Chapter V

CRITICAL ASSESSMENT OF FILLMORE'S CASE GRAMMAR MODEL
V.1 Preliminary

Fillmore's case grammar theory appears to have good appeal as it has the semantic base in his conception of case to describe language. In his article 'Some problems for Case Grammar' (1971) Fillmore explained his own position with much clarification. Here he referred to his earlier work, that is, the elaborate article 'The Case for Case' (1968) in which he had stated that his position there was that of the 'deep structure interpretivist' as it would then be called, but he later on stated:

"Since my efforts were largely directed toward the classification of lexical items and the analysis of complement patterns of ordinary verbs and adjectives, it was of the sort that today would be called 'lexicalist'" (Fillmore, 1971: 35).

He thought of his earlier work not as a proposal to eliminate deep structures altogether, but as an effort to find a level of syntactic structure which was deeper than that offered by the Standard Theory of Noam Chomsky. In the 1971 article he further stated that he was going to reverse the position as he assumed to be taken by the traditional grammarians and took the 'case uses' as the basic aspect and regarded the observable 'case forms' as derivable from them by the rules of grammar. He was encouraged to do so because the case uses had, as he observed, a lot in common between one language and the another. He thought of positing case uses for all languages. The commonalities in regard to presenting case uses can be observed in both English and Marathi. Grammarians of English such as Henry Sweet (1898), C.T. Onions (1905), Otto Jespersen (1924), Paul Roberts (1964) and Quirk et al. (1972) identified two or three or four form-based case categories in English and discussed different uses of each of them. Henry Sweet's two case categories were the common case used to express subject, direct and indirect object, vocative relation and also to express direction, space and adverbial relations, and the Genitive case subdivided into personal or subjective, objective, predicative and 'pleonastic' genitive depending on their
uses. Otto Jespersen (1924) presented two kinds of classification of cases in English 'syntactic' cases and 'analytic' cases. He stated that cases stand for address (vocative), subject (nominative), predicative, object (accusative and dative), connection (genitive), place and time, many different relations (locative etc), measure (no special case), manner (no special case) and instrument (instrumental). Paul Roberts (1964) agreed to have only two form-based case categories in English which were the Common and the Genitive case. He presented different meanings or uses of the Genitive case like possessive Genitive, subject Genitive, object Genitive, Genitive of measure, descriptive Genitive, Genitive of origin, appositive Genitive, partitive Genitive etc. Quirk et al. (1972) stated that English nouns have two-case system: the unmarked Common Case (boy) and the marked Genitive Case (boy's), whereas English pronouns have three cases with the addition of common case divided into Subjective and Objective cases. They discussed different meanings or uses of Genitive Case as Possessive genitive, Subjective genitive, genitive of Origin, Objective genitive and Descriptive genitive.

On the contrary, Charles Fillmore thought of positing case uses for all languages to be universally applicable. His position in forming the case categories was that of a semanticist. His case uses or the semantic functions of his cases, as he claimed, could be seen as realized in the form of NP's with different case endings and which are terminations or postpositions or no terminations in Marathi or as suffixes or prepositional constructions in English or possibly in some other forms in other languages.

V. 2 Descriptive problems in Fillmore's Case Grammar

Fillmore himself stated that in the meantime from 1968 to 1971 he encountered a large number of descriptive problems that turned out to be interactable within the model as he had been conceiving it. Therefore, he revised his earlier model (1968) in 1971, but still was aware of its
shortcomings. In his article ‘Some problems for case grammar’ (1971) he tried to expose some of the difficulties of the ‘fact and principle’ which the model faces (Fillmore, 1971 : 36-37).

Fillmore’s case notions are, as he claimed, “a set of universal, presumably innate concepts, which identify certain types of judgements human beings are capable of making about the events going on around them such as who did it, who it happened to, what got changed, and so forth” (Fillmore, 1968 : 24). It is these meanings which are claimed to be universal across languages and constitute the deep structure cases of the case grammar model.

In his later article ‘Some problems for case grammar’ (Fillmore, 1971) Fillmore clarified his position as follows:

"I see a transformational grammar with a case base as having in general the following properties. The propositional case of a simple sentence consists of a ‘predicator’ (verb, adjective, or noun) in construction with one or more entities, each of these related to the predicator in one of the semantic functions known as (deep structure) ‘cases’. The cases identify the role which the entities serve in the predication, these roles taken from a repertory defined once and for all human languages and including that of the instigator of an action, that of the experiencer of a psychological event, that of an object which undergoes a change or movement, that of the location of an event, and so on.” (Fillmore, 1971 : 37)

But he further admitted that he recognized the emptiness of this assumption in the absence of a coherent grammatical theory in which the cases play a crucial role.

