Volume 18 Issue 51
Originally issued as H8

Global Journal of human-social science: H
Interdisciplinary
Volume 18 Issue 8 Version 1.0 Year 2018
Type: Double Blind Peer Reviewed International Research Journal
Publisher: Global Journals
Online ISSN: 2249-460x & Print ISSN: 0975-587X

Social Semiotic in Ceha Kila Traditional Game

By Maria Marietta Bali Larasati

Flores University

Abstract- Semiotic comes from Greek, semeion, which means sign. Terminologically, semiotic can be defined as a study of a large number of objects, phenomena, and culture as the sign. Jan Zoest purposes semiotic as a study of sign and everything which relates with it, the functions, its connection with other words, the users' reception and transmission (Sobur, 2006: 95—96).

In Halliday's social semiotic there are three contextual centers of textual interpretation. They are field, tenor, and mode. These concepts are used in interpreting social and textual context which is the place where the exchange of meanings occurs (Halliday in Ruqaiya, 1992: 16).Man and culture are an inseparable thing. There will be no a culture if there isn't a man. Man use their reason and potencies to create a culture.

Manggarai culture is a work of reason, potencies, intentions, and ideals. This culture becomes the essential wealth for Manggarai people personally or collectively (Dagur, 1997:2). Ceha Kila (hide the ring) is one of inherited Manggarai traditional game.

Keywords: *social, semiotic, cehakila, traditional game.*

GJHSS-H Classification: *FOR Code: 950407, 950406*



Strictly as per the compliance and regulations of:

© 2018. Maria Marietta Bali Larasati. This is a research/review paper, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 3.0 Unported License http://creativecom-mons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/), permitting all non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Social Semiotic in Ceha Kila Traditional Game

Maria Marietta Bali Larasati

Abstract- Semiotic comes from Greek, semeion, which means sign. Terminologically, semiotic can be defined as a study of a large number of objects, phenomena, and culture as the sign. Jan Zoest purposes semiotic as a study of sign and everything which relates with it, the functions, its connection with other words, the users' reception and transmission (Sobur, 2006: 95—96).

In Halliday's social semiotic there are three contextual centers of textual interpretation. They are field, tenor, and mode. These concepts are used in interpreting social and textual context which is the place where the exchange of meanings occurs (Halliday in Ruqaiya, 1992: 16).Man and culture are an inseparable thing. There will be no a culture if there isn't a man. Man use their reason and potencies to create a culture.

Manggarai culture is a work of reason, potencies, intentions, and ideals. This culture becomes the essential wealth for Manggarai people personally or collectively (Dagur, 1997:2). Ceha Kila (hide the ring) is one of inherited Manggarai traditional game.

Ceha Kila engaged many people in two groups. They have to see, participate, and take these benefits for communal life. This game uses Kila (ring) as a mode. People must sing and riddle. If the answer is wrong the pointed player must say toe (no).

Semiotic sources can be found in everything which has cultural and social meaning. To figure Ceha Kila out, people must give attention to its cultural context, norms, and rules. Social semiotic contributes to finding and developing many new semiotic sources and their using in life.

Keywords: social, semiotic, cehakila, traditional game.

I. Introduction

Semiotic comes from Greek, semeion, which means sign. According to Sobur (2006), terminologically semiotic can be defined as a study on a large number of objects, phenomena, and culture as a sign. Van Zoest purposes semiotic as a study of sign and everything related to it: the functions, its connection to other words, the users' reception and transmission (p. 95—96). Premiger (in Kriyantono, 2007) says that this study assumes that social phenomena, society, and culture are the signs. Semiotic studies the systems, rules, and conventions that make the signs more meaningful (p. 261). In Halliday and Ruqaiya (1992) social semiotic model there are three contextual central of textual interpretation. They are field, tenor, and mode. These concepts are used in interpreting social textual context where meaning reciprocates (p.16).

Field of discourse focuses on what is going on, what is being occupied and discoursed by the tenors. In this, language takes part as basic elements. The tenor of discourse focuses on the people who participate, the qualities of their roles, positions, the relationship types between them, including their temporal and permanent relationship. The role of their conversation and the social relationship has an important meaning for them. Bungin (2009) said that mode of discourse focuses on the roles of language: how the mass media use figures of speech in describing the context and the participants, whether they use smoothed, hyperbolic, euphemistic, or vulgar speech? (p.174). In specific aspects, some cultural conventions apply knowledge, rules, and codes to reduce the wealth of meaning in a sign.

