UNDERSTANDING THE BEHAVIORS OF INDIVIDUAL-LEVEL AND STAGE-LEVEL PREDICATES

Misnadin
Dosen sastra Inggris Universitas Trunojoyo Madura
Email: misnadinunijoyo@yahoo.co.id

Abstrak: Artikel ini membahas masalah perilaku dua jenis predikat, yaitu predikat individu dan bertingkat. Ahli semantik membedakan kedua jenis predikat ini dengan menggunakan sejumlah tes diagnostik disertai dengan sejumlah fitur semantik yang dapat digunakan untuk mencirikan keduanya. Artikel ini dibagi menjadi tiga bagian utama. Bagian pertama membicarakan konsep kedua jenis predikat dengan penitikberatan pada pembedaan melalui ciri-ciri yang dimiliki oleh masing-masing jenis predikat. Bagian kedua melihat contoh hasil penelitian yang dilakukan dalam kasus bahasa Finlandia. Bagian ketiga mencoba menerapkan konsep tersebut pada data bahasa Indonesia. Hasil analisis data menunjukkan bahwa alat diagnostik yang digunakan dalam bahasa Inggris tidak serta merta dapat diterapkan dalam bahasa Indonesia. Ini menunjukkan bahwa tidak semua alat diagnostik dapat digunakan secara universal untuk menentukan jenis predikat.

Kata kunci: predikat individu dan bertingkat, tes diagnostik, kausatif statif

Introduction

Individual-level and stage-level predicates have become one of the most interesting and thought-provoking phenomena in semantics. A number of semanticists have been exerting some of their efforts to investigate the phenomenon by trying to find out and explain the distinctive features considered to be responsible for causing these two kinds of predicates to differ from each other. Carlson (1977), Kratzer (1995), Chierchia (1995), and Pylkkänen (2002) have been quoted as amongst the semanticists who have been concerned with and engaged in understanding the characteristic distinctions found between the two predicates by paying attention to the behavior of stative causative and noncausative verbs in Finnish.

The present paper discusses the distinctions between individual-level and stage-level predicates in general by discussing a number of the diagnostic tools which have been proposed and employed by semanticists such as Carlson, Kratzer, and Chierchia and which were then applied by Pylkkänen in her study of causative and inchoative verbs in Finnish in order to show how individual stative predicates differ from stative stage predicates. Having done that, Pylkkänen's work is employed as a model to analyze stative predicates in Indonesian and classify them as individual or stage predicates based on the diagnostic tools.

Before making a distinction between individual and stage predicates, it is important to have a commonly shared understanding of what is called a predicate. According to Hurford et al (2007), a predicate is any word (or sequence of words) which (in a given single sense) can function as the predicator of a sentence. By this definition, words like *hungry, in, crook,*

asleep, hit, show, mammal are all predicates, while *and, or, but, not* are not.

In this case, a distinction should be made between 'predicate' and 'predicator' due to the fact that the terms are quite different. The term 'predicate' points to elements in the language system, which is independent of particular example sentences. On the other hand, the term 'predicator' refers to the real semantic role played by a particular word (or a group of words) in a particular sentence. For example, *a beautiful young lady greeted me this morning*. The predicator of this sentence is *greeted*, while other words such as *beautiful, young, lady,* and *morning* are all predicates which can also function as potential predicators in other sentences.

In terms of the argument number, predicates can also be divided into a one-place predicate such as *sleepy, hungry, sneeze,* a two-place predicate such as *hate, love, afraid of, under,* and a three-place predicate such as *give, send, show*.

Discussion

Individual-level and Stage-level Predicates

Carlson (1977) classifies predicates based on their natural classes into individual-level and stage-level predicates and provides a sound explanation of what accounts for their differences. According to Carlson, the distinction between the two types of predicate may provide important implications for our understanding of genericity. Kratzer (1995) also proposes that stage-level and individual-level predicates have a certain argument structure differences. She notes that stage-level predicates are *Davidsonian* in the sense that they possess an extra argument position for events or spatio-temporal locations. In contrast, individual-level predicates lack this position.

Chierchia (1995) explains that the two classes of predicates differ due to the fact that individual-level predicates express properties of individuals that are permanent or tendentially stable, while it is not the case for stage-level predicates, which tend to show transient, episodic properties. Carlson, on the other hand, classifies individual-level predicates into three basic types, namely stative verbs, such as *know, love, hate*, etc (vs. *hit, speak, dance,* etc.), all (predicative) NPs, such as *be a man, be a dancer, be mammals,* etc., and adjectives, such as *smart, tall, altruistic,* etc. (vs. *sick, available, drunk*, etc.).

Chierchia (1995) proposes a number of typical characteristics that shed light on the distinction between individual-level predicates and stage-level predicates. The following properties have been identified in the literature as characterizing individual-level predicates.

Stable stativity. This property means that individual-level predicates are all aspectually stative. Because they are typically stative, they will be ungrammatical in the progressive, have the subinterval property, and so forth. However, one must bear in mind that stative adjectives which express transient or episodic qualities such as being available or being sick and pure locatives such as being on the roof are classified as stage-level predicates. The following examples are taken from Chierchia (1995).

(1)   a. John was drunk yesterday/last month/a year ago.

b. ?? John was tall yesterday/last month/a year ago.

Now we can see that there is nothing wrong with (1a), while there is with (1b). The reason why (1b) is odd is because "tall" is an individual-level predicate which must be stable and cannot co-occur with temporal adverbials like *yesterday*, *last month, a year ago*, etc, all of which show instability. In this case, only stage-level predicates like *drunk* in (1a) can co-occur with such adverbials since they express transient or changing states.

Locatives. Not only are individual-level predicates restricted in their co-occurrence with temporal adverbials, but also with their co-occurrence with locative modifiers. As noticed by Carlson, it is almost impossible to modify an individual-level predicate with a locative. To make these things clear, consider the following examples.

