

Case grammar in film “the Professor and the Madman” based on Charles J. Fillmore’s Perspective

Abdul Basid^{1*}, Argha Zidan Arzaqi², Ali Makhfud Afiyanto³

Department of Arabic Language and Literature, Faculty of Humanities, Maulana Malik Ibrahim State Islamic University of Malang, Gajayana Street No. 50, Malang, Indonesia

¹abdulbasid@bsa.uin-malang.ac.id, ²17310078@student.uin-malang.ac.id², ³17310079@student.uin-malang.ac.id³

*Corresponding author: abdulbasid@bsa.uin-malang.ac.id

Article History Received: March 1, 2021 Revision: April 5, 2021 Available Online: April 21, 2021

ABSTRACT

The sentences spoken by the actors in the dialogue contained in the film “the Professor and the Madman” consist of a variety of structures that form a grammatical construction, so that the sentences can be understood and the dialogue can run well and smoothly. In the context of Charles J. Fillmore’s case grammar, the various structures that form a grammatical construction in a sentence are called modality and proposition. In a line with that background, the purposes of the research are: (1) to reveal the modality in film “the Professor and the Madman” based on the perspective of Charles J. Fillmore; (2) to describe the proposition in film “the Professor and the Madman” based on the perspective of Charles J. Fillmore. This research is qualitative, descriptive and literary research. The data source in this research is film “the Professor and the Madman” directed by P.B. Shemran. The data collection techniques in this research use watching, reading-listening and taking note. The data analysis techniques consist of three stages, namely: (1) choosing and classifying data based on modality and its forms; and proposition and its forms; (2) illustrating and writing down case grammar elements and their forms on the table, explaining them sequentially and interpreting them based on Charles J. Fillmore’s perspective; and (3) conducting the induction of interpretation summary to obtain substantive and formative conclusions. The results are: (1) modality has types, including tense: past, present and future; mode: desiderative, imperative, indicative, and interrogative; negation: no and not; adverb: frequency, manner, degree, quantity, and explanatory; (2) there are several types of proposition. They are agentive case (A): first personal pronoun, second pronoun, and third pronoun; experiential case (E): verb (basic) and verb (modal); instrumental case (I): noun and sense; objective case (O): human and thing; source case (S): noun phrase and noun; goal case (G): human and place; locative case (L): area, part of house, and office; time case (T): part of the day, year, and century; collateral case (C): with + noun; and benefactive case: for + noun. Based on the results of this research, it can be concluded that if a sentence is viewed from the case grammar theory, then it must have an inner structure consisting of modality and or proposition. Modality and proposition consist of types and each of types has the various forms.



Copyright©2021, Abdul Basid, Argha Z Arzaqi, Ali M Afiyanto
This is an open access article under the [CC-BY-3.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/) license



Keywords Case grammar, Modality, Proposition, structure

How to Cite Basid, A., Arzaqi, A. Z., & Afriyanto, A. M. (2021). Case grammar in film “the Professor and the Madman” based on Charles J. Fillmore’s Perspective. *KEMBARA: Jurnal Keilmuan, Bahasa, Sastra dan Pengajarannya (e-Journal)*, 7(1), 34-52. doi: <https://doi.org/10.22219/kembara.v7i1.15870>

INTRODUCTION

Case grammar is a modification of the theory of transformational grammar which reintroduces the conceptual framework of case relationships from traditional grammar, but maintains a distinction between surface structure and inner structure of generative grammar, with the note “in” here means “semantic depth” (Yendra, 2016). Case grammar semantically relations one or more phrases (nouns) referred to as cases in the case grammar system rule (Tarigan, 1990). Case grammar is used to describe the grammatical description of various languages and for the description of children’s language acquisition (Richards & Schmidt, 2013) and might in fact provide a new synthesis toward new theories in linguistic semantics and rhetoric theories (D’Angelo, 1976).

The definition of case grammar according to Fillmore no longer means a traditional case, namely a change in the morpheme of a noun to express its function in syntax and is morphological-syntax which

includes: nominative, genitive, accusative, dative, ablative, vocative, locative, instrumental (Parera, 2009). However, Fillmore stated that the structure in a sentence consists of a modality and proposition (Arutjunova, 1975; Fillmore, 2003; Fletcher, 1971).

At this time, research on case grammar has been widely studied by researchers. Meanwhile, the study of case grammar is actually very interesting because it is rare to know what case grammar is. The impact of teaching case grammar is very numerous such as knowing the causes of sentences to be formed and distinguishing diction which are semantically similar. On the other hand, studying case grammar has the benefit of differentiating the expression of ideas about sentence (Fillmore, 1966). As Fillmore recounts this period, he was engaged in a project to create a single, coherent, transformational grammar of English when he encountered a problem with the notation used to represent the valence of predicates (Fillmore, Ackerman., Kay., & Connor, 2014).

The actual case grammar can be studied and found in daily activities, such as a person's conversation or communication, television shows, novels and films. However, in this study, researchers are more interested in using a film entitled the Professor and the Madman directed by P. B. Shemran. The film was released in 2019. The film tells about the history of making the Oxford English Dictionary (OED). The main character is Doctor Minor as Madman and James Murray as Professor. Then the two people work together to produce a dictionary which is used as a reference for science to date (Shemran, 2009).

The researchers focus on case grammar theme because there are only a few researchers taking this theme and it is a challenge for researchers today. Whereas the reasons why researchers choose the film "the Professor and the Madman" are: (1) the film tells about the history of making the Oxford dictionary which is still closely related to linguistics and is even used as the main reference; (2) the film does not only tell about the history of making OED, but also is covered with love, sacrifice, anger, and most importantly about madness; (3) dialogues between characters or even monologues contain modality and its forms; and proposition and its forms (Andini, 2016).

In accordance with previous researches about case grammar, the researchers found several previous researches, namely: (1) research detected case grammar by using the applications: IR (Information Retrieval) to prove that verbs are not case and become center of a sentence (Chu, 1999) and text summarization, machine translation, and text mining to label semantic role in relationship between noun and verb (Indrawati, Bijaksana, & Agustin, 2016); (2) research focused on one aspect of case grammar elements: causative case by using the adverbial modifier and reflexive interpretation rule (Saksena, 1975), instrumental case which is used to do the action of the verb and is represented by the word "with" (Alamsari, 2014), and benefactive case: the displacement of noun phrase to argument position (Prihatini, 2018); (3) research revealed that noun and verb become important part in case grammar theory and grammar based on deep structure cases is a correct form of universal grammar (Nilsen, 1970), the adverb doesn't have the same position in the sentence but it can change based on the context of the sentence (Azizah, Wahya, & Machdalena, 2020), and Platt's model for improving case grammar and tagmemic theory. The model shows predicate-centered approach, semantic definition of cases, distinction of inner and outer benefactives and locatives, discovery of the experiencer case, and three meanings of the objective case (Cook, 1970); and (4) research stated that case grammar declares a semantic role within relationship between verb and noun which is not described by grammatical generative transformation (Cahyadi, 2013; Suparnis, 2012); and (5) research explored case grammar structures and elements in various languages, namely Greek consists of verb (without complement), verb + identifier, verb + verb completer, verb + goal, verb + completer + identifier, verb + two completers (Theresiawati, Seta, Hidayanto, & Abidin, 2020), German consists of three positions of verb based on the kind of the sentence. In the independent sentence, verb is in second position, in the commands and yes-no questions, verb places in initial position, and in the dependent sentence is clause-final (Connolly, 1987), Malay consists of modality: tense, adverb, negation; and proposition: agentive case (A), experience case (E), instrument case (I), objective case (O), source case (S), goal case (G), locative case (L), time case (T), collateral case (C), and benefactive case



(B) (Basid & Indah, 2020); and Indonesian short story consists of agentive case (A), experience case (E), instrument case (I), objective case (O), locative case (L), and time case (T) (Subaeki et al., 2020), Indonesian novel consists of agents, experiencers, objects, source, goal, and referential (Fajri, Yoesoef, & Nur, 2016), and Indonesian social media consists of agentive case, commercial case, dative case, and source case (Alfadhil & Rahmadi, 2020).