Sukanto (1982) explained that culture is a complex system which includes knowledge, beliefs, moralities, laws, art, customs, abilities, and habits. Man gets these in a society(p.150). Daeng (2004) stated that men and culture are inseparable things. There is no culture if there is no man. Man creates languages, art, weaves and webbings, potteries, traditions, customs, institutions, norms, and rules so that human beings can be more cultured in one community (p.18).

Manggarai culture is a work of reason, potencies, and dreams of Manggarai people. According to Dagur (1997) they make it their essential wealth, personally or socially (p.2). *Ceha Kila*(hide the ring) is an inherited Manggarai traditional game. People play *Ceha Kila*when someone dies. They play it for three days since the corpse is buried. *Ceha Kila*is meant to cheer up the bereaved family.

The semiotic source can be found in everything which has cultural and social meaning. In this light, *Ceha Kila*, as communication which creates semiotic sources, requires people to be informed of the cultural context, norms, and rules of this game.

Social semiotic doesn't only collect and investigate semiotic sources and the use of these sources in a specific context. But, social semiotic contributes to finding and developing new semiotic sources and the use of these which help us to review many semiotic sources in *Ceha Kila*. People don't only focus on the words of a *Sando*, but on the setting, accessories, and other semiotic sources. These have potencies in creating a meaning.

a) Problem Formulation

Based on the background, there are some basic problems for discussing. They are:

1. How does field discourse play a role in *Ceha Kila* in Kole Village, North SatarMese, Manggarai?

*Author: Flores University Yosef Demon * Flores University.*
e-mail: demomaung051065@gmail.com

© 2018 Global Journals

2. How does tenor of discourse play a role in *Ceha Kila* in Kole Village, North SatarMese, Manggarai?
3. In what way the mode of discourse influences *Ceha Kila* as a traditional game in Kole Village, North Satar Mese, Manggarai?

This paper aims to know and describe the roles of:

1. Field discourse in *Ceha Kila*in Kole village, North Satar Mese, Manggarai.
2. The tenor of discourse in *Ceha Kila*in Kole Village, North Satar Mese, Manggarai.
3. Mode of discourse in *Ceha Kila*in Kole Village, North Satar Mese, Manggarai.

b) Concepts

i. *Social Semiotic*

Semiotic comes from Greek, semeion, which means sign. Based on the terminologically, Econ (in Sobur, 2001) stated that semiotic can be defined as a study of a large number of objects, phenomena, and culture as a sign (p. 95).

ii. *Halliday's Social Semiotic Model*

Halliday explains social semiotic in his book, Language Social Semiotic. Social semiotic is a study of man's sign system in symbols, both words, and sentences. As an Halliday oppinion, Sobur (2006) stated that social semiotic exercises sign system in language (p. 95—96).

iii. *Traditional Games*

Sustrisno and Hendar (2005) note that traditional games are children's games spread both verbally or collectively. Traditional games are inherited. These can have many variants in one game. Traditional games' characteristics are an unknown maker, orally, and sometimes society has different names for one game (p.195).

iv. *Ceha Kila*

Ceha Kila is a traditional game which engages many people. They are supposed to see, participate, and take the benefits for social life. This game uses Kila (ring) as the mode. There are two groups in this game. Each group has to sing and riddle. If the riddle is wrong the pointed player, who is holding Kila (ring), must answer toe (no).

c) Theoretical Revies

Halliday (in Sobur, 2006) explains that social semiotic in his book Language Social Semiotic. Social semiotic is one of study on sign specifically man's sign system in symbols, both in words or sentences. In other words, social semiotic studies sign system in language (p. 95—95). Beside that according to Santoso (2003) social semiotic more focuses on language as a sign system or symbols. This expresses social and cultural values and norms in a society in a linguistic progress (p. 6).

i. *Text*

The text is a product or output. It can be recorded and studied. The text has a specific structure in a systematic terminology. Besides, it is a mutual progress, a reciprocity of social meaning. Halliday (1992) note that therefore, the text is an object and social meaning example in a specific context (p.14—15).

ii. *Context*

Halliday and Ruqaeya (1992) stated that social semiotics also concerns with the context for understanding language lays on text's study. It means that text and context belong together. Context and text are two terms that come from the same process. How do we understand context? A context shows a text and another accompanying texts and text that accompany it. But, another text, in this case, refers not only to the verbal and writings language, but also events that cannot be said by words. – while the text(p.6).

