AGRARIAN LEXICAL CHANGE AS A REFLECTION OF CULTURAL AND ECOLOGICAL TRANSFORMATION AMONG FARMING COMMUNITIES ON THE SLOPES OF MOUNT MERAPI (AN ETHNOLINGUISTIC STUDY)

Robith Khoiril Umam[1], Ristiya Krisnawati[2]
[1] English Literature Study Program, Languages and Cultures Faculty
Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Mas Said Surakarta, Indonesia
[2] SD Negeri Bangkok, Boyolali, Indonesia
robith.khoirilumam@staff.uinsaid.ac.id

Abstract

This study examines agrarian lexicon among farming communities in Cepogo, Ampel, and the slopes of Mount Merapi through ethnolinguistic and ecolinguistic perspectives. It aims to identify the semantic domains of agrarian lexicon, examine its cultural and ecological meanings, and analyse intergenerational lexical change. Using a qualitative descriptive approach with an ethnographic design, data were collected through participatory observation, in-depth interviews, and lexical elicitation involving senior and younger farmers. The data were analysed based on semantic domains, cultural and ecological meanings, and intergenerational differences. The findings show that agrarian lexicon forms an interconnected semantic system in farming activities, agricultural tools, agricultural space, soil and environmental conditions, seasonal knowledge, and symbolic and ritual practices. Terms such as *nandur*, *luku*, *galengan*, *lemah teles*, *pranata mangsa*, and *slametan tandur* encode practical, cultural, and ecological knowledge. Intergenerational comparison indicates a shift from traditional terms used more prominently by senior farmers toward modern technical terms and loanwords among younger farmers. This shift is associated with agricultural modernization, technological development, education, socio-economic change, and changing ecological conditions. The study concludes that agrarian lexical change reflects not only vocabulary change but also transformations in agricultural practices and the transmission of local cultural and ecological knowledge.

Keywords: ethnolinguistics, ecolinguistics, agrarian lexicon, lexical change, mount Merapi

INTRODUCTION

In contemporary linguistic studies, language is not only an abstract system of signs but also a social practice reflecting the historical, cultural and ecological experiences of a certain speech community. This relationship is particularly evident in the lexicon of agrarian communities. The words and expressions often encode knowledge developed through long-term interaction with land, plants, seasons, weather, and agricultural practices. From an ethnolinguistic perspective, the lexicon provides a conceptual representation of how a community categorizes its surroundings and interprets its relationship with the natural environment (Foley, 2017; Ndruru, 2020; Abida & Juwariah, 2023). Studies of agrarian societies have shown that agricultural vocabulary

contains complex forms of local knowledge concerning natural cycles, land management, farming techniques, and cultural values governing human-environment relationships (Berlin, 2021; Huo & Chen, 2024; Lailiyah et al., 2024). Agrarian lexicon therefore serves not only a communicative function but also operates as a linguistic repository through ecological knowledge and cultural practices transmitted across generations.

The relationship between language, culture, and the environment is further can be addressed through ecolinguistics, viewing language as part of an ecological system involving speakers, social practices, culture, and the natural environment. From this perspective, changes in the physical and social environment may also affect linguistic practices, particularly at the lexical level (Rasheed, 2023). When agricultural practices, environmental conditions, and technologies change, the vocabulary used to describe and interpret those practices may also change. Stibbe (2015), for example, emphasizes the importance of language in maintaining ways of understanding human relationships with the environment. The loss or reduced use of local terms associated with ecological practices may therefore involve more than vocabulary loss, as it can also affect the transmission of knowledge embedded in those terms. Nevertheless, much of the existing ecolinguistic study has focused on contemporary environmental discourse, including media, public communication, and environmental policy, while comparatively less attention has been given to traditional agrarian lexicon and its transformation in communities living in environmentally vulnerable regions.

Indonesia provides a particularly relevant context for examining the relationship between agrarian language, culture, and ecological knowledge. Previous studies have documented agricultural and rice-related lexicons in Javanese, Sundanese, Balinese, Minangkabau, and other local communities (Darlina & Dyah, 2023; Emha et al., 2024; Romadhona, 2026; Sutriyadi, 2026; Nugrahani et al., 2024; Yanti & Jufrizal, 2019). These studies show that agricultural vocabulary reflects local classifications of plants, farming activities, tools, and agricultural environments. However, much of this research has primarily focused on documenting lexical forms and explaining their denotative meanings. Less attention has been given to how agrarian lexicon simultaneously encodes cultural values, ecological knowledge, symbolic meanings, and changing patterns of

knowledge transmission across generations. This limitation becomes important when agrarian communities experience rapid social, technological, and environmental change.