Previous researches above have similarities and differences with this research. The similarity is the theme, case grammar. However, the differences are in several aspects. They are: (1) the research conducted by (Chu, 1999) and (Indrawati et al., 2016) focused on detecting case grammar by using computer-based applications; (2) the research conducted by (Saksena, 1975), (Alamsari, 2014), and (Prihatini, 2018) focused on analyzing one aspect of case grammar theory; (3) the research conducted by (Nilsen, 1970) and (Azizah et al., 2020) focused on positioning verb and adverb in the context of sentence; and model for improving theory (Cook, 1970; Truscott, 1996); (4) research conducted by (Suparnis, 2012) focused on semantic role within relationship between verb and noun; (5) research conducted by (Theresiawati et al., 2020) focused on sentence structures of Greek, (Connolly, 1987; Ferris, 1999; Truscott, 1999) focused on positioning verb in the kinds of sentence, (Basid & Indah, 2020) focused on the sentence of Malay, and, (Ahla & Putri, 2020), (Fajri, Selviana, & Prasetyo, 2020) and (Alfadhil & Rahmadi, 2020) focused on the sentence of Indonesian short story, novel, and social media. All of these researches do not elaborate all kinds of modality: tense (past, present and future), mode (desiderative, imperative, indicative, and interrogative), negation (no and not), adverb (frequency, manner, degree, quantity, and explanatory), and all types of proposition: agentive case (A) (first personal pronoun, second pronoun, and third pronoun), experiential case (E) (verb-basic and verb-modal), instrumental case (I) (noun and sense), objective case (O) (human and thing), source case (S) (noun phrase and noun), goal case (G) (human and place), locative case (L) (area, part of house, and office), time case (T) (part of the day, year, and century), collateral case (C) (with + noun), and benefactive case (for + noun); and do not use object of the English film "The Professor and The Madman."

Therefore, based on the above similarities and differences, this research aims: (1) to reveal the modality in film "the Professor and the Madman" based on the perspective of Charles J. Fillmore; (2) to describe the proposition in film "the Professor and the Madman" based on the perspective of Charles J. Fillmore. The findings of this research can contribute to several things: (1) elaborating the deep structures of the sentence based on case grammar theory especially in English film. They are modality: tense (past, present and future), mode (desiderative, imperative, indicative, and interrogative), negation (no and not), adverb (frequency, manner, degree, quantity, and explanatory), and all types of proposition: agentive case (A) (first personal pronoun, second pronoun, and third pronoun), experiential case (E) (verb-basic and verb-modal), instrumental case (I) (noun and sense), objective case (O) (human and thing), source case (S) (noun phrase and noun), goal case (G) (human and place), locative case (L) (area, part of house, and office), time case (T) (part of the day, year, and century), collateral case (C) (with + noun), and benefactive case (for + noun); (2) enriching the use of case grammar theory in analyzing deep structure of sentence in modern linguistic studies because seeing the fact that how minimal research on case grammar and the things that have surrounded it since this theory was initiated in 1968 (after tracking JSTOR, garuda.ristekbrin.go.id, sinta.ristekbrin.go.id, etc.). It also clearly explains why some references of this research are over then ten years or above; and (3) deepening grammar studies as the distinction of the perspective of universal grammar (traditional grammar) and case grammar theory (modern grammar), as well as their similarities.

METHOD

This research is descriptive (Irina, 2017), qualitative (Townsend, Loudoun, & Lewin, 2016), and literature (Faisal, 1990). The data source in this research is the film "the Professor and the Madman" directed by P.B. Shemran which was released in 2019. Indeed, the data of this research is sentence or dialog that spoken by actors contained of modality: tense (past, present and future), mode (desiderative,

imperative, indicative, and interrogative), negation (no and not), adverb (frequency, manner, degree, quantity, and explanatory), and proposition: agentive case (A) (first personal pronoun, second pronoun, and third pronoun), experiential case (E) (verb-basic and verb-modal), instrumental case (I) (noun and sense), objective case (O) (human and thing), source case (S) (noun phrase and noun), goal case (G) (human and place), locative case (L) (area, part of house, and office), time case (T) (part of the day, year, and century), collateral case (C) (with + noun), and benefactive case (for + noun). To obtain the comprehensive data, researchers use several techniques in a series. They are the watching technique (Olsen, 2011) to understand the whole story of film and the part of dialog contains of modality and proposition, the reading-listening technique (Mahsun, 2005) to know clearly the part of dialog containing of modality and proposition, and the note taking technique (Evans, 2014) to record the part of dialog containing of modality and proposition.

The data is analyzed by using several steps. They are: (1) researchers choose and classify data based on modality and its forms; and proposition and its forms in accordance with Charles J. Fillmore's perspective. Modality consists of tense (past, present and future), mode (desiderative, imperative, indicative, and interrogative), negation (no and not), adverb (frequency, manner, degree, quantity, and explanatory), and proposition: agentive case (A) (first personal pronoun, second pronoun, and third pronoun), experiential case (E) (verb-basic and verb-modal), instrumental case (I) (noun and sense), objective case (O) (human and thing), source case (S) (noun phrase and noun), goal case (G) (human and place), locative case (L) (area, part of house, and office), time case (T) (part of the day, year, and century), collateral case (C) (with + noun), and benefactive case (for + noun); (2) researchers illustrate the data based on case grammar theory on the table 1: modality and its form and table 2: proposition and its forms and write down on the table case grammar elements and their forms. Then, researchers give explanation about case grammar elements and their forms sequentially and interpret them based on Charles J. Fillmore's perspective; (3) researchers make a summary from interpretation. Then, researchers conduct the induction of summary to obtain substantive and formative conclusions.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The researchers find data which is in the form of the dialog containing of modality: tense (past, present and future), mode (desiderative, imperative, indicative, and interrogative), negation (no and not), adverb (frequency, manner, degree, quantity, and explanatory), and proposition: agentive case (A) (first personal pronoun, second pronoun, and third pronoun), experiential case (E) (verb-basic and verb-modal), instrumental case (I) (noun and sense), objective case (O) (human and thing), source case (S) (noun phrase and noun), goal case (G) (human and place), locative case (L) (area, part of house, and office), time case (T) (part of the day, year, and century), collateral case (C) (with + noun), and benefactive case (for + noun) spoken by actors in film "the Professor and the Madman" directed by P.B. Shemran as follows:

Modality

Modality is a statement in a sentence that states the speaker's attitude towards the thing being discussed, namely regarding the actions, circumstances, events, or attitudes towards the interlocutor. This attitude can take the form of a statement, possibility, desire, or permission. In Indonesian the modality is stated lexically (Chaer, 1994; Fillmore, 2003); which contains phrases (Pak, 1974), moods (mode), aspects, negations (Parera, 2009; Tarigan, 1990).