(2) a. ??Mary is a linguist in her room.
    b. ??Mary is tall in Queensland.
    c. ??Mary knows Dutch in her university.
(3) a. Mary is always drunk in Japan.
    b. Mary always sleeps in the living room.

The examples above show that individual-level predicates like *a linguist, tall,* and *know* in (2a-c) cannot co-occur with locatives such as *in her room, in Queensland, in her university*, etc. In this case, it is true that individual-level predicates are not located in space, while stage-level predicates are. If someone is a linguist, she will be a linguist no matter where she is.

Perception sentences. The third characteristic that can be used to distinguish individual-level predicates from stage-level predicates is that individual-level predicates cannot occur appropriately within the 'small clause' complements of perception verbs (Chierchia, 1995):

(4) a. *I saw Mary a psychologist.
    b. *I saw Mary short.
    c. *I heard Mary hate John.

(5) a. I saw Mary drunk.
    b. I heard John marry Mary.

The reason why this should be so is yet unclear. If the reason of the ungrammaticality of (4a-c) is due to a ban against having states in the complement perception reports, it should also apply to (5a) where *drunk* is also a state. One possible reason for this ungrammaticality is because *a psychologist, short,* and *hate* in (4a-c) are individual-level predicates, while *drunk* and *marry* in (5a-b) are stage-level predicates. In other words, only stage-level predicates can occur within the complements of perception verbs.

There-sentences. There-*sentences* are also commonly used to determine whether a predicate is individual-level or stage-level. In this case, only stage-level predicates are allowed in the final position of there-*sentences*, while individual-level predicates must be singled out. To get a feel of what this means, consider the following examples.
(6) a. There are three girls asleep/sick/drunk, …

b. ??There are three girls smart/altruistic/tall, …

Bare plurals. Individual-level predicates also show a quite interesting interaction with bare plurals. In this case, individual-level predicates have a prominent property of selecting the universal reading of bare plurals, while stage-level predicates are normally interpreted existentially. Consider the following examples from Chierchia (1995).

(7) a. Humans are mammals.
     b. Firemen are altruistic.
     c. Dogs hate cats.
(8) a. Firemen are available.
     b. Dogs are barking in the courtyard.

The bare plural subjects in (7a-c) can only be interpreted universally (or generically), whereas those in (8a-b) are normally interpreted existentially, even though it might also be arguably possible to interpret them universally. However, the important thing to point out here is that the bare plurals in (7) are only possible if they are interpreted universally; interpreting them existentially is impossibility.

Adverbs of quantification. Kratzer (1995) argues that individual-level predicates cannot interact well with adverbs of quantification, while stage-level predicates can. This may explain why the sentences in (9) sound strange, while those in (10) are quite natural.

(9) a. ??When John knows Latin, he always knows it very well.
    b. ??When John is intelligent, he is always pleasant.
(10) a. When John speaks Latin, he always speaks it well.
     b. When John is drunk, he is always obnoxious.

Kratzer further argues that if one of the NPs in the *when*-clause of (9a) or (9b) is replaced with an indefinite or a bare plural, the sentence will be grammatical:

(11) a. When a Moroccan knows French, she knows it well.
     b. When a student is intelligent, it is a pleasure to work with him or her.

Now let's observe a closely related pattern where a *when*-clause is absent (Chierchia, 1995):

(12) a. John always speaks French.
     b. ??John always knows French.
     c. A Moroccan always knows French.
     d. Moroccans always know French.

The sentences in (9-11) show a quite regular behavior and a generalization can be made that sentences involving an adverb of quantification and an individual-level predicate will be grammatical if they interact with an indefinite or a bare plural as argument.

Case and Evidence from Finnish

Pylkkänen (2002) claims that both causative and noncausative psych predicates are aspectually stative. That noncausative psych verbs are stative is not surprising. On the other hand, saying that morphologically

causative psych verbs are also stative is surely surprising. The following are some tests used by Pylkkänen to determine the stativity of Finnish psych predicates.

Test 1: Accusative object case

Verbs whose event structure necessarily involves a culmination, i.e. achievement verbs, are incompatible with partitive objects as in (13). On the other hand, inherently atelic predicates, such as states, are only possible with partitive case-marked objects as in (14).

(13) a. Matti   voitti   kisa- n.   b. *Matti   voitti kisa-a.
     Matti.NOM won   race-**acc**   Matti. NOM won   race-**par**
     'Matti won the race'   'Matti won the race'

(14) a. Pekka rakastaa Liisa-a. b. *Pekka rakastaa Liisa-n.
     'Pekka loves Liisa'   'Pekka loves Liisa'

Since causative and noncausative psych verbs are strictly stative, they will never co-occur with accusative objects. Thus, the following sentences are strictly ungrammatical.

(15) *Causative*
    a. *Kaisa   inho-tti   Mati-n.
      Kaisa.NOM findDisgusting-CAUS.PAST Matti-ACC
      'Kaisa disgusted Matti'
    Noncausative
    b. *Kaisa   inho- si   Mati-n.
      Kaisa-NOM findDisgusting-PAST Matti-ACC

A point which can be withdrawn from the examples above is that psych predicates are neither accomplishments nor achievements and that makes them ungrammatical to co-occur with the accusative case.

Test 2: The progressive

Different from other types of verbs such as activity, accomplishment, and achievement verbs, stative verbs cannot occur in the progressive (16a). Since both causative and non-causative psych verbs are stative, they will be expected to be ungrammatical with the progressive, as shown in (16b-c).