V. 3 Critique of Fillmore

A number of scholars analyzed and commented on Fillmore’s
Case Grammar which throw light on the weaknesses as well as advantages of Fillmore’s Case Grammar model. Some of them are reviewed in brief in this section. Walter Cook’s comment on Fillmore’s Case Grammar is remarkable.

“The wider appeal of case grammar is probably due to the fact that, after a long period in which meaning was first ignored and then relegated to an interpretive role, semantics could be approached directly. The linguist could now deal with meaning in much the same way as the logician does but with more attention to the differences to be found in natural languages. Case grammar provided a system for analyzing the content behind the clause rather than its surface structure. If syntactic studies were based on visible language structures, then the meaning behind the structure was ‘empirically discoverable’ (Fillmore, 1968: 5) given that any language is a system of communication. The data is not in language expression but in the content behind the expression. This content could now be expressed in case grammar terms. The attempt to analyze meaning, no matter how defective the model, directly turned the minds of analysts towards meaning rather than form and this attempt to analyze meaning is the principal challenge offered by the introduction of the theory of case grammar” (Cook, 1989: 28).

N.D. Arutjunova (1975) in his article ‘Problems of syntax and semantics in the works of Charles Fillmore’ tried to survey the general linguistic aspect of Fillmore’s theories presented in his 1966, 1968 and 1971 articles and remarked that in essence, Fillmore was building the edifice of case grammar without having fixed his base, that is, without having defined the elementary (primary) position (Arutjunova, 1975: 8). According to him, lack of precision and explicitness in the principles of identifying cases was another fault of Fillmore’s theory and for the most part,
Fillmore relied upon our intuitive ideas of the situation that was being represented by the sentence which was an insecure guide. He commented that Fillmore's set of cases included functions which are associated with identical semantic positions; this was something like Hamlet and Othello appearing in the same tragedy (Arutjunova, 1975: 10).

Two other kinds of difficulties in Fillmore's theory were pointed out by Arutjunova, one was a result of the necessity of defining the elementary position; and the other was caused by the task of identifying and differentiating the semantic functions of arguments whose predicates differ in meaning; and he commented that these problems could not be solved on the referential (purely semantic) level of analysis, within which Fillmore operated.

In the concluding part of his article Arutjunova criticized Fillmore's theory as follows:

"In Fillmore's works ... we come across concepts which seem to be working in opposite directions. When studying the sentence-sense, that is working in the sphere which had been dominated by the communicative approach, Fillmore shifts the emphasis to denotational level of analysis. On the other hand, when dealing with the meaning of the word, Fillmore emphasizes the importance of the communicative approach. In the area of syntax, Fillmore bases his ideas on the notion that the denotative function is a property of the sentence as well as of the word. Treating the lexicon, Fillmore's underlying concept is that the meaning of a predicative word corresponds to its communicative value, and not to the sum of the differential semantic features which define the quantity of information transmitted by it. The meaning of words, when specialized in the predicative function by virtue of this very specialization approaches the meaning of sentences. Thus, Charles Fillmore, introduces to syntax the ideas and methods of lexicology, and to lexicology, some of the concepts and
principle characteristics of syntax." (Arutjunova, 1975: 12)

Fillmore's case grammar is strongly criticized by Paul Mellema (1974) in his article 'A brief against Case Grammar'. Examining Fillmore in critical light he states:

"Fillmore's writings are typically not polemical; they tend simply to explain how this or that linguistic phenomenon may be described within the framework of case grammar, without examining in detail the question of whether (or how economically) the standard theory of transformational grammar could describe the same phenomenon. Fillmore leaves his readers to draw their own conclusions about what constitutes evidence for case grammar and against the standard theory, and about the relevant importance of the various arguments for case grammar" (Paul Mellema, 1974: 39).

The Standard Theory of Chomsky (1965) claims semantic relevance primarily for grammatical relations at the level of deep structure. Mellema points out from Fillmore's argument that even at the level of deep structure, the grammatical relation terms 'subject' and 'direct object', as defined by Chomsky, are inadequate to the needs of a semantic theory for English. Fillmore (1966: 363) observes that the deep subject of one sentence may have the same semantic role as the deep object of another sentence. According to Fillmore, subject relation and the direct object relation may correspond to any of a number of distinct semantic relations, depending on the verb and on other constituents in the sentence.