The communities of Cepogo and Ampel, located within the agricultural landscape of the slopes of Mount Merapi, provide a distinctive context for examining these relationships. Agriculture in this region is closely connected to a volcanic environment characterized by fertile soils as well as recurrent environmental risks. Mount Merapi is therefore not only a geological feature but also part of the cultural landscape that has shaped local beliefs, agricultural practices, adaptation strategies, and ritual activities (Lavigne et al., 2008). Previous anthropological studies have documented the ways in which communities around Mount Merapi have developed strategies for adapting to the opportunities and risks associated with volcanic environments (Listyawati & Hakim, 2022; Masyithoh & Pramono, 2026). These long-term interactions with the environment provide an important basis for the development of specialized agricultural vocabulary. The linguistic dimension of this ecological experience remains insufficiently explored, particularly in relation to how local agrarian knowledge is represented in the lexicon and how such vocabulary changes as farming practices and environmental conditions evolve.

This issue becomes more significant as viewed from the perspective of intergenerational lexical transmission. Agricultural modernization, technological development, formal education, and market-oriented farming have introduced new practices and technical terms into rural communities. Previous studies have reported that younger generations tend to use modern technical vocabulary more frequently, while traditional agricultural terms are becoming less common in everyday communication (Siregar, 2018; Rahardi, 2020). Such changes should not be understood simply as the replacement of old words by new ones. In agrarian communities, lexical change may also indicate changes in how agricultural activities are practiced, understood, and transmitted. For example, when traditional terms associated with agricultural tools, seasonal knowledge, or soil conditions become less familiar to younger farmers, the linguistic change may also reflect a weakening of the transmission of the cultural and ecological knowledge associated with those terms. Yet previous studies have not examined these intergenerational differences systematically within the same community while

simultaneously considering the social, technological, and ecological factors that shape lexical change.

Ecological transformation further complicates this process. Volcanic eruptions, climate variability, and land-use changes have altered agricultural practices and the ecological conditions experienced by communities around Mount Merapi (Hudayana, 2025; Syam et al., 2025). Such changes may influence language in two related ways. They may generate new terms for emerging agricultural conditions and technologies, while also reducing the relevance or frequency of older terms associated with practices that are no longer widely used. In ecolinguistic perspective, lexical change can provide evidence of how communities adapt linguistically to changing environmental and social conditions.

Based on the previous studies review, this study focused on examining of agrarian lexicon as both a linguistic system and a repository of cultural and ecological knowledge. Previous studies have not connected intergenerational lexical change with cultural practices, ecological knowledge, agricultural modernization, technological development, and environmental change within an active volcanic setting. This study addresses this gap by examining agrarian lexicon as a representation of cultural and ecological knowledge and by comparing senior and younger farmers to reveal lexical change reflects transformations in agricultural practices, knowledge transmission, and human-environment relationships.

Further, this study has three main objectives. First, it identifies and describes the forms and semantic domains of agrarian lexicon used by farming communities in Cepogo, Ampel, and the slopes of Mount Merapi. Second, it examines the cultural, ecological, and symbolic meanings embedded in these lexical items. Third, it investigates intergenerational differences in the use and understanding of agrarian lexicon and examines the social, technological, and ecological factors associated with its transformation. This study also seeks to contribute to ethnolinguistic and ecolinguistic scholarship by demonstrating agrarian lexical change can provide insight into the transformation of local knowledge, cultural practices, and human-environment relationships in a dynamic volcanic landscape.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Agrarian lexicon has been widely studied in ethnolinguistic research as a linguistic representation of farming communities classifying agricultural activities, tools, plants, and their surrounding environment. Studies of Javanese agricultural vocabulary have documented specialized terms associated with farming tools, cultivation processes, and local agricultural practices. Budhiono (2017), for example, identified a range of Javanese lexemes for rice-farming tools and activities in Pemalang, including *luku*, *garu*, *pacul*, *tandur*, and *matun*. Similarly, Wibowo (2020) showed that agricultural lexicon among Javanese communities in Yogyakarta reflects local ways of categorizing plants and their environment, as well as forms of local wisdom. More recent research in Indramayu and Kebumen further demonstrates that agricultural lexicon encompasses not only linguistic categories but also cultural meanings associated with farming practices (Emha et al., 2024; Hariyanto, 2024).