(16) a. *Pekka   on osaa-ma-ssa   ranska-a.
      Pekka.NOM is know-INF-INESS French-PAR
      'Pekka is knowing French'
    Causative
    b. *Kaisa   on inho- tta- ma- ssa   Matti-a.
      Kaisa.NOM is findDisgusting-CAUS-INF-INESS Matti-PAR
      'Kaisa is disgusting Matti'
    Noncausative
    c. *Kaisa   on inhoa- ma- ssa   Matti-a.
      Kaisa.NOM is findDisgust-INF-INESS Matti-PAR
      'Kaisa is finding Matti disgusting'

Test 3:Habitual interpretation in the present tense

Nonstative verbs in English and Finnish share a similarity in that they have a habitual interpretation in the present tense (17a); Stative

verbs, on the other hand, appear in the present tense with a non-habitual interpretation (17b).

(17) a. Mikko   auttaa Maija-a.
         Mikko.NOM helps   Maija-PAR
         'Mikko helps Maija (habitually)'
    b. Mikko   osa-a   franska-a.
         Mikko.NOM knows French-PAR
         'Mikko knows French'

As both causative and noncausative pscyh predicates are classified as states, they will appear in the present tense with non-habitual interpretation as well.

(18) *Causative*
     a. Uutiset sure- tta-vat Matti-a.
       news.NOM beSad-CAUS-3PL Matti-ACC
   'The news cause Matti to be sad (now)'
   Noncausative
  b. Matti   sure-e   uutisi-a.
    Matti.NOM beSad-CAUS-3SG news.PAR
    'Matti is sad because of the news (now)'

Causative and noncausative psych predicates

Pylkkänen (2002) argues that in Finnish morphologically causative psychological verbs denote properties of complex stage-level states while morphologically noncausative psych verbs denote properties of simple individual-level states. Causative psych verbs are formed from noncausative psych predicates by adding the causative suffix –*tta* and this causativization affects the argument realization of the predicate, that is, the experiencer is the subject in noncausative psych verbs as in (19a), while it is realized as the object in causative psych verbs as in (19b).

(19) a. Mikko   inhoa-a   hyttysi-ä.
         Mikko.NOM findDisgusting-3SG mosquitoes-PAR
         'Mikko finds mosquitoes disgusting'
    b. Hyttyset   inho- **tta-** vat   Mikko-a
         mosquitos.NOM findDisgusting-**caus-**3PL Mikko-PAR
         'Mosquitoes disgust Mikko'

Both forms are fully stative and due to their stativity the only available case is partitive, which in Finnish encodes atelicity.

Tests for stage-level and individual-level psych verb distinctions

Pylkkänen argues that causative psych verbs are interpreted as stage-level states, i.e. as describing temporary predicates, while noncausative psych verbs are interpreted as individual-level predicates, i.e. as describing more permanent situations. To support the argument, she uses the following tests.

Test 1: Temporal and Locative adverbials

Various researchers (e.g. Chierchia 1995, Kratzer 1995) have shown that individual-level predicates cannot co-exist with temporal and locative adverbials, while stage-level predicates combine with them freely. This also

applies to Finnish where the noncausative psych verbs in (20) are odd with adverbials, while it is not the case for the causative psych verbs in (21).

Noncausative

(20) a. ??Jussi inho-si Mikko-a ruokapöyd ä-ss ä

  Jussi.NOM findDisgusting-3SG.PAST Mikko-PAR dinner-table-INESS

   'Jussi finds Mikko disgusting at dinner table'

  b. ??Inhosi- n sinu- a eilen kello 3.

   find-Disgusting- 1SG you- PAR yesterday clock 3

   'I found you disgusting yesterday at 3 o'clock'

  c. ??Sääli- n sinu- a eilen kello 3.

   pity- 1SG you-PAR yesterday clock 3.

   'I pitied you yesterday at 3 o'clock'

Causative

(21) a. Mikko inho- tti   Jussi- a

   Mikko.NOM findDisgusting-CAUS.PAST.3SG Jussi-PAR

   ruokapöyd ä-ss ä

   dinner-table-INESS

   'Mikko disgusts Jussi at dinner table'

  b. Sin ä inho- tit minu- a eilen kello 3

   you.NOM findDisgusting-CAUS.PAST.2SG I-PAR yesterday clock 3

   'You disgusted me yesterday at 3 o'clock'

  c. Sin ä sääli-tit   minu- a eilen kello 3.

   You.NOM pity-CAUS.PAST.2SG I-PAR yesterday clock 3

   'You caused pity me yesterday at 3 o'clock'

Test 2: Bare Plurals

  Individual-level predicates are different from stage-level predicates in that the former selects a universal reading for bare plurals while the latter is most naturally interpreted existentially (and arguably also universally). Again this is also true to the Finnish psych predicates, in which with noncausative psych verbs bare plurals have a universal interpretation while with causative psych verbs bare plurals can be interpreted both universally and existentially.

Noncausative (only universal)

(22) a. Suomalaiset inhoa- vat   räntäsadetta-a.

   Finns.NOM findDisgusting-3PL sleet-PAR

   '(All) Finns find sleet disgusting'

  b. Eurooppalaiset pohti-vat tulevaisuu-tta.

   Europeans.NOM wonder-3PL future-PAR

   '(All) Europeans wonder about the future'

Causative (existential or universal)

  c. Suomalaisi-a inho- tta-a   räntäsade.

   Finns-PAR findDisgusting-CAUS-3SG sleet-NOM

   'Sleet disgusts (all/some) Finns'

  d. Eurooppalaisi-a pohditu- tta- a   tulevaisuus.

