014) maintained that taboo words are related to inappropriate words and

phrases used in social communities; those are sacred, prohibited, or just inappropriate (Wene & Ena, 2020). Taboo words contain, by nature, hostile, rude, and offensive meanings. Proscription of taboo words reflects social restriction on the personal behavior that brings about the lousy 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 firmly banned in interpersonal and social interaction. As addressed by (Jay, 2009), 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 highly varied depending on socio-cultural contexts set in social interaction (Wardhaugh, 1992).

Furthermore, the content of taboo words indicates different referents. Based on the referents, taboo words are subsumed under some types, namely: obscenity, profanity, 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 previous analyses and the present research (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. 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, and 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 reasons for using taboo words were also revealed in the research findings of Wene & Ena (2020). The psychological condition was the most dominant reason: humor, ethnic group identity, and social class. However, Lidbäck (2020) demonstrated different reasons for taboo words such as a joke, appreciation, disclaimer, and reference. Simply, it seems reasonable that various reasons arise from the context variability of taboo words in interaction.

Impoliteness and taboo words are two crucial language issues that are closely connected. Taboo words entail impoliteness. Both are superficially and inherently found in social interaction. The analysis of impoliteness and taboo words is related to pragmatics and culture. Therefore, the exploration of the topic is conducted from an intercultural-pragmatics lens. It combines pragmatics perspective and cultural lens. Intercultural pragmatics looks at language use in conjunction with cultural background. Yule (1996) stated that cultural background is the basis for understanding how different speakers construct meaning in their languages. In this view, the

phenomenon of language behavior as impoliteness and taboo words is interwoven with cultural nuances and values. Leech (2014) emphasized that intercultural pragmatics is an approach to disclosing cultural differences in language use by comparison or contrasting. However, the current investigation of impoliteness and taboo words in the Manggaraian language is not compared and contrasted with other cultures. It is mainly applied to get across the linguistic form, strategies, and cultural values.

Manggaraian language (ML) is a local language spoken by most people in west Flores, East Nusa Tenggara Province. It is a Melayu-Polinesian language with a sufficiently average number of speakers and has some variations of regional dialects. Further, impoliteness and taboo words are manifested differently in the Manggaraian language in terms of words (lexicon) and cultural views of impoliteness. Several words are categorized as taboo because their meaning is hostile and offensive. Additionally, it is more sensitive and rude when employing taboo words in social interaction and disrupts interpersonal relations. Culturally, taboo words are impolite in Manggaraian culture as showing disrespect to other social beings. Taboo words are also forbidden due to violating social norms and cultures.

There have been several studies exploring taboo words in local languages. The investigation of taboo words has revealed a variety of contexts for taboo words. Exploring taboo words in local languages shows a more prosperous and diverse socio-cultural context. Some previous studies

concerned the impoliteness and taboo words in different local languages, including the Manggaraian language. Ranus (2019) analyzed swearing words in the Manggaraian language, particularly *Colol* dialect of East Manggarai. The study focuses mainly on the description of swearing words, referents, meaning, and context of use. Semantics and Sociolinguistics are the main theories used to account for swearing words in the Manggaraian language. The findings show that the Manggaraian language, particularly in the Colol dialect, has some lexicons or words used to express swearing.

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. Likewise, Apriani (2017) conducted research on swearing words in Balinese in terms of forms and referents. The analysis was qualitatively seen from the sociolinguistic approach. The study revealed that Balinese has particular swearing words. In the case of form, the swearing words are syntactically constructed in words and phrases. The swearing words are categorized into eleven kinds based on the referents. The words are noun, verb, and adjective. Furthermore, in the case of referents, those swearing words refer to a condition, animal, parts of the body, supernatural spirit, objects, kinship, activity, and profession. Sociolinguistically, the swearing words are considered rude and negative; therefore, they should be avoided and forbidden.

Samosir et al. (2020) mainly focused on investigating taboo words in Batak Toba language used in the

conservation between seller and buyer. The analysis was qualitatively done in terms of types of taboo words, perceptions, and 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 destructive 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) analyzed the relationship of taboo words in terms of intensity and frequency by applying statistical analysis to the relationship of three key components; Affective, Behaviour, and Cognitive. The analysis results 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 Manggaraian language has a linguistic repertoire of taboo words that are fascinating to investigate from pragmatics and culture. The phenomenon of impoliteness and taboo words in the Manggaraian language is necessarily conducted for further research. The topic has not been widely explored in recent studies as in other languages. Meanwhile, Manggaraian

taboo words are unique to be pursued in this present investigation. Hence, the analysis of taboo words and impoliteness provides new insights into intercultural pragmatics. Fourth, the current analysis enriches our understanding of impoliteness and taboo words in the Manggaraian language. These reasons drive the researcher to look at the topic.