In the aspect of lexical documentation, recent studies have increasingly connected agricultural vocabulary with ecological knowledge and cultural change. Research on ecological lexicon in East Java demonstrates that local vocabulary can encode community knowledge about relationships between language, living organisms, and the natural environment. More importantly, Rijal et al. (2025) demonstrate that generational changes in agricultural vocabulary can reflect broader socio-ecological transformations. Their study of the Dayak Tunjung community found that older generations retained a more detailed vocabulary associated with ecological succession and traditional land-use practices, while younger generations showed reduced familiarity with some traditional terms. These findings suggest that lexical change can provide an important linguistic indicator of changes in agricultural practices and the transmission of ecological knowledge.

Studies of Javanese farming communities show that agricultural language is closely connected with cultural practices and local ecological knowledge. Research on *pranatamangsa* and traditional farming practices demonstrates that seasonal knowledge guides agricultural activities and reflects local understandings of environmental conditions. Studies of communities around Mount Merapi similarly show that agricultural practices, local beliefs, and ecological knowledge have developed through long-term

interaction with the volcanic environment (Dove, 2008; Anjani & Suparta, 2019; Tyas, 2022). Previous studies have generally examined agrarian lexicon, cultural practices, and ecological adaptation separately. Agrarian lexicon changes across generations within an active volcanic environment need to be explored further.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employs a qualitative-descriptive approach with an ethnographic design, aiming to provide an in-depth description of the agrarian lexicon and the cultural, ecological and symbolic meanings embedded in the agricultural practices of communities in Cepogo, Ampel and on the slopes of Mount Merapi. This approach was chosen because it enables researcher to understand language as a social practice rooted in the cultural context, ecological experiences and social dynamics of farming communities. The research sites comprised several agricultural villages in the Cepogo and Ampel areas and on the slopes of Mount Merapi, which represent volcanic agricultural ecosystems. The research subjects comprised two main groups, namely older farmers (aged approximately 50–70 years) and younger farmers (aged approximately 20–35 years), who were selected through purposive sampling, taking into account their farming experience, active involvement in agricultural activities, and proficiency in the local Javanese language. This generational division was intended to identify differences in the use, understanding and continuity of the agricultural lexicon.

Data collection was carried out through in-depth interviews, participatory observation and lexical elicitation. Interviews were conducted to compile a list of agricultural lexical items, the intended meanings of these terms, and farmers' views on changes in language and agricultural practices in their region today. Participatory observation was carried out to record the use of the lexicon in real-life contexts or in everyday life, such as during the initial preparation of the land, planting, and harvesting of agricultural produce. Lexical elicitation techniques were used to compare responses across generations to specific agricultural terms. All the data collected was supported by documentation in the form of field notes, audio recordings and photographs of agricultural activities.

Data analysis was carried out in stages, drawing on qualitative analysis techniques. Lexical data were grouped according to semantic domains, such as

agricultural tools, farming processes, soil conditions, seasons and natural phenomena. Next, lexical meanings were analysed across three dimensions: cultural, ecological and symbolic. Intergenerational comparisons were carried out to identify lexical items that have persisted, undergone shifts, or are no longer in use or have disappeared. The final stage of the analysis focuses on examining the factors influencing lexical change, including the modernisation of agriculture, technological developments, social dynamics, and changes in the ecological conditions of Mount Merapi. Data validity was ensured through triangulation of sources and methods, comparison of data across informants, and cross-checking of interpretative findings with key informants. Through these procedures, this research methodology is expected to produce an accurate and comprehensive description of the dynamics of the agrarian lexicon within the cultural and ecological context of the communities living on the slopes of Mount Merapi.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Semantic Domains of Agrarian Lexicon

The analysis identified several semantic domains in the agrarian lexicon used by farming communities in Cepogo, Ampel, and the slopes of Mount Merapi. These lexical items refer not only to farming activities and agricultural tools but also to the organization of agricultural space, soil and environmental conditions, seasonal patterns, and symbolic practices. Their distribution indicates that agrarian vocabulary is closely related to the practical and ecological experiences of farming communities. The main semantic domains and representative lexical items identified in the data are presented in table 1.