   Europeans-PAR wonder-CAUSE-3SG future.NOM

   'The future makes (all/some) Europeans wonder'

Test 3: Always

Individual-level predicates will be odd with adverbs of quantification such as *always* unless they are predicates of kind-referring nouns such as *a Moroccan.* In contrast, stage-level predicates combine with those adverbs freely. The same pattern applies to the Finnish causative and noncausative psych verbs:

Noncausative
(23) a. ??Kerttu   aina   inhoa- a   räntäsadetta-a.
        Kerttu.NOM always findDisgusting-3SG sleet-PAR
        'Kerttu always finds sleet disgusting'
     b. Suomalainen aina   inho- a   räntäsadetta-a.
        Finn.NOM   always findDisgusting-3SG sleet-PAR
        'A Finn always finds sleet disgusting'
Causative
     c. Räntäsade inho- tta- a   aina   Kerttu- a.
         sleet.NOM findDisgusting-CAUS-3SG always Kerttu.PAR
        'Sleet always disgusts Kerttu'

Test 4: Episodic contexts
       Individual-level predicates can be distinguished from stage-level predicates by the fact that only causative psych verbs normally occur in episodic contexts. The following will make this distinction obvious.
    (24) a. Menin eilen kalatorille, mutta en ostanut mitään. Kalaa käsiteltiin
            paljain käsin ja…
            'Yesterday I went to the fish market, but I didn't buy anything.
            They handled the fish with bare hands and…'
       b. … se   **inho- tii**   minu-a.
           that-NOM **findDisgusting-caus.**PAST I-par
           '… that disgusted me'
       c. …?? Minä   **inho- si- n**   sitä.
              I-NOM **findDisgusting-**PAST-1SG that.PAR
           '… I found that disgusting'

The context means that the speaker was in a state of disgust while she was in the fish market. In this context, only the causative is appropriate, while the use of the individual-level predicate in (24c) is odd because of its incompatibility with the clearly episodic situation contextualized in (24a). However, both (24b) and (24c) will not sound odd in English.

Individual-level and Stage-level Predicates in Indonesian
       This section deals with predicates in Indonesian and uses Pylkkänen's model to analyze and classify them into individual-level and stage-level predicates. It is assumed that stative predicates in Indonesian include verbs, adjectives, and NPs, similar to English stative predicates.

Test 1: Temporal and Locative adverbials
       Various researchers (e.g. Chierchia 1995, Kratzer 1995) have shown that individual-level predicates cannot co-occur with temporal and locative adverbials, while stage-level predicates combine with them freely. Consider the following data from Indonesian.

(25) a. ??Budi mencintai Ani di rumahnya.
   'Budi loves Ani in her house'
   b. Budi berbicara dengan Ani kemarin.
   'Budi spoke with Ani yesterday.'
   c. ??Budi sangat cerdas tadi pagi.
   'Budi was very smart this morning'
   d. Budi mengantuk di ruang kelas.
   'Budi was sleepy in his classroom'
   e. ??Wati penyanyi di kamarnya.
   'Wati is a singer in her room'

We can see that (25a, c & e) are odd because the verb *mencintai,* the adjective *cerdas,* and the NP *penyanyi* are individual-level predicates which cannot co-occur with locative adverbials like *di rumahnya* and *di kamarnya* and temporal adverbials like *kemarin*. In contrast, (25b & d) sound fine due to the fact that the verb *berbicara* and the adjective *mengantuk* are stage-level predicates which can freely combine with these temporal and locative adverbials.

Test 2: Bare Plurals
   Individual-level predicates are different from stage-level predicates in that the former selects a universal reading for bare plurals while the latter is most naturally interpreted existentially (and arguably also universally). Again the same thing can also apply to predicates in Indonesian, in which with individual-level predicates bare plurals have a universal interpretation while with stage-level predicates bare plurals can be interpreted both universally and existentially.

(26) a. Anak-anak suka binatang piaraan.
   '(All) children like pets'
   b. Anak-anak bermain bola.
   '(All/some) children play football'

Test 3: Always
   Individual-level predicates will be odd with adverbs of quantification such as *always* unless they are predicates of kind-referring nouns such as *a Moroccan.* In contrast, stage-level predicates combine with those adverbs freely. Consider the following:
(27) a. Ima selalu berbahasa Jawa.
   'Ima always speaks Javanese'
   b. ?? Ima selalu tahu bahasa Jawa.
   'Ima always knows Javanese'
   c. Ima selalu sakit.
   'Ima is always sick'
   d. ?? Ima selalu cerdas.
   'Ima is always intelligent'
   e. ?? Ima selalu pelajar.
   'Ima is always a student'

The sentences in (27a & c) are fine since the verb *berbahasa* and the adjective *sakit* are stage-level predicates, while those in (27b, d, & e) are

9

odd due to the fact that the verb *tahu,* the adjective *cerdas,* and the NP *pelajar* are individual-level predicates, which of course cannot co-occur with an adverb of quantification like *always.*

Test 4: There-sentences

There-*sentences* are also commonly used to determine whether a predicate is individual-level or stage-level. In this case, only stage-level predicates are allowed in the final position of there-*sentences*, while individual-level predicates must be singled out in the position. However, different from English, Indonesian allows either individual-level or stage level predicate to occur in the coda position since both predicates must be in that position. Consider the following examples:

(28) a. Ada tiga gadis pintar/baik hati/pemurah.
     'There are three girls smart/kind/generous'
  b. Ada tiga gadis sakit/ mabuk/ngantuk.
     'There are three girls sick/drunk/sleepy'

As we can see, there is nothing wrong with (28a) in Indonesian, even though it will be odd in English. In this case, this test cannot be applied to determine whether a predicate is individual-level or stage-level in the context of Indonesian.

Test 5: Perception sentences

Another diagnostic test that can be used to distinguish individual-level predicates from stage-level predicates is that individual-level predicates cannot get along well within the 'small clause' complements of perception verbs in English. However, this test is not applicable to Indonesian. The following examples will make this clear.

(29)a. Saya lihat Wati mahasiswa.
    'I saw Wati a student'
  b. Saya lihat Wati pendek.
    'I saw Wati short'
  c. Saya dengar Wati benci Budi.
    'I heard Wati hate Budi'
(30)a. Saya lihat Wati mengantuk.
    'I saw Wati sleepy'

  b. Saya dengar Budi menikahi Wati.
    'I heard Budi marry Wati'

The sentences in (29a-c) and (30a-b) are all semantically and syntactically sound in Indonesian, while only (30a-b) are possible in English. It means that perception sentence test used to distinguish individual-level predicates from stage-level predicates is not applicable in Indonesian.