The situation is the space in which the text works. The context of the situation is about whole space both verbal space either the space in which the text is produced (verbal or writings). In the model of social semiotics, Halliday and Ruqaeya (1992) explain three elements that become the center of the hermeneutics of text contextually. These three elements are field, tenor, and mode (p.16). These concepts are used to interpret the context of the social text that is a field in which meanings exchange.

a. Field of discourse

It refers to the thing that is happening. In other words, this concept refers to the character of social behavior that is going on. Therefore, the field of discourse aims at the things that are discourse by participants in which language is involved as the main element.

b. *Tenor of discourse*

It refers to those who participate, be it the character of participant, position, and their role; the kind of relation of the roles within the participants. It involves also the relation both permanent and temporary; both the kind of verbal role in their conversation either the whole of the relation that in the group is so meaningful.

c. *Mode of Discourse*

Buning (2009) note that mode of discourse refers to the role of language, how does the communicator such as mass media use language style to explain the situation and participant; whether using smoothed language, hyperbole, euphemistic or vulgar (p.174).

II. Research Methods

Research Methods that is used here is Social semiotics analysis proposed by Halliday. Specific semiotics analyzes the symbol of man as sign system

© 2018 Global Journals

including word and sentences. In other words, social semiotics elaborates sign systems in a language.

There are three Text interpretations according to Halliday. First, the field of discourse that refers to the thing that is happening. The discourse that is played by traditional game participants is *Ceha Kila*. Second, the tenor of discourse refers to those who participate in this traditional game *Ceha Kila*, or all who are the references in the explanation. Third, the mode of discourse refers to the use of language. How does *Sando* use language style in explaining the situation and the players? It relates to the use of language and figure of speech that is used to explain the message in the traditional game, *Ceha Kila*.

a) Research approach

The approach that is used by the author is qualitative. This approach helps the author to analyze and interpret the meaning that contains in the text and context that are related to the traditional game *Ceha Kila*in Kole Village, North Satar Mese, Manggarai. In this approach author also describes in what way this traditional game construct reality.

b) Data and Resources

The data of this research is contextual text interpretation that includes field, tenor, and mode in the traditional game *Ceha Kila*. The data resources of this research are the people of Kole village, North Satar Mese, Manggarai.

c) Data Collection Technique

i. *Interview*

The interview in this research is an in-depth interview or intensive and unstructured. This interview uses interview guide which generally aims to get depth information by focusing on main matters. The guide of this research does not contain detail questions, but just big picture regarding data and information that could be developed by focusing on the development, context, and situation. The purpose of this way is to get depth qualitative data. This interview is addressed to Sando and all players of *Ceha Kila*in Kole, North Satar Mese, Manggarai.

ii. *Observation*

Observation is the process by which Researchers see the situation. This technique is relevant in research of traditional *Ceha Kila*. It encompasses observation of the condition of player interaction, the behavior of the players and the interactions of players and their group in using language or poem. The observation could be practiced freely and structured. The tool that can be used in this observation is observation paper, checklist, Event note, and so on. Some information from this observation is space, participants, activity, behavior, event, time, feelings. The reason for the Author for using this observation is to produce a realistic picture of using language and the behavior of *Ceha Kila*player.

iii. *Recording*

Record technique is collecting data by recording the conversation of the traditional player of *Ceha Kila*. The players are divided into two groups and they are conducted by a man of *Sando*. The conversation that uses poem will show the player who hides the ring (kila). The technique is used by reasoning that data is oral or verbal.

d) Data Analysis Technique

Collecting data in this research is done by passing some steps. The steps are grouping data, simplifying them, and put them into the table. Visual data is collected by watching traditional game *Ceha Kila*in Kole Village, North SatarMese, Manggarai and doing an interview with Sando and the players. The collected data is categorized based on the social semiotics method according to Halliday that includes the field of the interview, participants in an interview, and discourse tool in traditional game *Ceha Kila*.

e) Data Presentation Technique

Milles and Huberman (in Gunawan, 2013) put forward three steps in analyzing qualitative research data (p. 210). The first step is data reduction. Data reduction means summarizing, putting main things, focusing on the main thing and looking for the theme and pattern. The Second step is data display. Data display as compilation information is composed and give possibility taking the conclusion and action. The third step is conclusion drawing or verifying. This step is the result of research obtained by answering the focus of research according to data analyzed. The conclusion is presented in the form of research object description by guiding to the research study. Qualitative data analyze is an ongoing effort. Data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing become a success in a row like a series of data analyses that come in a row too. Data reduction that is practiced by Author refers to the traditional game *Ceha Kila*in Kole, North Satar Mese, Manggarai . Data is presented by grouping them according to the sub of explanation. Having data display, the next step is drawing a conclusion. The conclusion is to explain the collected data.