Table I
 Modality and Its Forms

Case Grammar Element	Types of Modality	Forms of Modality	
Modality	Tense	Past	
		Present	
		Future	
	Mode		Desiderative
			Imperative
			Indicative
			Interrogative
	Negation		No
			Not
	Adverb		Frequency
Manner			
Degree			
Quantity			
Explanatory			

Tense modality

Tense modality shows a description of the time of occurrence of work or deeds, experiences, or events as a form of information in the sentence mentioned with the predicate. Tense modality in general indicates the past, present, or future (Chaer, 2007).

Past

The modality of the past type is the modality that shows information about the elapsed time (Chaer, 1994).

- (1) He wanted them to make him laugh (Shemran, 2009)
- (2) He looked at Jack, and he started to laugh (Shemran, 2009)
- (3) My Lord, Dr. Minor got the wrong shot (Shemran, 2009).

The tense modality form in the sample (1), (2), and (3) can already be classified in the past tense. The past tense modality in the sample (1), (2), and (3) is indicated by using V-2. V-2 in the sample (1): wanted and (2): looked and started is regular verb, and (3): got is irregular verb. In the context of the sentence, the sample (1), (2), and (3) means that someone already did action in elapsed time.

Present

The modality of the present type is the modality that shows the current time when the happening occurs (Chaer, 1994).

- (4) I submit that the extraordinary, the unconventional (Shemran, 2009).
- (5) Now he is plucking his nose hair (Shemran, 2009).

The tense modality form in the sample (4) and (5) is the present tense. The present tense modality in the sample (4) is indicated by using V-I. The formula of the sample (4) is present tense: S + P (V-I). Whereas the present tense modality in the sample (5) is shown by two signs. They are: (a) the word "now" in the beginning of sentence; and (b) the structure of the sentence, namely to be + verb-I + ing. The formula of the sample (4) is present continuous tense. In the context of the sentence, the sample (4) and (5) means that someone does or is doing action in the present time.

Future

The modality of the future type is the modality that shows the information about the time that will be passed or future (Chaer, 1994).

- (6) You will be famous after this book is finished (Shemran, 2009).
- (7) We're leaving this place, we're going back to London (Shemran, 2009).

The tense modality in the sample (6) and (7) is the future tense. In the sample (6), the future tense modality is indicated by auxiliary verb or modal "will." The auxiliary verb or modal "will" in the sample (6) can also indicate several situations, namely the ability or willingness to write a book from someone's request. Whereas, the future tense modality in the sample (7) is demonstrated by to be + VI + ing. In the context of the sentence, the sample (6) and (7) means that someone will do an action in the future.

Mode modality

Modality has a relation with mode. A sentence is expressed capitalized (mode) when it contains the concept of modality. In this case, sentences that do not contain the concept of modality are referred to as unsigned sentences. Lyons mentions that a single declarative sentence is a non-capital sentence (the mode is unsigned). According to him, declarative sentences are indicative sentences (Lyons, 1968).

Desiderative

Desiderative mode according to the big Indonesian dictionary is the mode that expresses desire (Lyons, 1968).

- (8) I will collect my ideas to trigger yours (Shemran, 2009).
- (9) I want to share the good news with you (Shemran, 2009).

The mode modality in the sample (8) and (9) denotes a desiderative form or volition. The desiderative form or volition in the sample (8) is shown by auxiliary verb or modal "will" and in the sample (9) is shown by word "want." The sentence in the sample (8) means that someone wants to gather their ideas in order to bring up other people's ideas and in the sample (9) means that someone wants to share good news with others.

Imperative

The imperative mode according to the large Indonesian dictionary is a mode that expresses orders or restrictions (Lyons, 1968).

- (10) Please keep an eye on the letter that would come from the good doctor! (Shemran, 2009).
- (11) (Be) quiet...!! Quiet...!! (Shemran, 2009).

The mode modality in the sample (10) and (11) shows the imperative or command. In the sample (10), it is shown by many signs. They are: (a) the sentence begins with the word "please" means "to ask subtly and respectfully;" (b) the formula of sentence, namely predicate + object without mentioning the interlocutor; (c) intonation when the speaker says the sentence. It means that when the speaker says the sample (10), the interlocutor is already in front of him; (d) exclamation point (!) in the last of the sentence. In the context of the sample (10), the sentence means that the speaker orders the interlocutor to do something (keep an eye on the letter). Whereas, in the sample (11), it is demonstrated by three signs. They are: (a) to be + adjective in the beginning of the sentence; (b) intonation when the speaker says the sentence. It means that when the speaker says the sample (11), the interlocutor is already



in front of him; (d) exclamation point (!) in the last of the sentence. In the context of the sample (II), the sentence means that the speaker orders the interlocutor (audience in the court) to be quiet.

Indicative

The indicative mode according to the large Indonesian dictionary is the mode which states an objective or neutral attitude (Lyons, 1968).

(12) My Lord, Dr. Minor got the wrong shot (Shemran, 2009)

The mode modality in the sample (12) shows an indicative or neutral form. In the sample (12), it is shown that there is actuality, certainty and reality from the speaker's point of view. This mode consists of a statement of fact from a lawyer Dr. Minor which Dr. Minor shots he did miss the target or the wrong target. Indicators in the inductive form sentence can be seen in the gesture or body language of a lawyer, where there is emphasis in the sentence that has been described above.

Interrogative

The interrogative mode according to the big Indonesian dictionary is the mode that states questions (Lyons, 1968).

(13) Have you read it? (Shemran, 2009).

(14) Can you define it and tell us its history? (Shemran, 2009).

The mode modality in the sample (13) and (14) shows an interrogative form. In the sample (13) and (14), it is shown by two signs. They are: (a) the sentence begins with auxiliary verb (13) and modal (14). The positive form of the sample (13) is "You have read it" and the sample (14) is "You can define it;" and (b) the sentence of the sample (13) and (14) is ended by question mark (?). In the context of the sample (13) and (14), the sentence means that someone ask to other if they already read (13) and someone ask to other to define a thing (14). On the other hand, the pronouncement of the interrogative mode modality both of the sample (13 and (14) also has a distinctive question tone as if a question is spoken in a dialogue.

Negation modality

Negation modality is a type of modality that means denouncing or canceling a statemen (Chaer, 2009).

No

No is a form of negation modality. No cannot be interpreted as a particle to express a denial, rejection and denial. No in Indonesian language means "tidak."

(15) No Sir, no title (Shemran, 2009).

(16) I am no man's friend (Shemran, 2009).

The form of negation modality in the sample (15) and (16) is indicated by the word "no" followed by noun. The word "no" describes a rejection or denial of a pre-existing statement. The word no also illustrates that speaker wants to emphasize to his interlocutors that the speaker does not have a title or friend. In explaining grammar rules in English, the word "no" is used to describe an object or noun. The word "no" followed by object indicates the absence of a thing, both objects and non-objects.