Table 1. Classification of Agricultural Lexicon

Lexical Item	Semantic Domain	Denotative Meaning	Cultural and Ecological Significance
nandur	farming activity	planting crops	beginning of the agricultural cycle
matun	farming activity	removing weeds	crop maintenance and care
macul	farming activity	digging/tilling the soil	work ethic and land preparation

garu	agricultural tool	traditional harrow	traditional soil preparation technology
luku	agricultural tool	traditional plough	relationship among farmers, animals, tools, and land
galengan	agricultural space	field bund or embankment	spatial boundaries, water management, and agricultural order
lemah teles	soil condition	wet/moist soil	indicator of soil condition and cultivation readiness
lemah atos	soil condition	hard soil	indicator of soil condition and land stress
udan awet	environmental condition	prolonged or persistent rain	ecological indicator for agricultural decisions
angin garing	environmental condition	dry wind	indicator of environmental change and agricultural risk
rendheng	seasonal marker	rainy season	seasonal knowledge related to farming activities
ketiga	seasonal marker	dry season	seasonal knowledge and agricultural risk
pranata mangsa	seasonal and temporal knowledge	traditional seasonal system	ecological and cosmological knowledge
slametan tandur	symbolic and ritual practice	planting-related ritual	social, symbolic, and cosmological relations

The data analysis identifies several interconnected semantic domains in the agrarian lexicon used by farming communities. These domains include farming activities, agricultural tools, agricultural space, soil conditions, environmental conditions, seasonal and temporal knowledge, and symbolic and ritual practices. The distribution of these lexical items indicates that agrarian vocabulary is organized not only around the practical

stages of farming but also around farmers' ways of observing, interpreting, and managing their agricultural environment.

The first domain consists of terms referring to farming activities, including *nandur*, *matun*, and *macul*. These terms represent important stages of agricultural work, from planting and maintaining crops to preparing the land. Their meanings may also carry cultural values associated with agricultural practice. For example, *macul* is associated by senior farmers with *tata, titi, lan ngati-ati*, referring to orderly, careful, and attentive work. This association suggests that agricultural activities can function not only as economic practices but also as contexts in which work ethics are expressed and transmitted. The second domain concerns agricultural tools and technology, represented by terms such as *luku* and *garu*. The terms refer to traditional technologies used in soil preparation and reflect the historical relationship among farmers, animals, tools, and land. The presence of these terms in the agrarian lexicon indicates that agricultural technology is linguistically represented according to the specific practices and material conditions of farming communities.

The third domain concerns agricultural space, particularly *galengan*, refering to the field bund or embankment separating agricultural plots. In the data, *galengan* is associated not only with the physical organization of agricultural land but also with the management of water and the orderly arrangement of farming space. It shows that agrarian vocabulary also encodes farmers' knowledge of spatial organization and land management. The fourth domain comprises terms describing soil conditions, including *lemah teles* and *lemah atos*. *Lemah teles* refers to wet or sufficiently moist soil and is interpreted by farmers as an indication of suitable conditions for cultivation. In contrast, *lemah atos* refers to hard soil and may indicate less favorable conditions for agricultural activities. These terms demonstrate how farmers distinguish and evaluate soil conditions through locally developed ecological categories based on repeated interaction with the land.

The fifth domain consists of terms referring to environmental conditions, such as *udan awet* and *angin garing*. These expressions represent farmers' observations of weather and environmental conditions that may affect agricultural activities. Rather than describing natural phenomena merely as physical events, these terms provide linguistic

categories through which farmers recognize environmental changes and assess their potential implications for farming. The agrarian lexicon reflects practical ecological knowledge developed through long-term experience with the local environment. The sixth domain includes seasonal and temporal expressions such as *rendheng*, *ketiga*, and *pranata mangsa*. *Rendheng* and *ketiga* refer to the rainy and dry seasons, *pranata mangsa* represents a more systematic form of seasonal knowledge associated with agricultural activities. These terms indicate that agricultural time is understood through locally recognized environmental and seasonal patterns that are relevant to farming practices.