"... The semantic role of deep structure subjects appears not to be universal .... The involvement of the entity named by the subject NP appears to be quite different in each case ... there appears to be no common notional property of 'subjectness' which semantic descriptions of the given sentences can exploit"

Mellema observes that Fillmore has presented evidence that the semantic component, in mapping grammatical relations into semantic ones, must on some occasions map the grammatical subject relation and the grammatical object relation into exactly the same semantic role. Moreover, it appears that the subject relation may be mapped into any of a half-dozen or so semantic roles, and the same applies to the object relation and these semantic roles are the various case roles in Fillmore analyzing language at a deep structure level.

Another critique of Fillmore is in Zygmunt Frajzyngier's article 'Against the universality of Spatial Source and Goal' (1975) showing that sentences containing verbs of motions and sentences containing stative verbs can be analyzed as having one Locative case rather than Source and / or Goal for the former and Location for the latter. He proves that the analysis based on Awutu, a Kwa language, assigns the direction features to verbs, in accordance with the linguistic facts present in the Kwa group of languages. By analyzing a few sentences in the Awutu language, the author shows that Source and Goal cannot be postulated as universal deep structure cases but there is no claim being made that there are no languages in which such deep cases do exist. He observes that within the framework of Case Grammar if Source and Goal are postulated, they have to be realized in Awutu by embedded sentences as the distinction between Source and Goal is realized by verbs only, and within one propositional core (with no embedding or conjoining) only one of those notions can occur. These facts make Frajzyngier to argue against the establishment of these two deep structure cases. Therefore, instead of Source and Goal, he deals with one deep structure case, Locative (Frajzyngier, 1975: 353).

Peter Sgall (1980) pointed out that it was in Fillmore (1977) the author endeavored to specify the level of his deep cases in a linguistic
description (in particular with respect to its relationship to other levels) in a more precise way than that found in his earlier writings (Sgall, 1980: 525). Fillmore considered "this new interpretation as a position in the theory of grammatical relations and as a position in semantic theory with which one could associate this slogan: MEANINGS ARE RELATIVIZED TO SCENES" (Fillmore, 1977: 59). It is apparent that in 1977 Fillmore placed case grammar within the context of general semantic theory. The three terms he used to explain it were SCENE, PERSPECTIVE AND SALIENCE, which are discussed in detail in Chapter IV.

Don L.F. Nilsen in his article 'Some notes on Case Grammar in English' (1970) criticized Fillmore's case grammar (1968) to be a grammar of sets and so to lack much of the justification for phrase-structure rules. In his article he intended to support case grammar by setting up a number of sets of verbs and it seemed to him that the treatment of them could be efficiently handled only by the use of case grammar or something of the sort. According to him, much evidence supported the fact that a grammar based on deep structure cases was a correct form of universal grammar, whether this indicated a nullification of the phrase-structure rules or not was still open for investigation.

Ty Pak in his article 'Absurdities in Fillmore's case grammar' (1974) criticized Fillmore's case grammar theory to be based on contradictory principles and found it unworkable. He pointed out some ambiguities and their consequences in Fillmore's theory. According to Ty Pak, Fillmore's decision "adjectives constitute a subset of verbs" (Fillmore, 1968: 27 fn. 36) creates an imbalance with regard to the predicative noun, and the syntactic parallels between the two predicatives are well known, as noted by Fillmore himself, for example, the use of adverbs like 'quite' for both (Fillmore, 1968: 84). Ty Pak also pointed out that Fillmore's definitions of the cases were so vague that one case could be another and his inventory of cases changed from year to year (Pak, 1974: 35). For example, in his 1968 model Fillmore defined Agentive as "the case of the
animate being affected by the action or state identified by the verb" (Fillmore, 1968 : 25). In 1971 article he defines Agent as 'the instigator of an action, the principle cause of an event. The only difference between the two was animateness, but this feature, the internal property of an object, according to Ty Pak, should not figure so importantly in the determination of case, the inter-relationship of one object to another in the action or state identified by the verb. Similarly, Agentive (A) in Fillmore 1968 is defined as the case of animate perceived instigator of the action identified by the verb" but if ‘instigate’ is understood as “cause”, the definition of instrument (I) as “the case of inanimate force or object causally involved in the action or state identified by the verb” fits Agentive just as well, except, again for the animateness difference and the intra-object property “animateness”, like other properties such as ‘square’, ‘round’, ‘sweet’ is irrelevant.

Fillmore’s Instrument case has multiple definitions. It is the immediate cause of an event; it is a thing which the Agent manipulates; in non-Agentive causality the subject of the verb ‘cause’ are also immediate causes and are classed as sentences embedded under the Instrument case; natural forces are also subsumed under the Instrument case; for psychological verbs the Instrument identifies the stimulus. Thus, we come across a host of definitions of Instrument, which requires, rather, a wider examination of this case.