METHODOLOGY

This research is, by nature, designed in a qualitative study in which the data source was taken from the recorded daily interaction. The data are primarily the words spoken by the Manggaraian speakers in interaction in Langke Rembong District and other surrounding areas. Part of the data is the researcher's intuitive knowledge as a native speaker of the Manggaraian language. The data were obtained through recording and direct observation. Audio recorder and field-note were the instruments employed to collect sufficient data. The data were then analyzed through three interactive procedures: data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing. In the data condensation stage, the recorded data were transcribed into the written texts and coded by themes and category. The results of the data analysis were displayed in an informal way and the matrix. Further, the data were explained by the inductive-deductive method and based on the theory of taboo language and intercultural pragmatics.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of the data analysis presented in this part indicate some crucial points regarding types of taboo

words and impoliteness strategies. In the case of taboo words, the results are related to types of taboo, referents, functions and factors, and impoliteness strategies. Each point is discussed comprehensively below.

Types of Taboo Words and Referents

As the data are shown below, taboo words of the Manggaraian language can be categorized into some types. Some taboo words are very likely to be made even though the classification is not exclusively used as a reference. Some taboo words are also found in the Manggaraian language, as presented in the data below.

TYPES OF TABOO WORDS	EXAMPLES	REFERENTS
EPITHET	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Mpedal</i> lut keta kuru caci. - Rei hi <i>berat</i> hitu lau le kraeng. - <i>Mbulak</i> neho mata de pot - <i>Nggilek mata dehau</i>, lako sangge ledas kaut - Paca kaut ine winan hot <i>mbiset</i>, pika taungs kaba de eman - <i>Dongkil!</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. - Woko <i>rigit</i> wuk, dat kole gauk'n. - <i>Nggilek mata dehau</i>, lako sangge ledas kaut 	Physical appearance/parts of the 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 - <i>Laé</i> diong keta hot pande rusak barang daku? - <i>Pukilneka</i> sangge toko agurona data 	Sexuality/genital parts
SCATOLOGY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Acu</i>, toe di'a gauk agur tombo sangge ngoeng. - Do bail mboros, berat ne ho keta <i>ntung</i> - <i>Tai acu</i>, mesen keta bora dehau ko! 	Animal, excretion

	- <i>Kaba dongong</i> , reak sot wengkel bail	
	- <i>Rimpe Rampet!</i> Neho keta tara de kode	
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
	- Nahe <i>hang le poti</i>	
	- <i>Kokong koe so</i> , labar mane rep taungs.	
	- <i>Com mata olo</i> , eme ngonde bail kerja.	
	- <i>Mata ba le emam</i> . Sangge keta aus tombo anak data.	

Concerning the given data, taboo words of the Manggaraian language are subsumed under epithet, obscenity, scatology, and profanity. This category is in line with the existing category of taboo words by Battistella (2005) and Jay (2009). As demonstrated in the above examples, the types of taboo words and referents 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 to express religious cursing.

Nevertheless, no specific name is employed in the religious taboo words or phrases like in English. Additionally, the offensiveness of the tabooed subjects relatively ranges from profanity, obscenity, scatology, and

epithet. However, the context of interaction directly determines the degree of offensiveness.

In Manggaraian culture, taboo (*ireng*) deals with speech and act. The taboo act is such a kind of specific activity that is forbidden to be conducted, while taboo speech is specific words or phrases that are prohibited. Both are considered rude, negative, and offensive. They were exploiting taboo words and humiliating people's dignity and self-respect. It also discredits others as social beings. Thus, those taboo words violate socio-cultural norms in the Manggaraian speech community. The social-cultural norms organize people to respect each other in interaction highly (*hiang hae ata*) and use polite language or speech (*curup ata kop/dia'n, jaga mu'u, neka mbucak tombo agu ata*). These local cultural norms are conventionally held and applied to social interaction in Manggaraian society. If speakers ignore the existing cultural norms, some harmful impacts will occur, such as social conflict, failure of communication, and disruption of interpersonal relationships.

Concerning this case, Keith & Burrige (2006) and Wene et al. (2020) emphasized that the Proscription of taboo words reflects social restriction upon the personal behavior that brings about destructive impacts such as discomfort, harm, or injury, as well as mitigates a conflict between groups of people in society.

Some Functions and Factors of

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 Manggaraian language speak of taboo words in their utterances. Each function can be identified from taboo words and phrases used in 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. At the same time, he could address cursing and swearing on one another occasions. In context, there are some factors causing speakers to employ taboo words, such as psychological condition, speaker-hearer relationship, social-physical setting, and authority. The

Using Taboo Words

Taboo words convey various functions depending mainly on the context of interaction. Generally, taboo words are spoken to state some functions, feelings, or emotions, such as cursing, insulting, swearing, being aggressive, or provocative. Based on the data, taboo words in the Manggaraian language reveal some functions, as presented below.

psychological condition is much more dominant among these factors, driving an individual speaker to exploit taboo words in utterances or speech acts. However, taboo words have arisen from social-physical settings and authority in a broader context of social interaction (Finn, 2017; Jay, 2009; Njoroge, 2014).