The final domain consists of symbolic and ritual expressions, particularly *slametan tandur*. This expression refers to a ritual associated with planting and indicates that agricultural activities are embedded in a broader cultural system. Such practices connect farming with social relationships and symbolic meanings, showing that agricultural production is not understood solely in technical or economic terms. Taken together, the explained domains demonstrate that the agrarian lexicon of the farming communities studied forms an interconnected semantic system. The vocabulary encompasses not only actions and tools but also agricultural space, soil and weather conditions, seasonal knowledge, and cultural practices. The lexicon provides a linguistic representation of how farmers organize agricultural activities, interpret environmental conditions, and transmit locally situated knowledge across generations.

Cultural and Ecological Meanings of Agrarian Lexicon

The agrarian lexicon identified in this study reveals that farming knowledge among the farming communities is not limited to technical knowledge of agricultural production. The meanings associated with these lexical items reflect ways of observing environmental conditions, organizing agricultural space and time, regulating farming practices, and relating agricultural activities to broader cultural values. In this view, the agrarian lexicon provides access to locally situated knowledge developed through farmers' long-term interaction with their environment.

One important dimension is local ecological knowledge, particularly in the vocabulary used to describe soil and environmental conditions. The terms *lemah teles* and *lemah atos*, for example, represent locally meaningful categories for distinguishing soil conditions. *Lemah teles* refers to sufficiently moist soil and is associated with conditions

considered suitable for cultivation, while *lemah atos* refers to harder soil and signals less favorable conditions for agricultural activities. Similarly, expressions such as *udan awet* and *angin garing* show how farmers attend to weather patterns as indicators relevant to agricultural decisions. These terms therefore represent more than descriptions of physical phenomena. They encode experiential knowledge through which farmers observe environmental conditions and relate them to agricultural possibilities and risks.

The lexical item *galengan* further illustrates the relationship between language, spatial organization, and agricultural practice. As a field bund or embankment, *galengan* has a practical function in organizing agricultural plots and managing water. At the same time, its presence in the local agrarian vocabulary indicates that agricultural space is conceptualized through specific spatial categories developed from everyday farming practices. The term thus reflects farmers' practical knowledge of how land is divided, maintained, and connected within the agricultural landscape.

Agrarian vocabulary also expresses knowledge of agricultural time. The terms *rendheng* and *ketiga* identify seasonal conditions. Further, *pranata mangsa* represents a more systematic form of seasonal knowledge associated with agricultural activities. The use of these terms suggests that farming time is interpreted through observable environmental patterns and accumulated experience rather than simply through standardized chronological units. *Pranata mangsa* therefore represents an important form of local ecological knowledge because it connects seasonal observation with agricultural planning and decision-making.

The lexicon also reflects cultural values embedded in agricultural work. The interpretation of *macul* by senior farmers in relation to *tata, titi, lan ngati-ati* illustrates physical agricultural activities can be associated with values of orderliness, carefulness, and attentiveness. Similarly, *slametan tandur* demonstrates that planting is situated within a broader cultural framework in which agricultural activities may involve social and symbolic practices. These expressions indicate that farming is understood not only as a means of production but also as a cultural practice through which values and forms of collective knowledge are maintained.

The relationship between agriculture and the local worldview becomes particularly visible in the symbolic meanings associated with the agricultural

environment. The data indicate that environmental elements are not always conceptualized as neutral physical objects but may be interpreted through culturally meaningful categories. The association of *lemah teles* with fertile and "living" land, for example, illustrates ecological observation can become connected with cultural interpretation. Likewise, the symbolic significance attributed to agricultural rituals suggests that farming practices are embedded in a worldview in which human activities, environmental conditions, and cultural values are interconnected.

These findings prove that agrarian lexicon functions as a repository of local knowledge in which ecological observation, agricultural practice, cultural values, and symbolic interpretation intersect. The vocabulary does not simply name objects, activities, or environmental conditions; it reflects how farmers make sense of their agricultural world through accumulated experience. This finding is particularly important in the context of Mount Merapi, where agricultural life is shaped by both the productive potential and environmental risks of a volcanic landscape. The agrarian lexicon provides evidence of a knowledge system in which farming, environment, and cultural meaning are closely interconnected.

Intergenerational Lexical Change

The comparison between senior and younger farmers indicates a shift in the agrarian lexicon used to describe agricultural practices, tools, and seasonal knowledge. The change is reflected not only in the frequency of traditional and modern terms but also in the meanings and forms of knowledge associated with them. Table 2 summarizes the main differences identified between the two generations.