Not

Not is a form of negation modality. Not is negative particle and often used to refute a statement. Not can be followed by verb, adjective, adverb, and noun. Not in Indonesian language means “bukan.”

- (17) I'm not crazy, mister! (Shemran, 2009).
- (18) So, he didn't mean to (Shemran, 2009).
- (19) This is not the Finean (Shemran, 2009).

The form of the negation modality in the sample (17) is shown by the negative particle “not” followed by adjective, in the sample (18) is indicated by “not” followed by verb-I mean, and in the sample (19) is demonstrated by “not” followed by noun. The particle “not” describes a rejection or denial of a pre-existing statement. In the context of the sentence, “not crazy” in the sample (17) means that the speaker is healthy-minded people; “not meant” in the sample (18) means that the someone does not mean what the people assume; and “not Finean” in the sample (19) means that Finean doesn't kill somebody, Finean is not a killer. In English grammar rules the use of “not” is much broader than “no” which can change positive sentences into negatives sentences.

Adverb modality

Adverb modality is a word that provides information on verbs, adjectives, predicate nouns, or sentences. More clearly adverb modality is a category that accompanies nouns, verbs and adjectives in the formation of phrases or clauses (Chaer, 2009).

Frequency

Adverb of frequency is a type of adverb modality that shows the frequency or number of times the activity is carried out or the event occurs (Chaer, 1994).

- (20) It is up to us to fix it once and for all (Shemran, 2009).
- (21) It's always been that way with all of them (Shemran, 2009).
- (22) Sometimes it sounds like gunfire. Sometimes like.... (Shemran, 2009).

The form of the adverb modality in the samples (20), (21), and (22) is adverb of frequency. The adverb modality of frequency in the sample (20) is shown by the multiplicative number “once,” in the sample (21) is demonstrated by the word “always,” and in the sample (22) is indicated by the word “sometimes.” In the context of the sentence, the sample (20) shows that the speaker wants to fix a ting in one time, the sample (21) demonstrates that speaker assumes that they are used to do this, and the sample (22) indicates that speaker argues that the happening occasionally seems like gunfire.

Manner

Adverb of manner is a type of adverb modality that states how an activity is performed or an event occurs. Adverb of manner usually is formed by adjective + ly (Chaer, 1994).

- (23) Inmates are angry. Spitting repeatedly (Shemran, 2009).
- (24) Honestly, Freddie, it's a bit much (Shemran, 2009).
- (25) Constantly leaping from his bed to search (Shemran, 2009).

The form of the adverb modality in the sample (23), (24), and (25) is adverb of manner. The adverb modality of manner in the sample (23) is shown by the word “repeatedly,” in the sample (24) is demonstrated by the word “honestly,” and in the sample (25) is indicated by the word “constantly.” In the sample (23), (24), and (25), the construction of adverb of manner is adjective + ly. In the context of the sentence, the adverb of manner “repeatedly” in the sample (23) shows how the action of “spitting” is



done, the adverb of manner “honestly” in the sample (24) indicates how the speaker argues, and the adverb of manner “constantly” in the sample (25) declares how the action “leaping” is acted.

Degree

Adverb of degree is a form of adverb modality that indicates grade (Chaer, 1994). This adverb of degree is divided into two, namely comparative degree and superlative degree. Comparative degree is the second degree of comparison. It is a type of adverb modality that compares two things, both in terms of characteristics, sizes and so on.

- (26) The language is developing faster than our progress (Shemran, 2009).
- (27) The more impossible, the greater the love (Shemran, 2009).

The form of the adverb modality in the sample (26) and (27) is degree. In this context of the samples (26) and (27), this adverb of degree is called comparative degree because: (a) known from the context of the sentence, it compares two things; (b) it has formula, namely adjective followed by er: faster (26) and greater (27), or more + adjective (more than two syllables): more impossible (27). In the context of the sentence, the word “faster” compares between language and progress. It means that language they have mastery develop faster or more quickly than their progress (26) and the word “more impossible” and “greater” compares between the probability of finding love and the love. It means that if someone feel more impossible he can't find the love, the love is getting much bigger and greater (27).

Superlative degree is the third degree of comparison. It is a type of adverb modality that compares three or more things, both in terms of characteristics, sizes and so on.

- (28) We are about to embark on the greatest adventure that language has ever known (Shemran, 2009).
- (29) The tongue is at its purest peak (Shemran, 2009).
- (30) The largest trading dominion ever known (Shemran, 2009).

The form of the adverb modality in the sample (28), (29), and (30) is degree. In this context of the sample (28), (29), and (30), this adverb of degree is called superlative degree because: (a) known from the context of the sentence, it compares three things or more; (b) it has formula, namely adjective followed by est: greatest (28), purest (29), and largest (30). In the context of the sentence, the word “greatest” shows a convincing speaker's explanation that the adventure that will be undertaken is the greatest adventure in the history: making the Oxford dictionary that has never been done before and there has been no substitute until now (28); the word “purest” indicates that all about pronunciation, the tongue determines everything (29); and the word “largest” demonstrates that the making of dictionary will be the biggest trade, the best academic work, and the highest income in history (30).

Quantity

Adverb of quantity is a type of adverb modality which indicates size or number (Chaer, 1994).

- (31) “80. Maybe 90 people”(Shemran, 2009).
- (32) Whatever you intend to do, Dr. Murray, you have one day (Shemran, 2009).

The form of the adverb modality in the sample (31) and (32) is quantity. In the context of the samples (31) and (32), the adverb of quantity is shown by cardinal number “80” and “90” in the sample (31) and “one” in the sample (32). The cardinal number “80” and “90” in the sample (31) means a number of people and the cardinal number in the sample (32) means a number of day to do work.

Explanatory

Adverb of explanatory is one type of adverb modality that describes the state or description of the subject, predicate, object, or time and place (Chaer, 1994).

- (33) There is nothing you can tell me to make this right! (Shemran, 2009).
- (34) And I know the same has been done to you (Shemran, 2009).
- (35) Get him off of me! Who did that to me? (Shemran, 2009).
- (36) On that fateful night of the 17th of February, the defendant woke with a start (Shemran, 2009).

The form of the adverb modality in the sample (33), (34), (35), and (36) is explanatory. The adverb of explanatory in the sample (33) is lied on the clause “You can tell me to make this right.” This clause clearly describes the predicate attribute (nothing). The construction of the sentence is S + P + AP (Attribute Predicate - auxiliary) + AE (Adverb of Explanatory). The adverb of explanatory in the sample (34) is lied on the clause “the same has been done to you.” This clause briefly explain the object (the same). The clause “the same has been done to you” is passive clause and if we change into active clause, it will be “somebody does the same to you.” The construction of the sentence is S + P + O + AE (Adverb of Explanatory). The adverb of explanatory in the sample (35) is lied on the clause “(get) off of me.” This clause indeed elaborates object “him.” The construction of the sentence is P (command) + O + AE (Adverb of Explanatory). The adverb of explanatory in the sample (36) is lied on the clause “the defendant woke with a start.” This clause reveals time “On that fateful night of the 17th of February.” The construction of the sentence is T + AE (Adverb of Explanatory).