Impoliteness of Taboo Words

Taboo words reflect the impoliteness of communicative acts. As the data demonstrated above, those types of taboo words are related to impoliteness in social interaction. There are essentially two results to be discussed: impoliteness strategies and flouting maxims.

Taboo words are closely bound

with social settings and interactional context. In the 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 excerpt.

Ema : *manga bae le Morin*,
sanged 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, the speaker employed this taboo word 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 violates religious and social-cultural norms. Socio-culturally, when a speaker exploits the word "morin" wrongly, as in the given example, his language sounds rude *per se*, but it is taboo. In impoliteness, the speaker employed a *bald-on strategy* to curse and swear at his opponent. By applying the impoliteness strategy, the speaker directly attacked his counterpart's face hoping that God punishes the person. This impoliteness has flouted some maxims, according to Leech (1983), such as maxim of approbation, maxim of modesty, maxim of tact, and maxim of generosity. The flouting maxims indicate that the speaker maximized his benefit while giving more costs to his

opponent.

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 covered and secret. It cannot be directly mentioned or firmly banned and avoidable in interaction. Look at the example below.

(1) Aleks : *Lae* diong keta
hot pande rusak barang
daku?

Agus : Toe baen ge, kae.

(2) Dina : *Puki* mai! Ngo
ngelang weli kopi sina
kios.

Dedi : Bo eme inung
kopi tong. Sua gelas.

In the 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 sexual activity. In contrast, the word *puki* is a female genital organ that serves a similar function to a male. These taboo words are compassionate, rude, and offensive as they share negative meanings and have derogative content. These taboo words were exploited in both interactions to express their emotions/feelings and swear the negative behavior. The speakers' psychological condition, like as pressure and disappointment, is the factor that affects the exploitation of the sexual taboo words. The sexual taboo words, categorized as obscenity, have a terrible impact on self-image, face, and interpersonal relationships. To its worst extent, they can provoke harm and a

social conflict in the broader social setting.

The speakers applied different impoliteness strategies. In excerpt (1), the speaker used a positive impoliteness strategy. The utterance was constructed in the interrogative sentence to attack the hearer's positive face indirectly. This indirect way reveals that the speaker redressed to minimize the tension and risk of conflict. In excerpt (2), the speaker applied the negative impoliteness strategy using imperative utterance to destroy the opposing face. There was not any option offered on the side of the hearer. Some maxims were flouted, such as the maxim of tact, maxim of modesty, maxim of approbation, and maxim of agreement.

Taboo words are also related to animals and excretion. In the Manggaraian language, animal and excretion are taboo words such as *acu*, *ela*, *kode*, *lawo*, *ntung*, *kaba*, *tai*. These taboo words are categorised into scatology. The animal and excretion taboo words are metaphorically used to swear a person with unfavourable appearance, bad behaviour 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 da'at neho ke
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 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 those animals. In interaction (1), the speaker employed the word "ela" (pig) to swear his counterpart with greedy behavior. In the second interaction, the speaker applied the word "kode" (monkey) to swear at another person with an ugly physical appearance, while in interaction (3), the speaker used the word "acu" (dog) to swear at another person with negative behavior. The animal taboo words are impolite to be spoken as they humiliate and discredit other people. Human appearance has the most respected self-image that is unequal to animals. The use of animal taboo words has downgraded the existence of human dignity.

The speakers employed different strategies to attack the hearers' positive and negative faces concerning the impoliteness strategies. In excerpt (1), the speaker applied a negative impoliteness strategy to show his disrespect to the other participant and express his emotional feelings against the uncivil behavior. The declarative utterance was constructed to convey the speaker's wants. In excerpt (2), the speaker utilized a positive impoliteness strategy to threaten the cheerful face of his opponent. Moreover, the speaker showed his dissatisfaction with one's conduct. In excerpt (3), the speaker also used a positive impoliteness strategy to attack the counterpart's cheerful face. In addition, the speaker reacted to the hearer's utterance. The flouting maxims were some maxims, namely the maxim of tact, the maxim of

approbation, the maxim of sympathy, dan the maxim of modesty.

The employment of impoliteness strategies does not change taboo words into mild impoliteness. Taboo words naturally remain harmful and offensive. However, in social interaction, strategies are crucial for speakers to consider their degree of impact on others' faces, feelings, and self-respect. The flouting maxims are in line with the types of impoliteness strategies. In other words, the impoliteness of taboo words is parallel to flouting maxims of politeness.