Table 2. Intergenerational lexical change

Aspect	Senior Farmers	Younger Farmers
Lexical variation	More diverse traditional vocabulary	More limited traditional vocabulary
Traditional agricultural terms	Frequently used	Less frequently used
Modern technical terms	Less prominent	More prominent
Agricultural tools	*Luku, garu*	Tractor, cultivator

Seasonal knowledge	*Pranata mangsa*	Modern planting calendar
Symbolic meanings	More strongly associated with farming terms	Less frequently expressed
Language used in agricultural interaction	Predominantly Javanese	Javanese with greater use of Indonesian/technical terms

Based on the finding shown in table 2, the most dominant difference concerning with agricultural tools and technologies. Senior farmers use terms such as *luku* and *garu*, refering to traditional implements associated with land preparation. They are embedded in farming practices that involve direct interaction among farmers, animals, tools, and soil. Younger farmers, in contrast, more frequently use terms such as *tractor* and *cultivator*, reflecting the increasing presence of mechanized agricultural technology. The contrast indicates a change in the lexical repertoire used to represent agricultural work as traditional tools are increasingly accompanied or replaced by modern technologies.

A similar pattern can be observed in the vocabulary associated with agricultural time. Among senior farmers, *pranata mangsa* represents an important form of seasonal knowledge connected with observations of environmental patterns and agricultural activities. Younger farmers are more likely to refer to modern planting calendars and technical schedules as discussing planting time. This difference does not necessarily mean that younger farmers no longer possess knowledge of seasonal conditions. Rather, it indicates a shift in the linguistic and knowledge systems through which agricultural timing is conceptualized and communicated.

The intergenerational difference also involves the symbolic meanings attached to agrarian vocabulary. Senior farmers tend to associate traditional terms with broader cultural values and farming experiences. Terms related to agricultural activities, tools, seasons, and rituals may therefore carry meanings that extend beyond their immediate technical functions. Among younger farmers, agricultural vocabulary is more frequently oriented toward practical and technical communication. This suggests that lexical change may involve not only the replacement of particular terms but also a reduction or transformation of the cultural meanings associated with those terms.

The emergence of terms such as sprayer and hybrid seed further shows the influence of agricultural modernization on the younger generation's lexical repertoire. These terms represent new technologies and agricultural inputs that have become part of contemporary farming practices. Their use demonstrates that lexical change is also responsive to changes in material practices. As agricultural technologies change, farmers require new linguistic resources or technical terms to describe tools, inputs, and procedures that were not part of earlier farming systems.

These differences have implications for the transmission of local agricultural knowledge. Traditional terms such as *luku*, *garu*, and *pranata mangsa* function not only as labels but also as linguistic carriers of knowledge about farming practices, tools, and seasonal conditions. If their use becomes less frequent among younger farmers, the linguistic channel through which such knowledge is transmitted may also become narrower. At the same time, the emergence of modern terms demonstrates that lexical change should not be understood simply as linguistic loss. It also reflects farmers' adaptation to technological and socioeconomic changes in agricultural practice.

Finally, the intergenerational comparison shows that agrarian lexical change involves both lexical replacement and transformation of knowledge transmission. The movement from terms such as *luku* and *garu* toward *traktor* and *cultivator*, and from *pranata mangsa* toward modern planting calendars, illustrates how changes in agricultural practices are accompanied by changes in the vocabulary through which those practices are understood and communicated. The findings therefore suggest that intergenerational lexical change provides an important indicator of broader transformation in agricultural practices and the transmission of local agrarian knowledge.

CONCLUSIONS

This study reveals that the agrarian lexicon used by farming communities in Cepogo, Ampel, and the slopes of Mount Merapi creates more than a collection of terms for agricultural activities and tools. The lexicon forms an interconnected semantic system about farming practices, agricultural technology, spatial organization, soil and environmental conditions, seasonal knowledge, and symbolic and ritual practices. Terms such as *nandur*, *macul*, *luku*, *galengan*, *lemah teles*, *udan awet*, *pranata mangsa*, and

slametan tandur describe how agricultural vocabulary is closely connected to farmers' practical experiences and ways of understanding their environment.