Conclusion

This paper discusses the distinctions between individual-level and stage-level predicates making use of a number of diagnostic tools such as temporal and locative adverbials, bare plurals, adverbs of quantification, there-*sentences*, and episodic contexts.

One point to note here is that the diagnostic tools for categorizing predicates into individual-level and stage-level predicates may vary from language to language. It is assumed that they tend to be language-specific. Let's take for example the there-*sentences* test and perception sentence test; while they are validly applicable in English, they are not in Indonesian, as shown in (28), (29), and (30). It is also questionable whether bare plurals are exhaustively applicable in Indonesian due to the fact that in Indonesian we can use bare singulars to mean a universal reading, e.g., *Polisi suka menolong* (literally means, *A policeman is altruistic*). This problem and others require further investigation, which are, of course, beyond the scope of the present paper.

References

Carlson, Gregory. 1977. *Reference to Kinds in English.* PhD Dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst MA. (Published 1980 by Garland Press, New York.)

Carlson, Gregory and Pelletier, Francis (eds.) 1995. *The Generic Book.* Chicago; London: The University of Chicago Press.

Chierchia, Gennaro. 1995. "Individual-level Predicates as Inherent Generics." In G. Carlson and F. Pelletier (eds.) *The Generic Book*, 176-223*.* Chicago; London: The University of Chicago Press.

Hurford, James R; Heasley, Brendan and Smith, Michael B. 2007. *Semantics: a Course Book*. Cambrige: Cambridge University Press.

Kratzer, Angelika. 1995. "Stage-level and Individual-level Predicates." In G. Carlson and F. Pelletier (eds.) *The Generic Book,* 125-175*.* Chicago; London: The University of Chicago Press.

Pylkkänen, Liina. 2002. "On Stativity and Causation." In C. Tenny and J. Pustejovsky (eds.) *Events as Grammatical Objects: the converging perspectives of lexical semantics and syntax,* 417-444. Standford, Calif.: CSLI Publications.

PROBLEMATIKA DALAM PENERJEMAHAN NOVEL

Rudi Hartono
Dosen bahasa Inggris Universitas Negeri Semarang
Email: rudi_fbsunnes@yahoo.com

Abstract: Translating literary works is different from translating non-literary works. One of the literary texts meant in this study is novel. In the process of translating a novel, translators sometimes have problems to determine appropriate equivalent words. The equivalent words themselves must be literary words that are difficult to search. There are many factors that cause translators difficult to translate a novel. Some of them are lack of basic knowledge of English language and literature, misinterpretation and being careless in translation process. Consequently they have difficulties in linguistics, analysis, culture, and appreciation. So the way to overcome the problems is increasing the knowledge of both languages and cultures, having literary studies background, referring to guidance and rules of translating a novel or other literary works.

Key words: Translation problems, novel translation, bahasa sumber (Bsu), bahasa sasaran (Bsa), teks sumber (Tsu), teks sasaran (Tsa)

Pendahuluan

Menerjemahkan karya sastera berbeda dengan menerjemahkan karya non-sastera. Seorang penerjemah karya sastera harus memiliki pengetahuan, pemahaman dan apresiasi yang mendalam terhadap karya sastera yang diterjemahkannya. Jika ia tidak mampu melakukan tiga hal tadi, maka ia akan mengalami kesulitan dalam menerjemahkan karya sastera.

Menerjemahakan karya sastera tidak hanya mengalihkan pesan atau makna atau mencari padanan dari bahasa sumber (Bsu) ke bahasa sasaran (Bsa) dengan tepat. Menerjemahkan karya sastera adalah menerjemahkan multidimensi: dimensi lahir, dimensi batin, dimensi budaya, dimensi moral, dan lain-lain. Seorang penerjemah yang sembrono (*careless translator*) akan melakukan kekeliruan pada saat ia menerjemahkan karya sastera. Mungkin saja ia hanya mengejar isi (*content*) semata dan lupa untuk memperhatikan aspek emosi, sehingga karya sastera yang ia terjemahkan jauh dari maksud si pengarang aslinya.

Maka dari itu banyak penerjemah karya sastera sering mengalami kesulitan-kesulitan dalam proses menerjemahkannya. Mengapa demikian? Marilah kita bahas dalam paparan berikut ini. Dalam makalah ini penulis hanya menfokuskan diri pada penerjemahan novel dan memaparkan sekelumit penerjemahan karya sastera, di antaranya novel, kesulitan-kesulitan dalam menerjemahkannya dan beberapa cara untuk mengatasi kesulitan-kesulitan dalam proses penerjemahannya.

Pembahahasan

Penerjemahan Karya Sastera

Menerjemahkan karya sastera, berbeda dengan menerjemahkan karya non-sastera. Proses ini membutuhkan pengetahuan kesusasteraan yang sarat dengan bahasa yang mengandung estetika dan artistika, pemahaman kultural dan tujuan moral, serta pelibatan emosional, perasaan, dan suasana batin si pengarang.