CONCLUSION

Taboo word is linguistic evidence embracing impoliteness. It is unarguably perceived as rude, negative, offensive, and impolite. Remarkably, the Manggaraian language has a repertoire of taboo words. Based on the data analysis, some points of conclusion are drawn. 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, and drawing attention. Third, those taboo words refer to sexuality, sacred/metaphysical things, animal/excretion, and physical appearance. Fourth, the employment of taboo words is triggered by a psychological condition, speaker-hearer relationship, social-physical setting, and authority. Fifth, socio-culturally, taboo words are forbidden and should be avoided in social interaction since they violate socio-cultural norms in the Manggaraian speech community. According to

Manggaraian culture, people should highly respect others' dignity or self-respect as social beings and treat them as equally as themselves. However, applying impoliteness strategies, such as *bald-on strategy, positive impoliteness strategy, and negative impoliteness strategy*, is vitally essential to moderate the impact on others. The implications are at two points. Taboo words should be recognized and taught to younger Manggaraian speakers to recognize the negative meaning and destructive impact when using the words in social interaction. Aspects of taboo words and impoliteness are complex matters as connected to some rituals in the Manggaraian speech community. It is interesting for future research to further explore taboo words in particular rituals of the Manggaraian speech community.

REFERENCES

- Allan, Keith & Burridge, Kate. 2006. *Forbidden Words: Taboo and the Censoring of Language*. First. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Apriani, Ni Wayan. 2017. *Bentuk Dan Referensi Kata Makian Dalam Bahasa Bali*.
- Brown, Penelope & Levinson, Stephen C. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Culpeper, Jonathan. 1996. "Towards an Anatomy of Impoliteness." *Journal of Pragmatics* 25(April 1994):349-67.
- Culpeper, Jonathan and Hardaker, Claire. 2017. "Impoliteness." Pp. 199-225 in *Linguistic Impoliteness*. Lancaster: PALGRAVE

- MACMILLAN.
- Finn, Eileen. 2017. "Swearing: The Good, the Bad & the Ugly." *ORTESOL* 34:26.
- Jay, Timothy. 2009. "The Utility and Ubiquity of Taboo Words." *The Association of Psychological Science* 4(2):153–61.
- Leech, Geoffrey. 2014. *The Pragmatics of Politeness*. New York: Oxford University.
- Leech, Geoffrey N. 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics*. First. New York: Longman Group.
- Lidbäck, Jonathan. 2020. "Functions of Taboo Expressions in YouTube Discourse: The Case of IDubbbzTV." Karlstad University.
- Njoroge, Rita Njeri. 2014. "Euphemisms And Taboo Words: A Case Of Kikuyu' S Kabete Dialect." The University of Nairobi.
- Pilotti, Maura, Jennifer, Almand and Melanie Martinez. 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, Bernabas and Imranudin. 2019. "An Analysis of Taboo Words in Rich Brian's Song Lyrics." *Journal of English Education and Teaching* 3(2):143–55.
- Ranus, Maria J. and Grey Wendardins. 2019. "Makian Dalam Bahasa Manggarai Dialek Colol Manggarai Timur." Sanata Dharma.
- Rosenberg, Patricia and Danilo Garcia. 2017. "The A (Effective) B (Behavioral) C (Ognitive) of Taboo Words in Natural Language : The Relationship Between Taboo Words ' Intensity and Frequency." (May). DOI: 10.1177/0261927X16660830.
- Samosir, Widya Nola, Meisuri and Putri, Citra Anggia. 2020. "Taboo Language Expression Between Seller and Buyer In Traditional Market." *Linguistica* 09(04):396–402.
- Sari, Yunita Permata. 2020. "An Analysis of Types of Taboo Words in Parker Movie." *Humanis: Journal of Arts and Humanities* 24(3):232–37.DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24843/JH.2020.v24.i03.p01>.
- Tamos-Villadolid, Marilyn and Santos, Angelina Lozada. 2019. "Euphemisms for Taboo Words : Ili Ganon ' s Sociolinguistical Approach for Social Harmony." *Journal of Education & Social Policy* 6(4):50–57. DOI: 10.30845/jesp.v6n4p7.
- Wene, Imelda Woa and Ouda Teda Ena. 2020. "Cursing, Sexual Harassment, Profanity, Obscenity, and Epithet in Dallas Buyers Club Movie." *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literature* 5(1):71–87. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.33369/joall.v5i1.8920>.
- Wibowo, Ridha Mashudi. 2020. "Leksikon Makian Dalam Pertuturan Bahasa Indonesia : Kajian Sosio-Pragmatik." 21(2):70–81.
- Yule, George. 1996. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University.