Proposition

Proposition is a set of relations that are not tied to phrases that include verbs and nouns (and scope sentences, exist), separated from what is called an element (Tarigan, 1990). Fillmore uses the term proposition rather than a predicate because that includes what will be the subject of the sentence (Fillmore, 2003). Procedures that first inspired Fillmore, modern work has focused on ways to induce semantic roles from corpora without role annotation (Jurafsky, 2014). Proposition contains verbal plus one or more categories or constituency (Palmatier, 1972) of different cases. These categories which comprise a set of innate universal concepts covers cases: agentive, experience, instrument, objective, source, goal, locative, time, collateral, and benefactive (Anderson, 1986; Parera, 2009).



Table 2
 Proposition and Its Forms

Case Grammar Element	Types of Proposition	Forms of Proposition
Proposition	Agentive case (A)	First personal pronoun Second personal pronoun Third personal pronoun
	Experiential case (E)	Basic verb Verb (modal)
	Instrumental case (I)	Noun Sense
	Objective case (O)	Human Thing
	Source case (S)	Noun phrase Noun
	Goal case (G)	Human Place
	Locative case (L)	Area Part of house Office
	Time case	Part of the day Year Century
	Collateral case (C)	With + noun
	Benefactive case (B)	For + noun

Agentive case (A)

Agentive case (A) is a case that specifically states the subject or perpetrator in a happening or event (Parera, 2009; Tarigan, 1990).

First personal pronoun

The first personal pronoun is a type of personal pronoun that serves to replace the person speaking (Alwi, Dardjowidjojo, Lapoliwa, & Moeliono, 2019).

- (37) I also have a useful knowledge of Russian (Shemran, 2009).
 (38) I have to play it back, dad (Shemran, 2009).

The word “I” in the sample (37) and (38) is first personal pronoun. The word “I” both of in the sample (37) and (38) is agentive case because it refers to subject or actor in an event. In the context of the sentence, the sample (37) means that subject (I) possesses wide knowledge of Russian and the sample (38) declares that subject (I) should play something.

Second personal pronoun

The second personal pronoun is a type of personal pronoun used to replace the person spoken (Alwi et al., 2019).

- (39) You do not possess a university degree (Shemran, 2009).
 (40) No, no, you promised me! (Shemran, 2009).

The word “you” in the sample (39) and (40) is second personal pronoun. The word “you” in both of the sample (39) and (40) is agentive case because it refers to subject or actor in an event. In the context of the sentence, the sample (39) means that subject (you) doesn’t have a university degree and the sample (40) declares that subject (you) has a word to the speaker.

Third personal pronoun

The third personal pronoun is a type of personal pronoun used to replace the person spoken of (Alwi et al., 2019).

- (41) So, **he** didn't mean to (Shemran, 2009).
(42) **They**'ve got warm clothes now (Shemran, 2009).

The word “he” in the sample (41) and the word “they” in the sample (42) is the third personal pronoun. He is a single and they is a plural. The word “he” in the sample (41) and the word “they” in the sample (42) is agentive case because it refers to subject or actor in an event. In the context of the sentence, the sample (41) means that subject (he) didn't mean to hurt anybody and the sample (42) declares that subject (they) already have warm clothes.

Experiential case (C)

An experiential case is a type of case that specifically states psychological, sensation, emotional, and cognitive experiences or events (Parera, 2009).

- (43) What I know of love, the sickness often becomes the cure (Shemran, 2009).
(44) And they can, James, if there is love (Shemran, 2009).

The basic verb “know” in the sample (43) and the (verb) modal “can” in the sample (44) is an experiential case. The word “know” in the sample (43) means that the speaker has experience about love: the speaker suffered because love and found that the sickness is the cure. Because of the experience, the speaker says that “the sickness often becomes the cure.” The modal “can” in the sample (44) declares that the speaker believes that if there is love, somebody can do anything. The speaker believes in it because the speaker already has experience in that condition.

Instrumental case (I)

Instrumental case is the forceful case that is lifeless or the object is causally involved in the action or state introduced by the verb. Instrumental case are cases that involve a lifeless instrument which is the cause of an action or state expressed by a verb - which is characterized by conjunction “with” (Tarigan, 1990).

- (45) Let other people help to catch the ocean **with their wide net** (Shemran, 2009).
(46) And **with this system**, Mr. Murray how long do you estimate to finish your task? (Shemran, 2009).
(47) **With his blind eyes**, he can only see me in the dark (Shemran, 2009).

The combination between the preposition “with” in the sample (45), (46), and (47) and the noun phrase “their wide net” in the sample (45), “this system” in the sample (46), and “his blind eyes” in the sample (47) is instrumental case. The construction of instrumental case in three samples above (45), (46), and (47) is preposition (with) + noun phrase = prepositional phrase. The noun phrase “their wide net” in the sample (45) means that the noun phrase “their wide net” is an instrument that people may use to catch the ocean. The noun phrase “this system” in the sample (46) demonstrates that the noun phrase “this system” is an instrument that somebody should use in doing work. The noun phrase “his blind eyes” in the sample (47) means that the noun phrase “his blind eyes” is an instrument that somebody must use to see a thing.



Objective case (O)

The objective case (O) is a semantically neutral case, a case of everything that can be described or represented by a noun whose role in the action or state is introduced by the verb, introduced by the semantic interpretation of the verb itself. According to Charles J. Fillmore, the concept should be limited to things that are influenced by the action or state introduced by the verb (Parera, 2009; Tarigan, 1990).

- (48) On the road, he saw **people** running (Shemran, 2009).
- (49) Recently I submitted **a paper** on German verb retrogression (Shemran, 2009).

The word “people” in the sample (48) and the word “a paper” in the sample (49) is objective cases because in both sentences there is a description of a noun (people and a paper) whose role in action is introduced by the verb. In objective case grammar, a noun or phrase refers to anything or anyone with a neutral relationship. In the sample (48), the word “people” is not an agent but an objective case because the word “people” does not take any action. In the sample (49), the word “a paper” is not an instrument but an objective case because it isn’t a tool used to do anything.

Source case (S)

Source case is a type of case that becomes the reason for the formation of the process or circumstances or activities indicated by the verb (Tarigan, 1990).

- (50) **Your decisions** affect all the lives of this land (Shemran, 2009).
- (51) **The guilty** make recompense the victim (Shemran, 2009).

The noun phrase “your decision” in the sample (50) and the word “the guilty” in the sample (51) is source case. The noun phrase “your decision” in the sample (50) declares that the noun phrase “your decision” is source of causing the change of all the lives of the land: good, bad, and its dynamic. The noun phrase “your decision” places the subject slot. The word “the guilty” in the sample (51) indicates that the word “the guilty” is source of the victim being avenged or getting replied. The word “the guilty” also places the subject slot.

Goal case (G)

A goal case is a type of case that can be interpreted as destination and already expressed by a noun, which is usually characterized by a preposition “to” (Parera, 2009; Tarigan, 1990).

- (52) Take me **to him** (Shemran, 2009).
- (53) Send your word **to Oxford** (Shemran, 2009).

The combination between preposition “to” in the sample (52) and (53) and noun “him” in the sample (52) and “Oxford” in the sample (53) is goal case. The construction of goal case in both of sample (52) and (53) is preposition (to) + noun = prepositional phrase. In the context of the sentence, the sample (52) shows that the speaker asks to the interlocutor to take the speaker to somebody else’s place: it’s move from the speaker’s owner place to somebody else’s place; and the sample (53) means that the speaker asks the interlocutor to do something. It is “send the word to Oxford.”