III. Research

Society's structure is a characteristic of a cultured society. They honor the meaning of personal and social life. It can be found in society's activities. They communicate and interact with others in running social relationship.

© 2018 Global Journals

Tabel 1: Field of Discourse in *Ceha Kila* Traditional Game in Kole Village, North Satar Mese, Manggarai:

No	Date	Finding
1	3rd April 2017	1. Two elders were sitting in living room and kitchen. Before starting the game they greets (*Kinda*) all the participants. 2. The elder was sitting in kitchen will riddle and the others were sitting in living room will guess and answer. 3. An elder mentioned the caveat of *Ceha Kila*.

First Data Analysis: Greetings (*Kinda*)

Ceha Kila is a traditional game in Manggarai. People play it after the funeral, specifically on the third day after the corpse has just been buried. They will play at 01.00 a.m being started by greeting (kinda).

The elders, who are sitting in the living room and kitchen, greeted all of the guests.

Frirstly, the elder, who is sitting in lutus (living room) greets:

> *Denge le ite ai laka kaut kali ite ga (called the name of someone that had died), wale benta de maria agu ngaram toe tanjeng ami ase kaen. Tegi dami kali ga, porong ema keta ite ngasang ipererus ene isung, lu'u one mata, perem molos laka ditengger le morin, sehat kami musi mai, ngong meu tngasang ine wai ata musi mai neka sendos lewing agu cewat. Wale diha tanta kaeng musi dapur, tae dami kole toe manga sendos kole lami lewing agu cewat.*

'Listen to our ancestors! Now our beloved has left his life behind. We pray, strengthen us who were left. He has gone because God has called him. We pray and implore God, may he get worth place. Free us who are good, throw the wicked away'.

After the saying, they will wait for a voice. If there is no strange voice, it means the dead person's death is natural, but if there is a strange voice, it means there will be following strange thing.

Second Data Analysis: Riddle (*bundu*)

The elder, who was sitting in the kitchen, will start to the riddle (*bundu*) and the others who were sitting in the living room will guess an answer. For example:

Wae pantar leleng one: *Nio*
There is water inside it: Coconut
Mbaruditece'enggereta ulun, mbaru data peangngger waulun: *Wani*
Our house's roof at the top, but their house's roof at the bottom: Honey Bee
Wentarbendera wan derekolong: Manuk
The flag waves, it sings immediately: Roster
Cawasewengke toe ngancenglulung: Salang
A long cord which can't be rolled up: Road
Paki-paki toe ganceng: Wae
Can't be cut: Water
Duguremengkoenpakebajuta'a,duhutu'anpakebajuwara : Nggurus
When it was young worn green clothes when it was adult worn red clothes: Red Pepper
Duhuremengkoenpakebaju,wokoduhutu'an toemangapakebajun : Pering
When it was young worn clothes, when it was adult didn't wear it anymore: Bamboo
Pau one longkajarangana : Sontakcepa
Falling into a foal's hole: The mashed tool for betel nut

The riddle will be held for 30 minutes. After this game, they started playing *Ceha Kila*. *Ceha Kila* (hide the ring) is an inherited traditional game of Manggarai. There are two groups, and the total membership of that groups don't be determined. Each group has a leader (*Sando*). They engaged in this game to prove who is better and cleverer. Generally, people play it after the corpse is buried. *Ceha Kila* aims to amuse the sorrowing family.

Many people engaged in this game. They are supposed to see, participate, and take the benefits for social life. This game uses *Kila* (ring) as the mode. Each group is trying to guess. The pointed player, who is holding the ring, have to answer the riddle. If the answer is wrong, he must mention toe (no).

Third Data Analysis: The Caveat

All of Kole's people are supposed to participate actively in *Ceha Kila*. Their unity manifests in a saying:

Mai gaitecama-cama
Let's we gather and unite
Naicaanggittukacaleleng
Don't be separable
Teuca ambo nekawolenglako
Don't be fishy
Mukucapu'unekawolengcurup
Make our intention one because we are one

The caveat of this saying is social life is shared together. They must be one in attitude, though, and action in keeping unity and togetherness in social life.As a social being, Kole's people show their fraternity with participating in *CehaKila*. They want to give amusement to the sorrowing family. It can be found in this following saying:

Ai iteho'o de canatas bate labar
Live in one village
Cambaru bate kaeng
There should be no fight between us
Neka manga bike agukehas
We must unite
Poromite kali gacanaikaut
There should be no differentiation

The caveat aims to establish a better social life. They must amuse the sorrowing family in order that they don't be too sad because of the death of their beloved.