Dalam hal pengetahuan kesusasteraan seorang penerjemah karya sastera harus mampu mengidentifikasi unsur-unsur karya sastera, misalnya, 1) karya sastera yang berbentuk prosa, baik itu ceritera pendek maupun novel, memiliki unsur-unsur prosa yang meliputi tema (*theme*), lakon atau tokoh ceritera (*character*), alur ceritera (*plot*), sudut pandang (*point of view*), serta latar tempat dan waktu (*setting*); 2) karya sastera yang berbentuk puisi mempunyai unsur-unsur puisi yang meliputi pilihan kata (*diksi*), bentuk-bentuk retorika (*rhetoric figures*), *tema* (*theme*), bait (*stanza*), rima (*rhyme*), matra (*meter*), aliterasi (*alliteration*), asonansi (*assonance*), tamsil (*imagery*), dan gaya bahasa (*figurative language*); 3) teks drama mencakup unsur-unsur: dialog (*dialog*), monolog (*monolog*), alur ceritera (plot), latar (*setting*), dan arahan tayangan panggung (*stage direction*). (Klarer, 1999:10-44)

Selanjutnya seorang penerjemah karya sastera harus memiliki pemahaman budaya dan tujuan moral dari karya sastera yang ia terjemahkan. Ia harus memahami budaya pada masyarakat pengguna bahasa sumber (Bsu) dan bahasa sasaran (Bsa) yang memiliki pengaruh besar dalam proses penerjemahan karya sastera. Yang dimaksud dengan pengaruh budaya menurut New Mark (1988) dalam Suparman (2003:145) adalah budaya bahasa sumber (Bsu) dalam teks asli. Pengaruh budaya ini dapat muncul dalam gaya bahasa, latar, dan tema. Dalam memahami aspek budaya, si penerjemah harus kaya dengan skemata budaya yang sering muncul dalam bahasa sumber (Bsu) dan padat pengetahuan dengan padanan budaya yang ada dalam bahasa sasaran (Bsa). Istilah *"Thanksgiving"*, misalnya, dalam sebuah novel asing yang bertema cinta kasih, itu merupakan contoh budaya pada bahasa sumber yang belum tentu memiliki budaya yang sejenis dalam bahasa sasaran. Mencari padanan budaya yang tepat mungkin menjadi sebuah kesulitan bagi seorang penerjemah, oleh karena itu ia akan berupaya mencari pengetahuan dan pemahaman silang budaya (*cross-cultural understanding*), sehingga ia dapat melakukan proses penerjemahannya dengan baik.

Budaya Indonesia yang kental dengan ketimuran dan pengaruh Islam memiliki kebiasaan memberi makanan ketika menjelang bulan Ramadhan atau pada saat Hari Raya Idul Fitri atau Lebaran yang dikenal dengan istilah "Syukuran". Apakah kata "Syukuran" sepadan dengan frase *"Thanksgiving"* dalam budaya barat? Inilah salah satu contoh menganalisis kesepadanan, sehingga dimungkinkan seorang penerjemah akan sulit menilainya.

Kemudian yang dimaksud dengan tujuan moral adalah tujuan yang ingin disampaikan oleh pengarang kepada pembaca. Seorang penerjemah karya sastera harus mampu menyelami pesan moral (*moral value*) yang

terkandung dalam karya sastera yang diterjemahkannya. Ia akan mampu mengambil pesan moral sesuai dengan tujuan pesan moral yang disampaikan oleh si pengarang. Jika ia sudah membaca karya sastera tersebut berulangkali, maka ia dapat menarik simpulan dari keseluruhan isi karya sastera itu. Ini adalah upaya yang sangat sulit dilakukan oleh seorang penerjemah karya sastera. Proses penerjemahannya mungkin akan sangat lama dan membutuhkan waktu berbulan-bulan karena ia tidak bisa langsung menerjemahkan per kalimat atau per alinea. Ia harus membaca karya sastera yang akan diterjemahkannya itu secara tuntas dan berkali-kali, sehingga ia dapat menyimpulkan pesan apa yang terkandung dalam karya sastera tersebut. Mengetahui tujuan moral merupakan upaya yang sangat penting bagi seorang penerjemah, sehingga ia akan tahu alur ceritera, tokoh ceritera dan penokohannya, tema, dan sekian banyak peristiwa yang mengandung pesan moral bagi pembaca.

Di samping itu, seorang penerjemah karya sastera harus mampu melibatkan emosional, perasaan dan suasana batin sebagaimana yang dimiliki dan dirasakan oleh si pengarang. Penerjemahan karya sastera adalah suatu proses mengalihkan "suasana batin" dari pengarang dalam bahasa sumber (Bsu) ke dalam bahasa sasaran (Bsa). Ciri-ciri seorang penerjemah karya sastera yang berhasil adalah ia mampu melakukan pelibatan emosional, misalnya ketika ia membaca teks sumber yang menggambarkan perasaan sentimentil dari tokoh ceritera, maka ia peka, dan mencari ungkapan perasaan yang tepat, perasaan sentimentil yang sepadan dalam teks sasaran. Ketika ia tahu bahwa pengarang menggunakan sudut pandang (*point of view*): *"I"* (orang pertama tunggal), maka ia harus mampu merasakan tokoh ceritera yang ber-*point of view* tersebut, merasakan simbol keakuan, keegoan (*selfish*) dari tokoh ceritera itu, sehingga ia harus mencari padanan *point of view* dalam bahasa sasaran yang tepat, misalnya menggunakan kata "Saya", "Aku", "Hamba", "Gua", atau yang sejenis. Ketika *point of view*-nya *"You"* (orang kedua tunggal) muncul dalam bahasa sumber, maka penerjemah harus mampu merasakan *point of view* tersebut dalam bahasa sasaran sebagai unsur kata ganti yang mewakili perasaan tokoh ceritera yang ber- dalam bahasa sumber. Kata ganti *"You"* itu sendiri dapat menggambarkan tokoh ceritera yang berkarakter terintimidasi atau tersanjungi, sehingga terjemahannya dapat menggunakan padanan kata ganti orang kedua "Kamu", Engkau", "Anda", "Paduka", "Saudara", atau yang lainnya.