Locative case (L)

Locative case is a type of a case that introduces the location, place (position), or spatial orientation of the action or state introduced by the verb. In case grammar, a noun or noun phrase that refers to the location or place where the action of the verb take place is called locative case (Tarigan, 1990).

- (54) Is considered dangerous for others. Held **in Block 2** (Shemran, 2009).

- (55) I tucked it **under the door** (Shemran, 2009).
(56) Mr. Gell has asked for me **at the Press Office** this morning (Shemran, 2009).

The combination between the preposition of place “in” in the sample (54), “under” in the sample (55), and “at” in the sample (56) and the noun phrase “Block 2” in sample (54), the word “the door” in the sample (55), and the noun phrase “the Press Office” in the sample (56) is locative case. The construction of locative case is preposition + noun or noun phrase = prepositional phrase. The prepositional phrase “in Block 2” in the sample (54) means place. In the context of the sentence, the prepositional phrase “in Block 2” is safe place for someone being hunted. The prepositional phrase “under the door” in the sample (55) means place. In the context of the sentence, the prepositional phrase “under the door” is the place when someone tucked. The prepositional phrase “at the Press Office” in the sample (56) means place. In the context of the sentence, the prepositional phrase “at the Press Office” is the place when the speaker and the interlocutor meet.

Time case (T)

The time case (T) is a type of case that introduces the time when the verbs performed by the actor or agent (Tarigan, 1990).

- (57) Mr. Gell has asked for me at the Press Office **this morning** (Shemran, 2009).
(58) I will be proposing this at an emergency meeting of the delegates **this afternoon** (Shemran, 2009).
(59) The statue was approved and colors designed **in 1849** (Shemran, 2009).
(60) We are missing the reference to the word "approve" **in the 17th and 18th centuries** (Shemran, 2009).

The noun phrase “this morning” in the sample (57) and “this afternoon” in the sample (58); and the prepositional phrase “in 1849” in the sample (59) and “in the 17th and 18th centuries” in the sample (60) is time case. The construction of time case is adverb of time or preposition + noun or noun phrase = prepositional phrase. The noun phrase “this morning” in the sample (57) and “this afternoon” in the sample (58) is part of day, whereas the prepositional phrase “in 1849” in the sample (59) and “in the 17th and 18th centuries” in the sample (60) is year and century. In the context of sentence, the noun phrase “this morning” in the sample (57) means the time when Mr. Gell asks the speaker to meet at the Press Office. The noun phrase “this afternoon” in the sample (58) means the time when the speaker proposes a thing at an emergency meeting of the delegates. The prepositional phrase “in 1849” in the sample (59) means the time when the dictionary statue is approved and colors is designed. The prepositional phrase “in the 17th and 18th centuries” in the sample (60) means the time when the speaker tells the interlocutor that the speaker misses the word “approve.”

Collateral case (C)

Collateral case (C) is the case for a noun phrase that bears a conjunctive relationship “with” and another noun phrase in the sentence (Parera, 2009).

- (61) I'll talk **with Bradley** (Shemran, 2009).
(62) I had a word **with him** (Shemran, 2009).

The prepositional phrase “with Bradley” in the sample (61) and “with him” in the sample (62) is collateral case. The construction of collateral case is preposition “with” + noun = prepositional phrase. In the context of the sentence, the prepositional phrase “with Bradley” in the sample (61) indicates that Bradley is the interlocutor of the speaker; someone and Bradley talk; and the prepositional phrase “with him” in the sample (62) declares that someone (him) make promise to the speaker; someone and the speaker have promise.



Benefactive case (B)

Benefactive case (B) is the case for a living being (which is animate) who gains by the action described by the verb. Benefactive is associated with the preposition “for” (Tarigan, 1990).

- (63) Are you sure this is what you want **for all of us?** (Shemran, 2009).
(64) Application **for an audience of English readers** in Great Britain (Shemran, 2009).

The combination between the preposition “for” in the sample (63) and (64) and the noun phrase “all of us” in the sample (63) and “an audience of English readers” in the sample (64) is benefactive case. The construction of benefactive case is preposition (for) + noun phrase = prepositional phrase. In the context of the sentence, the prepositional phrase “for all of us” in sample (63) means that the interlocutor want to do something to people (for all of us), people may take a benefit from the thing that the interlocutor do; and the prepositional phrase “for an audience of English readers” in the sample (64) means that the speaker creates the application that may be useful for an audience of English readers, audience of English readers may take benefit from the creation that the speaker creates.

The findings of this research is similar to what Charles J. Fillmore (1967, 1966, 2003) said that each sentence consists of modality and proposition. Modality is the description of a sentence as a statement of the speaker’s attitude towards something that is talked about actions, circumstances, and events. Modality is nothing but what is expressed by capital. Modality is the speaker’s attitude to his association with the proposition. Modality is an element of deep structure of sentences in the case grammar Charles J. Fillmore consisting of tense, mode, adverb, aspect, and negation. While the Proposition is a vertex consisting of a predicate or an active verb as its center (central node) and some arguments include nouns, adjectives, adverbs that are bound semantics in case. Fillmore states that cases have 10 types, namely agentive case (A), experiential case (E), instrumental case (I), objective case (O), source case (S), goal case (G), locative case (L), time case (T), collateral case (C), and benefactive case (B). The findings of this research also corroborate Charles J. Fillmore’s perspective that types of cases are formed in semantic relationships – the syntax between omen and verbum as a sentence or semantic relationship between multiple nouns and verbs or predicates as a set. Modality: types and forms, and proposition: types and forms will not be revealed if it does not look at the aspects of surface structure and deep structure (meaning) because modalities and propositions are born on grammatical construction between surface structure and deep structure (meaning). Surface structures are used to see grammatical construction of sentences, while deep structures are used to understand sentence coherence.

The findings of this research can be compared with the findings of previous researches. Comparison of the findings of the same problem, can be seen from the findings of (Alamsari, 2014; Galovic, 2017). From the findings of (Alamsari, 2014; Galovic, 2017) and this research, it can be concluded that these two studies have a relation point. In the context of the instrumental case, both of these researches agree that the instrument case is a type of case that states about the tool that becomes the cause of an event occurred. The instrumental case is always in the form of prepositional phrase, i.e. preposition (with) + noun or noun phrase. (Alamsari, 2014; Galovic, 2017) does not address many aspects in case grammar theory. It only discusses the instrumental case which is one of the ten parts of the proposition, while this study discusses something larger than just the instrumental case, namely types of modality consisting of tense (past, present and future), mode (desiderative, imperative, indicative, and interrogative), negation (no and not), adverb (frequency, manner, degree, quantity, and explanatory), and proposition: agentive case (A) (first personal pronoun, second pronoun, and third pronoun), experiential case (E) (verb-basic and verb-modal), instrumental case (I) (noun and sense), objective case (O) (human and thing), source case (S) (noun phrase and noun), goal case (G) (human and place), locative case (L) (area, part of house, and office), time case (T) (part of the day, year, and century), collateral case (C)

(with + noun), and benefactive case (for + noun). This is precisely what distinguishes and novelty of this research from (Alamsari, 2014; Galovic, 2017)'s research.