© 2018 Global Journals

Tabel 2: The Tenor of Discourse in *Ceha Kila* in Kole Village, North Satar Mese, Manggarai

No	Date	Findings
1	3rd April 2017	The Participants in *Ceha Kila* are; 1. Aloisius Ancu, 2. Kanisius Danggur, 3. The member of First Group 4. The member of Second Group

First Data Analysis: Aloisius Ancu

Aloisius Ancu is one of the elders who were sitting in a living room (lutus) and greeted (kinda) before starting *Ceha Kila*. His greeting is:

> *Denge le ite (…mention the dead person's name) ai laka kaut kali ite ga, wale benta de maria agu ngaram toe tanjeng ami ase kaen. Tegi dami kali ga, pereng ema keta ite ngasang ipereruseneisung, lu'u one mata, porong molos laka ditengger le morin, sehat kami musi mai, ngong meu tngasang ine wai ata musi mai neka sendos lewing agu cewat. Wale diha tanta kaeng musi dapur, tae dami kole toe manga sendos kole lami lewing agu cewat.*

Second Data Analysis: Kanisius Danggur

Kanisius Danggur is one of the elders who was sitting in the kitchen and said traditional expressions when others were playing *Ceha Kila*. The traditional expressions which he said are:

1. *Mai gaitecama-cama*
Don't be separable
Naicaanggittukacaleleng
Don't be separable
Teuca ambo nekawolenglako
Don't be fishy
Mukucapu'unekawolengcurup
Make our intention one because we are one
2. *Ai iteho'o de canatas bate labar*
Live in one village
Cambaru bate kaeng
There should be no fight between us
Neka manga bike agukehas
We must unite
Porongite kali gacanaikaut
There should be no differentiation

Third and Fourth Data Analysis: First and Second Groups Member. These people are *Ceha Kila*'s participants. They will riddle each other. Firstly, they will hide the ring (*kila*) on a member's hand. The other group was supposed to guess an answer. This game will be held along the night in order to amuse the family.

Tabel 3: Mode of Discourse in *Ceha Kila* in Kole Village, North SatarMese, Manggarai

No	Date	Finding
1	3rd April 2017	Metaphor

Metaphor

1. *Wale benta de maria agungaram toe tanjeng ami ase kaen* (the dead person) has left his life behind.

The dead person can't do anything anymore, even walking or traveling. But, this metaphor says the dead person can leave his/her body (life) toward the other world.

2. *Tae damikole toe manga sendos kole lami lewing agu cewat* Give us the good, throw the wickedness away

People believe that the invisible God can do anything. The family prays God for the dead person in order to not leave wickedness for them. This metaphor believes that God will give them good and throw the wickedness away from their life.

IV. Conclusion

Semiotic sources aren't only sayings, writings, paintings, or pictures. But, people can find semiotic sources in everything which has cultural and social meaning. *Ceha Kila* is a communication that makes many semiotic sources. So, to figure out the potential meaning of this semiotic source out, people must notice cultural context, norms, and rules in this game.

Bibliography

1. Bungin, Burhan. 2009. PenelitianKualitatif. Jakarta: Kencana Prenad Media Group Daeng, Hans. 2004. AntropologiBudaya. Ende: Nusa Indah.
2. Dagur, B. Antony. 1997. Kebudayaan Manggarai Sebagai Salah Satu Khasanah Kebudayaan Nasional. Surabaya: Ubhara Press.
3. Gunawan, Iman. 2013. Metode Penelitian Kualitatif: Teori dan Praktik. Jakarta: Bulit Aksara Halliday, M.A.K dan Ruqaeya Hasan. 1992. Aspek-aspek Bahasa dalam Pandangan Semiotik Sosial. Yogyakarta: Gajah Mada University Press.
4. Kriyantono, Rachmat. 2007. Teknik Praktis: Riset Komunikasi. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group.
5. Sutrisno, Mudidan Hendar Putranto. 2005. Teori-Teori Kebudayaan. Yogyakarta :Penerbit Kanisius.
6. Sugiyono. 2005. Memahami Penelitian Kualitatif. Bandung: Alfabet.
7. Santoso, Riyadi. 2003. Semiotika Sosial: Pandangan terhadap Bahasa. Surabaya: Pustaka Eureka dan JP Press.
8. Santoso, Anang. 2008. Jejak Halliday dalam Linguistik Kritis dan Analisis Wacana Kritis. Jurnal Fakultas Sastra Universitas Negeri Malang
9. Sobur, Alex. 2009. Semiotika Komunikasi. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
10. Sobur, Alex. 2006. Analisis Teks Media. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.

© 2018 Global Journals