Penerjemah karya sastera harus sarat dengan suasana sentimentil karena ia harus mampu merespon dan mengapresiasi pesan yang disampaikan lewat tokoh dan penokohan (*character and characterization*). Selanjutnya, walaupun penerjemahan karya sastera tidak mungkin sepenuhnya mengalihkan "suasana batin" karya aslinya, namun terjemahannya harus tetap setia pada karya aslinya itu. (Hasan, 2001:20)

Bagaimana mencari padanan yang tepat dari bentuk gaya bahasa dalam bahasa sumber yang menggambarkan suasana batin tokoh ceritera yang sedang sedih, pilu, nestapa dan duka lara atau yang sedang riang, gembira, bahagia, dan damai? Inilah tugas seorang penerjemah untuk terampil mencari padanan yang sesuai dengan suasana batin itu. Misalnya, dalam ungakapan *"I'm cloudy now, like*

the day without the sun", suasana batin apa yang bisa ditangkap oleh penerjemah? Padanan ungkapan apa yang dapat mewakili suasana batin itu? Penerjemah mungkin akan langsung menangkap gambaran suasana batin yang sedang sedih itu dan menerjemahkan ungkapan itu menjadi *"Hatiku kelabu, bagaikan hari tanpa mentari"* atau *"Hatiku haru biru, bagaikan malam tanpa rembulan."*

Beberapa Kesulitan dalam Penerjemahan Novel

Novel adalah sebuah bentuk prosa atau ceritera panjang yang memiliki unsur tema, tokoh ceritera, alur ceritera, sudut pandang, dan latar (Klarer, 1999: 11 dan Davies, 1989: 755). Pada dasarnya sebuah novel ditulis untuk tujuan menghibur. Dengan imajinasi yang luar biasa, si pengarang mampu berkreasi untuk menulis ceritera hayalan (Fiksi) yang mengandung nilai-nilai kehidupan. Novel sebagai karya sastra, yang cenderung berbentuk ceritera fiksi, mengandung gambaran kehidupan. Novel, yang sarat dengan imaginasi dan hayalan, sangat jauh berbeda dengan karya non-fiksi yang penuh dengan logika dan data serta fakta atau realita yang nyata. Bahasa yang digunakan di dalam novel penuh gaya, sarat makna, dan membutuhkan daya nalar tinggi serta kedalaman apresiasi.

Novel sebagai bentuk karya sastera yang lengkap dan luas banyak diterjemahkan ke dalam berbagai bahasa, terutama novel-novel yang memiliki tema aktual dan kontroversial. Apakah novel mudah untuk diterjemahkan? Kesulitan-kesulitan apa yang dihadapi oleh penerjemah dalam menerjemahkan novel? Tampaknya menerjemahkan novel tidak semudah menerjemahkan teks biasa. Banyak penerjemah yang menghadapi kesulitan dalam menerjemahkan novel. Robinson (1977) dalam Suparman (2003:144-145) menyatakan bahwa secara garis besar kesulitan-kesulitan itu mencakup aspek kultural dan bahasa, sedangkan Newmark (1988) menambahkan bahwa kesulitan-kesulitan itu muncul karena pengaruh budaya dan tujuan moral.

Selanjutnya perlu disadari oleh para penerjemah sastera, khususnya penerjemah novel, bahwa menerjemahkan karya sastera bukanlah menerjemahkan pernyataan yang tersurat dalam serangkaian kailmat, namun memahami tujuan apa yang terkandung di balik pernyataan itu (Iser dalam McGuire, 1988:115). Tidak sedikit para penerjemah yang sembrono (*careless translator*) melakukan beberapa kecerobohan dalam menerjemahkan karya sastera, misalnya:
(1) Salah menerjemahkan informasi.
(2) Melakukan interpretasi tambahan dari teks asli.
(3) Melakukan interpretasi dangkal atas beberapa hal penting yang saling berkaitan yang terkandung di dalam karya sastera.

Maka dari itu muncullah sebuah hasil terjemahan karya sastera yang menyimpang dari teks dan konteks aslinya. Mengapa mereka melakukan hal sedemikian?

Kalau penulis akumulasikan dari beberapa pendapat di atas, maka kesulitan-kesulitan dalam menerjemahkan novel meliputi:

1) Kesulitan Bahasa

Kesulitan bahasa dalam hal ini adalah kesulitan untuk memahami diksi berupa kata-kata pilihan yang mengandung estetika dan artistika yang khusus dipilihkan oleh pengarang agar karangan yang ia buat tampak lebih memiliki ketepatan untuk menyampaikan makna. Mengapa ia menggunakan kata "*Home*" (lebih artistik dan estetik) bukan "*House*" (makna umum), sehingga penerjemah harus mencari padanan yang tepat untuk kata-kata itu, apakah "Tempat Tinggal" , "Rumah", atau "Tempat Mengadu"? Misalnya dalam ungkapan: (1) *Home Sweet Home;* (2) *My mother is my home.* Jika diterjemahkan maka akan menjadi: (1) *Rumahku Sorgaku*. Kata "*Home*" yang pertama diterjemahkan "Rumah" sedangkan kata "Home" yang kedua diterjemahkan "Sorga". (2) *Ibuku tempat mengadu"*. Dalam kalimat (2) kata "*Home*" diterjemahkan "Tempat Mengadu". Jadi pilihan kata (*diction*) dalam novel menjadi masalah yang cukup sulit untuk difahami oleh seorang penerjemah.

2) Kesulitan Analisis

Kesulitan analisis dalam hal ini adalah kesulitan mengidentifikasi unsur-unsur novel misalnya, unsur *point of view* yang sangat erat kaitannya dengan tokoh ceritera (*character*). Kalau tokoh ceriteranya raja yang ber-*point of view* "I", maka pronomina itu dapat diterjemahkan "Aku", tetapi jika tokoh ceriteranya adalah rakyat jelata yang ber-*point of view* "I", maka pronominanya dapat diterjemahkan menjadi "Saya" atau "Hamba".