The findings of this research also can be compared to the findings of (Basid & Indah, 2020). After reading the findings of both of (Basid & Indah, 2020) and this research, it can be summarize that both of the two research findings have similar aspects: modality and proposition. The differences are (Basid & Indah, 2020) find that modality consists of tense (past, present and future), negation (*mane ade* and *tak ade*), and adverb (frequency, degree, comparative, quantity, and explanatory), and proposition: agentive case (A) (first personal pronoun and third pronoun), experiential case (E) (verb-basic), instrumental case (I) (first type leverage), objective case (O) (human and animal), source case (S) (human and ghost), goal case (G) (suffix), locative case (L) (village, area, *warung*), time case (T) (part of the day and week), while this research explores modality consisting of tense (past, present and future), mode (desiderative, imperative, indicative, and interrogative), negation (no and not), adverb (frequency, manner, degree, quantity, and explanatory), and proposition: agentive case (A) (first personal pronoun, second pronoun, and third pronoun), experiential case (E) (verb-basic and verb-modal), instrumental case (I) (noun and sense), objective case (O) (human and thing), source case (S) (noun phrase and noun), goal case (G) (human and place), locative case (L) (area, part of house, and office), time case (T) (part of the day, year, and century), collateral case (C) (with + noun), and benefactive case (for + noun). It can be concluded that this research improve (Basid & Indah, 2020)'s research.

The findings of this research indeed can be compared to the findings of (Ahla & Putri, 2020), (Alfadhil & Rahmadi, 2020), (Basid & Maghfiroh, 2021), and (Fajri, Selviana, & Prasetyo, 2020). The findings of the three previous researches have a connection with this research. The three previous researches find that the sentence consist of proposition: agentive case (A), experiential case (E), objective case (O), locative case (L), time case (T), and instrument case (I) (Ahla & Putri, 2020); agentive case (A), commutative case (C), dative case (D), and source case (S); and agentive case (A), experiential case (E), objective case (O), source case (S) (Alfadhil & Rahmadi, 2020), and goal case (G) (Fajri, Selviana, & Prasetyo, 2020). These three previous researchers only find some of cases, some of them use the old terms of proposition such as commutative case and dative case (this old terms are no longer used after 1971), and does not describe modality and a complete proposition, while this research reveals modality consisting of tense (past, present and future), mode (desiderative, imperative, indicative, and interrogative), negation (no and not), adverb (frequency, manner, degree, quantity, and explanatory), and a complete proposition: agentive case (A) (first personal pronoun, second pronoun, and third pronoun), experiential case (E) (verb-basic and verb-modal), instrumental case (I) (noun and sense), objective case (O) (human and thing), source case (S) (noun phrase and noun), goal case (G) (human and place), locative case (L) (area, part of house, and office), time case (T) (part of the day, year, and century), collateral case (C) (with + noun), and benefactive case (for + noun).

The findings of this research prove two things: (1) a sentence in various languages such as Greek, German, Malay, and Indonesian is composed of structures. The structures in every sentence of various language have different places and orders; (2) if a sentence in various languages such as Greek, German, Malay, and Indonesian composed of structures is analyzed by using Charles J. Fillmore's case grammar, those structures are included in the modality and proposition.

CONCLUSION

There are 4 types of modalities and 10 types of propositions contained in film "the Professor and the Madman" based on Charles J. Fillmore's perspective. In detail, the researchers concluded as follows: (1) modality has 4 types, including tense: past, present and future; mode: desiderative, imperative, indicative, interrogative; negation: no and not; adverb: frequency, manner, degree, quantity, and explanatory; (2) proposition has 10 types. They are agentive case (A): first personal pronoun, second pronoun, and third pronoun; experiential case (E): verb (basic) and verb (modal); instrumental case (I): noun and sense; objective case (O): human and thing; source case (S): noun phrase and noun; goal case



(G): human and place; locative case (L) area, part of house, and office; time case (T): part of the day, year, and century; collateral case (C): with + noun; and benefactive case: for + noun.

This research is limited to the visible construction of the sentences, while there are many sentences whose construction is not visible but will be visible when viewed from the context. Therefore, future researchers can investigate a case grammar study in the construction of the sentence by basing it on the context of the sentence as well as will also feel more interesting if they develop the construction of the sentence based on its functions and its impact toward meaning. As a reminder for the future researchers, if they want to study the language using the point of view of the case grammar, then they must have mastery of three areas of science, namely syntax, morphology, and semantics. The goal is for the findings to be revealed in detail and comprehensively.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The researchers dedicate this publication to the Forum of Young Researchers, Department of Arabic and Literature, Faculty of Humanities, State Islamic University of Maulana Malik Ibrahim of Malang, Indonesia that has supported to conduct this research.

REFERENCES

- Ahla, S. S. F., & Putri, S. M. K. (2020). ata bahasa kasus dalam cerpen Laki-laki Tua Tanpa Nama karya Budi Darma berdasarkan perspektif Charles J. Fillmore. In A. Basid (Ed.), *Linguistik Modern: Tata Bahasa Kasus dan Transformatif Generatif* (pp. 49–67). Malang: Edulitera.
- Alamsari, F. (2014). Instrumental case in the novel of Spicerwick Chronicles Book 5: The warth of mulgarath: A case grammar approach. *Jurnal Bahasa dan Pariwisata*, 2(1), 1–11. Retrieved from <http://stbayapariaba.ac.id/unduh/ki-2014-fuji.pdf>
- Alfadhil, M. T. A. F., & Rahmadi. (2020). Tata bahasa kasus dalam sosial media tweet Rocky Gerung berdasarkan perspektif Charles J. Filmor. In A. Basid (Ed.), *Linguistik Modern: Tata Bahasa Kasus dan Transformatif Generatif* (pp. 69–87). Malang: Edulitera.
- Alwi, H., Dardjowidjojo, S., Lapoliwa, H., & Moeliono, A. M. (2019). *Tata bahasa baku bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.
- Anderson, J. (1986). Structural analogy and case grammar. *Lingua*, 70(2–3), 79–129. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-3841\(86\)90035-5](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-3841(86)90035-5)
- Andini, R. (2016). *Analisis semantis verba pada cerpen Tsubaki no Shita no Sumire dengan tinjauan tata bahasa kasus*. Universitas Brawijaya.
- Arutjunova, N. D. (1975). Problems of syntax and semantics in the works of charles fillmore. *Linguistic*, 13(150), 5–14. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.1975.13.150.5>
- Azizah, I. N., Wahya, W., & Machdalena, S. (2020). Exploring the se of adverb ‘literally’ in corpus of contemporary American English. *Lensa: Kajian Kebahasaan, Kesusastraan, dan Budaya*, 10(2), 250–262. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.26714/lensa.10.2.2020.250-262>
- Basid, A., & Indah, R. I. (2020). Tata bahasa kasus dalam film Upin dan Ipin berdasarkan perspektif Charles J. Fillmore. In A. Basid (Ed.), *Linguistik Modern: Tata Bahasa Kasus dan Transformatif Generatif* (p. 3–48.). Malang: Edulitera.
- Basid, A., & Maghfiroh, D. L. (2021). Case grammar in the movie “The Gentlemen” based on the perspective of Charles J. Fillmore. *Seloka: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia*, 10(1), 77–87. Retrieved from <https://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/seloka/article/view/45491>
- Cahyadi, I. W. W. (2013). Semantic role: A case grammar approach in “the Minister’s Black Veil. *Humanis*, 5(2), 1–8. Retrieved from [file:///C:/Users/LENOVO/Downloads/7091-I-12144-I-10-20131113 \(1\).pdf](file:///C:/Users/LENOVO/Downloads/7091-I-12144-I-10-20131113 (1).pdf)
- Chaer, A. (1994). *Linguistik umum*. Jakarta: PT. Rineka Cipta.
- Chaer, A. (2007). *Linguistik umum*. Jakarta: PT. Rineka Cipta.
- Chaer, A. (2009). *Sintaksis bahasa Indonesia (pendekatan proses)*. Jakarta: PT. Rineka Cipta.