The findings further show that agrarian lexicon functions as a repository of local cultural and ecological knowledge. Terms referring to soil, weather, agricultural space, and seasonal patterns encode farmers' observations and accumulated experiences in managing agricultural activities. At the same time, expressions associated with farming practices and rituals reflect cultural values and forms of social and symbolic meaning. The lexicon provides a linguistic representation of a worldview in which agricultural practice, environmental conditions, and cultural knowledge are interconnected.

The intergenerational comparison reveals a shift in the agrarian lexical repertoire. Senior farmers use traditional terms such as *luku*, *garu*, and *pranata mangsa* more prominently, meanwhile younger farmers more frequently use modern technical terms such as *tractor*, *cultivator*, *sprayer*, and *hybrid seed*. This shift reflects changes in agricultural technology and practice and is accompanied by differences in the ways agricultural knowledge is communicated. Lexical change is therefore not only a process of vocabulary replacement but is also related to changing channels of cultural and ecological knowledge transmission.

Finally, agrarian lexical change in the Merapi agricultural landscape reflects the interaction between linguistic practice, agricultural modernization, local ecological experience, and cultural transformation. Documenting these lexical forms is consequently important not only for understanding language change but also for preserving the local knowledge embedded in agricultural language. Further research may examine how these lexical changes develop over a longer period and how changes in agricultural practices and environmental conditions continue to reshape the agrarian lexicon of communities around Mount Merapi.

REFERENCES

Abdullah, W. (2016). Ethnolinguistic study of local wisdom in ex-residency of surakarta. *Humaniora*, *28*(3), 279-289. https://doi.org/10.22146/jh.22279

Abida, F. I. N., Iye, R., & Juwariah, A. (2023). Ecological lexicon of East Java community: An ecolinguistic study. Cogent Arts & Humanities, 10(2), 2281070. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2023.2281070

Darlina, L., & Dyah, W. (2023). DINAMIKA LEKSIKON KE-PARE-AN SAWAH DALAM GUYUB TUTUR SUNDA: KAJIAN EKOLINGUISTIK. *Jurnal Ilmiah Global Education*, *4*(2), 1084-1096. https://doi.org/10.55681/jige.v4i2.939.

Donovan, K., & Suharyanto, A. (2011). Cultural responses to volcanic hazards: Traditional knowledge and practices at Mount Merapi, Indonesia. *Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research*, 204(3–4), 153–164. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvolgeores.2011.04.004

Dove, M. R. (2008). Perception of volcanic eruption as agent of change on Mount Merapi, Central Java. *Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research*, 172(3–4), 329–337. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvolgeores.2007.12.037

Duranti, A. (2004). *Linguistic anthropology*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511810190

Emha, R. J., Fatinova, D., & Hardiansyah, Y. (2024). Kajian Etnolinguistik pada Istilah Pertanian Padi di Kabupaten Indramayu Jawa Barat. *Literasi: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Bahasa, Sastra Indonesia dan Daerah*, *14*(1), 441-452. DOI: https://doi.org/10.23969/literasi.v14i1.11413

Foley, W. A. (2017). *Anthropological linguistics: An introduction*. Blackwell Publishers. DOI:10.1525/aa.1999.101.1.197

Hudayana, B. (2025). *Etnografi Bencana Adaptasi Komunitas Lokal terhadap Erupsi Gunung Merapi*. UGM PRESS. https://ugmpress.ugm.ac.id/en/product/budaya/etnografi-bencana-adaptasi-komunitas-lokal-terhadap-erupsi-gunung-merapi

Huo, F., & Chen, X. (2024). Soul of Banyan Tree: A Study on the Folk Culture of Banyan Tree Worship in Hainan. Journal of Humanities, Arts and Social Science, 8(3), 697–700. https://doi.org/10.26855/jhass.2024.03.025

Kashyap, G. S., Kamani, P., Kanojia, M., Wazir, S., Malik, K., Sehgal, V. K., & Dhakar, R. (2024). Revolutionizing agriculture. *Research Advances in Intelligent Computing: Volume 2*, 82.https://doi.org/10.3390/agriengineering8080312

Lailiyah, N., Wijayanti, F. I., & Surtikanti, M. W. (2024). Pergeseran Bahasa dan Tradisi Petani Padi di Jawa: Kajian Etnolinguistik. *Etnolingual*, *8*, 99-123. https://doi.org/10.20473/etno.v8i1.56033