3) Kesulitan Budaya

Yang dimaksud dengan kesulitan budaya adalah kesulitan untuk mencari padanan yang berkaitan dengan budaya dari dua bahasa, baik itu yang menyangkut benda-benda, kegiatan-kegiatan, adat-istiadat maupun istilah lain. Kesulitan budaya ini biasanya muncul dalam bentuk istilah, idiom, peribahasa, maupun gaya bahasa. Contoh unik yang sulit diterjemahkan dan membutuhkan pengetahuan budaya adalah unsur budaya yang berbentuk *onomatopoeia*, misalnya suara kucing "*Meow*" diterjemahkan menjadi "Meong"; suara ayam "*Cock-a-doodle-doo*" diterjemahkan menjadi "Kukuruyuk"; "*Cuckoo*" diterjemahkan menjadi "*Cuccu*" (dalam bahasa Jerman).

4) Kesulitan Apresiasi

Kesulitan apresiasi adalah kesulitan yang dialami oleh penerjemah untuk menyelami isi dan maksud si pengarang. Hal ini sangat sulit karena disamping harus membaca novel aslinya beberapa kali, untuk mengetahui tema dan memahami pesan yang terkandung di dalamnya, penerjemah harus tahu betul tentang latar belakang pengarang novel aslinya itu. Dalam hal ini karena latar belakang pengarang sangat berpengaruh terhadap isi ceritera, tema, dan pesan atau pelajaran yang tersirat di dalamnya. Pernah penulis bertanya tentang tema sebuah novel yang berjudul "*The Last of the Mohicans*". Setiap pembaca dan penerjemah memberi apresiasi dan pendapat yang beragam, diantaranya ada yang menyatakan tentang perang antar suku, dendam membara, cinta di tengah perang, dan lain-lain. Padahal tema utamanya adalah *"Patriotism and Heroism"*.

Mengapa kesulitan-kesulitan tersebut di atas terjadi? Ada beberapa kemungkinan penyebabnya. Dimungkinkan bahwa penerjemah itu tidak memiliki kemampuan dalam bidang sastera, bahasa, dan budaya dari kedua Bsa dan Bsu.

Beberapa Cara Mengatasi Kesulitan dalam Penerjemahan Novel

Untuk mencari solusi dan mengurangi masalah serta kesulitan dalam menerjemahkan novel, dalam hal ini penulis mengambil pendapat Hilaire Belloc dalam McGuire (1988:116) yang mengemukan enam buah aturan umum bagi para penerjemah teks prosa atau novel:

Penerjemah hendaknya tidak menentukan langkahnya hanya untuk menerjemahkan kata-per-kata atau kalimat-per-kalimat saja. Ia harus selalu mempertimbangkan keseluruhan karya, baik karya aslinya maupun karya terjemahannya. Penerjemah harus menganggap naskah aslinya sebagai satu kesatuan unit integral, meskipun pada saat menerjemahkannya, ia mengerjakan bagian-per-bagian saja.

Penerjemah hendaknya menerjemahkan idiom menjadi idiom. Idiom dalam teks sumber hendaknya dicari padanan idiomnya dalam teks sasaran, meskipun kata-kata yang dipergunakan tidak sama persis.

Penerjemah hendaknya menerjemahkan maksud dengan maksud. Kata maksud dalam hal ini berarti muatan emosi atau perasaan yang dikandung oleh expresi tertentu. Muatan emosi dalam ekspresi bahasa sumber bisa saja lebih kuat daripada muatan emosi dari padanannya dalam bahasa sasaran. Sebaliknya, ekspresi tertentu terasa lebih pas dalam bahasa sumber, tetapi menjadi janggal dalam bahasa sasaran, apabila diterjemahkan secara literal.

Penerjemah hendaknya waspada terhadap kata-kata atau struktur yang kelihatannya sama dalam bahasa sumber dan bahasa sasaran, padahal sebenarnya sangat berbeda.

Penerjemah hendaknya berani mengubah hal-hal yang perlu diubah dari bahasa sumber ke bahasa sasaran dengan tegas. Kegiatan menerjemahkan ceritera fiksi adalah kebangkitan kembali "jiwa asing" dalam "tubuh pribumi". Yang dimaksud jiwa asing adalah makna ceritera dalam bahasa sumber, sedangkan tubuh pribumi adalah bahasa sasaran.

Penerjemah tidak boleh membubuhi ceritera aslinya dengan hiasan-hiasan yang bisa membuat ceritera dalam bahasa sasaran itu lebih buruk atau lebih indah sekalipun. Tugas penerjemah adalah menghidupkan kembali jiwa asing tadi, bukan mempercantik, apalagi memperburuknya.

Penutup

Dari sekian banyak pendapat dan uraian di atas, dapat ditarik beberapa poin penting sebagai berikut:
Menerjemahkan teks karya sastera, tidak sama dengan menerjemahkan teks karya non-sastera. Menerjemahkan karya sastera membutuhkan pengetahuan kesasteraan, bahasa, dan pemahaman budaya kedua bahasa sumber (Bsu) dan bahasa sasaran (Bsa). Menerjemahkan novel dianggap masih sulit, sehingga banyak penerjemah yang menghadapi beragam kesulitan, misalnya kesulitan bahasa, analisis, budaya, dan apresiasi.

Penerjemah novel atau karya fiksi lainnya hendaklah memperhatikan beberapa rambu penerjemahan novel atau karya fiksi lainnya, sehingga dapat mengurangi kesulitan dalam proses penerjemahan.

Referensi

Davies, M.W. (ed). 1989. *Guide to English Literature*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing Company.

Hasan, F. 2001. *Menatap Jejak Khalil Gibran*. Jakarta: Pustaka Jaya.

Klarer, M. 1999. *An Introduction to Lirerary Studies*. London: Routledge.

McGuire, S.B. 1988. *Tanslation Studies*. Revised Edition. London: Routledge.

Newmark, P. 1988. *A Textbook of Translation*. United Kingdom: Prentice Hall   International (UK) Ltd.

Robinson, D. 1977. *Becoming a Translator*. London: Routledge.

Suparman. 2003. "Terjemahan Sastera". Proceeding Paper. Kongres Nasional Penerjemahan. Surakarta: Fakultas Sastera dan Seni Rupa & Program Pascasarjana, USM Surakarta.