- Chu, P. C. (1999). Verbs are not cases: Applying case grammar to document retrieval. *Information Processing Letters*, 71(1), 29–34. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/s0020-0190\(99\)00080-0](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/s0020-0190(99)00080-0)
- Connolly, L. A. (1987). Case grammar and word order in German: the case for place by case. *Studies in Language. International Journal Sponsored by the Foundation "Foundations of Language,"* 11(1), 129–161. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1075/sl.11.1.06>
- Cook, W. A. (1970). The tagmemic-case grammar model. *American Speech*, 45(3), 262–277. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2307/454843>
- D'Angelo, F. J. (1976). Notes toward a semantic theory of rhetoric within a case grammar framework. *College Composition and Communication*, 27(4), 359–362. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2307/356297>
- Evans, K. M. (2014). *Merencanakan penelitian dalam pendidikan*. Surabaya: Bina Ilmu.
- Faisal, S. (1990). *Penelitian kualitatif: Dasar-dasar dan aplikasi*. Malang: YA3.
- Fajri, A. A. N. S., & Prasetyo, A. P. (2020). Tata bahasa kasus dalam novel Sang Pencuri Warna karya Yersita berdasarkan perspektif Charles J. Fillmore. In A. Basid (Ed.), *Tata Bahasa Kasus dan Transformatif Generatif* (pp. 91–115). Malang: Edulitera.
- Fajri, N., Yoesoef, A., & Nur, M. (2016). Pengaruh model pembelajaran kooperatif tipe talking stick dengan strategi joyful learning terhadap prestasi belajar siswa pada mata pelajaran IPS kelas VII MTsN Meuraxa Banda Aceh. *JIM: Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Pendidikan Sejarah*, 1(1).
- Ferris, D. (1999). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: A response to Truscott (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/10503309912331332611>
- Fillmore, C. (1967). The case for case. *Chemistry & Industry*, 79(9), 41–49. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/cind.799_13.x
- Fillmore, C. J. (1966). Towards a modern of case. *Modern Studies in English*, 34(3), 361–375.
- Fillmore, C. J. (2003). Form and meaning in language. *Stanford: Centre for the Study of Language & Information Publications*, 37(3), 234–253.
- Fillmore, C. J., Ackerman, F., Kay, P., & Connor, M. C. O. (2014). Charles J. Fillmore. *Language*, 90(3), 755–761. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2014.0060>
- Fletcher, P. (1971). Case grammar: Its viability as an alternative grammatical model. *Lingua*, 28(1), 237–350. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-3841\(71\)90059-3](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-3841(71)90059-3)
- Galovic, F. (2017). The phonological system of the local dialect of Pražnica. *Fluminensia*, 29(2), 91–110. <https://doi.org/10.31820/f.29.2.5>
- Indrawati, N., Bijaksana, M. A., & Agustin, R. D. (2016). Pelabelan peran semantis menggunakan tata bahasa kasus. *Masyarakat Telematika dan Informasi: Jurnal Penelitian Teknologi Informasi dan Komunikasi*, 4(2), 85–108. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.17933/mti.v4i2.54>
- Irina, F. (2017). *Metode penelitian terapan*. Yogyakarta: Parama Ilmu.
- Jurafsky, D. (2014). Obituary: Charles J. Fillmore. *Computational Linguistics*, 40(3), 725–731. https://doi.org/10.1162/COLI_a_00201
- Lyons, J. (1968). *Introduction to theoretical linguistics* (Vol. 510). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mahsun, M. S. (2005). *Metode penelitian bahasa: tahapan strategi, metode dan tekniknya*. Jakarta: PT Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Nilsen, D. L. F. (1970). Some notes on case grammar in English. *Word*, 26(2), 271–277. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/00437956.1970.11435598>
- Olsen, W. (2011). *Data collection: Key debates and methods in social research*. London: Sage Publications.
- Pak, T. (1974). Absurdities in Fillmore's case grammar. *Studia Linguistica*, 28(1), 19–50. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9582.1974.tb00603.x>



- Palmatier, R. A. (1972). *A glossary for English transformational grammar*. New York: Century-Crofts.
- Parera, J. D. (2009). *Dasar-dasar analisis sintaksis*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Prihatini, A. (2018). Perpindahan frasa nomina benefactive ke argument-position dalam kalimat pasif bitransitif pada ragam bahasa lisan anak usia prasekolah. *KEMBARA: Jurnal Keilmuan Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pengajarannya (e-Journal)*, 4(2), 128–140. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.22219/kembara.v4i2.7045>
- Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. W. (2013). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. London: Routledge.
- Saksena, A. (1975). A case grammar of Hindi (with a special reference to the causative sentences) by Lakshmi Bai Balachandran. *Language: PMLA/Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, 51(5), 753–760. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1632/s0030812900076318>
- Shemran, P. . (2009). *The professor and the madman*. London: Longman.
- Subaeki, B., Manaf, K., Pitoyo, D., Setiawan, H., Sugiri, T., & Effendi, A. (2020). New normal concept in E-learning context: An application of the delone and mclean information system model. In *14th International Conference on Telecommunication Systems, Services, and Applications, TSSA 2020*. Universitas Sangga Buana, Faculty of Engineering, Department of Information System, Bandung, Indonesia: Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSSA51342.2020.9310891>
- Suparnis, S. (2012). Tata bahasa kasus (case grammar). *Komposisi: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa, Sastra, dan Seni*, 9(2), 126–131. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.24036/komposisi.v9i2.96>
- Tarigan, H. G. (1990). *Pengajaran tata bahasa kasus*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Angkas.
- Theresiawati, Seta, H. B., Hidayanto, A. N., & Abidin, Z. (2020). Variables affecting e-learning services quality in Indonesian higher education: Students' perspectives. *Journal of Information Technology Education: Research*, 19, 259–286. <https://doi.org/10.28945/4489>
- Townsend, K., Loudoun, R., & Lewin, D. (2016). *Handbook of qualitative research methods on human resource management: Innovative techniques*. United Kingdom: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, 46(2), 327–369. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1996.tb01238.x>
- Truscott, J. (1999). The case for “The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes”: A response to Ferris. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(2), 111–122. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(99\)80124-6](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(99)80124-6)
- Yendra, S. S. (2016). *Mengenal ilmu bahasa (linguistik)*. Yogyakarta: Deepublish.