Lavigne, F., De Coster, B., Juvin, N., Flohic, F., Gaillard, J.-C., Texier, P., Sartohadi, J. (2008). People's behaviour in the face of volcanic hazards: Perspectives from Javanese communities, Indonesia. *Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research*, 172(3–4), 273–287. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvolgeores.2007.12.013

Listyawati, A., & Hakim, F. N. (2022). Kearifan lokal masyarakat desa lereng Merapi dalam upaya mitigasi bencana erupsi. *Sosio Konsepsia: Jurnal Penelitian dan Pengembangan Kesejahteraan Sosial*, *11*(3). https://ejournal.kemensos.go.id/index.php/SosioKonsepsia/article/view/3089

Maffi, L. (2023). Linguistic, cultural, and biological diversity. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 34, 599–617. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.34.081804.120437

Masyithoh, K. D., & Pramono, D. (2026). Suronan Sedekah Gunung Merapi: Ekspresi Simbolik Rasa Syukur dan Strategi Kultural Mitigasi Risiko Bencana. *Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Sosial*, *12*(1), 62-77. DOI: https://doi.org/10.23887/jiis.v12i1.111781

Mei, E. T. W., Lavigne, F., Picquout, A., de Bélizal, E., Brunstein, D., Grancher, D., ... Sartohadi, J. (2013). Lessons learned from the 2010 evacuations at Merapi volcano. *Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research*, 261, 348–365. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvolgeores.2013.03.010

Ndruru, M. (2020). Flora Lexicon in Bolanafo for Guyub Tutur Nias: An Ecolinguistic Study. *Journal of Education and Development, South Tapanuli Education Institute*, *8*(2), 257–260. https://journal.ipts.ac.id/index.php/ED/article/view/1691

Nugrahani, A., Setyowati, E., & Sumarti, E. (2024). Register dalam Berkebun Tanaman Hias: Kajian Struktur dan Makna. *Paradigma: Jurnal Filsafat, Sains, Teknologi, dan Sosial Budaya*, *30*(3), 190-202. DOI **:** 10.33503/paradigma.v30i3.250.

Rahardi, R. K. (2020). Pergeseran leksikon bahasa Jawa dalam masyarakat agraris modern. *Humaniora*, 32(2), 123–135. https://doi.org/10.22146/jh.55555

Rasheed, N. J. (2023). Language ecology or ecolinguistics: Conceptual and theoretical discussions. *Journal of the College of Education for Women*, *34*(1), 1-9. DOI: https://doi.org/10.36231/coedw.v34i1.1650

Romadhona, A., Ardiansyah, M. A., Aini, A. Q., Salsabila, A. N., Auliyah, K., & Afkar, T. (2026). LEKSIKON PERTANIAN PADA KOMUNITAS PETANI DI DESA KROMONG KABUPATEN JOMBANG KAJIAN: ETNOLINGUISTIK. *Jurnal Padamu Negeri*, *3*(3), 254-264. DOI: https://doi.org/10.69714/cqs0qh11

Stibbe, A. (2015). *Ecolinguistics: Language, ecology and the stories we live by*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315687391

Sutriyadi, S. (2026). Kajian Etnolinguistik pada Istilah Pertanian Nanas di Kabupaten Kubu Raya. *ASMARALOKA: Jurnal Bidang Pendidikan, Linguistik dan Sastra Indonesia*, *4*(1), 12-20. DOI:10.55210/asmaraloka.v4i1.644

Syam, A., Anggraeni, I., & Frisca, N. (2025). Pemulihan Lahan Pertanian Akibat Banjir Lahar Dingin Gunung Marapi Di Jorong Aur Nagari Barulak Kecamatan Tanjuang Baru. *INTEGRATIF: Jurnal Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat*, *3*(2), 76-84. https://kilaupublishing.com/integratif/article/view/493/237

Yanti, N., & Jufrizal. (2019). Istilah pertanian tradisional Minangkabau: Kajian etnolinguistik. *Jurnal Arbitrer*, 6(2), 89–101. https://doi.org/10.25077/ar.6.2.89-101.2019

Widjaya, S. (2026). Social Meaning Behind Names A Cultural Perspective on the Javanese Naming System. *International Proceeding of Innovative Science and Transdisciplinary Studies*, *6*(1), 64-73. https://ipistrans.lppmi.or.id/index.php/proceeding/article/view/46