Werner Abraham (1978 : 694) upholds Fillmore’s theory of case grammar admitting that some of the concepts developed within it have gained a solid and lasting foothold in applied linguistics, in artificial intelligence, and in experienced work in cognitive psychology, to name but a few fields related to theoretical linguistics.

On the other hand, St. Finke (1974) gravely criticizes case grammar. W. Abraham summarizes Finke’s gravest points of criticism against Fillmore’s case grammar model as follows:

1. Case grammar (if we consider the formulation that was elaborated in
Fillmore's 1971 article ‘Some problems of Case Grammar’) claims to be a theory of the grammatical structure of natural languages based on empirical conditions which cannot be safely assumed. This is certainly the case with respect to such propositions as ‘the singularity principle’ (only one case type per simple sentence), the ‘hierarchical relation’ posited to hold among the deep cases operative in the conversion of the semantic deep structure to the grammatical sentential relations, and the assumed links between ‘case frames, case relations, and grammatical relations’.

2. The claims with respect to the universal status of the case concepts, the principles governing their combinability as well as the claims about their perceptual and cognitive validity are still questionable.

3. Given the shaky empirical adequacy of case grammar, the Generative standard theory not only seems to be equally powerful, but even superior with respect to the syntactic component of the linguistic description. As regards the semantic explanatory adequacy, just any semantics based on model theory is crucially superior to the case grammar model.

4. Case grammar is inadequate in terms of form in that it blends aspects of phrase structure grammar and dependency grammar. Furthermore, as soon as variables and quantifiers in the sense of predicate logic are introduced in a sentence, the case relations can no longer be regarded to be functions applying on one single level. Most essentially, however, not only are the concepts of relational case vaguely defined, but any attempt at sharper definitions of the case concepts in the model-theoretic sense is doomed to failure because of the principally imprecise nature of the concepts of semantic case, which obstructs a higher degree of explicitness by any methodological standard” (Abraham, 1978 : 696-697)

Fillmore's theory of case relations was employed as a descriptive
framework by the field linguists as pointed out by Janet D. Fodor (1977) and was applied in the study of language acquisition (see Brown, 1973). But it is no longer receiving as much attention from theoretical linguists as it did a few years ago. The reason perhaps is this: the theory defines a level of deep structure more abstract and more 'semantic' than the standard deep structure level, and correspondingly employs fewer interpretive semantic rules. Those who might be expected to be sympathetic to the position of generative semantists, have in fact overtaken it. Generative Semantics has a deep structure level IDENTICAL to the semantic level, and has correspondingly no interpretive semantic rules at all. (Janet D. Fodor, 1977 : 89)

The Standard Theory has a positive reason to reject Fillmore's proposal. As Fillmore himself noted, his transformations are not meaning-preserving. He comments that he is inclined to tolerate the reinsertion into grammatical theory of transformations with semantic import (of a highly restricted kind). It is, however a fundamental principle of the (non-extended) standard theory that transformations do not change meaning.

Stanley Starosta (1987 : 67) comments that classical Fillmorean case grammar is situationally rather than grammatically oriented (1987 : 67). Fillmore himself states that cases are "...a type of judgement human beings are capable of making about the events that are going on around them" (Fillmore, 1968 : 24). Stanley Starosta believes that this situational orientation has in fact been primarily responsible for the great popularity of case grammar over the years, especially among students and linguistically-unchurched information scientists.

Nicholas Ostler (1980) comments on Fillmore's case grammar as follows:

"...explicit theories of functional roles as have been given within the purely linguistic literature have tended to take the roles or primitives, without giving an accompanying theory of predicate
structure to integrate them. Most notable in this respect is Fillmore 1968, where notional definitions in terms of states and actions are given for a number of roles (called ‘cases’) ... But it is no more than a preliminary step in the right direction. There is no sense that these ‘cases’ form a complete, coherent system: for instance, there is no accompanying theory of what makes some of these roles compatible with states, some with actions and some with both. In latter work (1977) Fillmore suggests that the cases should be relativized to a theory of SCENES, a theory which seems to have something in common with the componential analysis of predicates. But again no concrete theory is forthcoming; the problem is recognized, but we get no more than hints as to what might constitute a solution. It does not appear that the various epigoni of Fillmore’s ‘Case Grammar’ have made any further steps in the direction of grounding the Cases more firmly (though cf. Cook 1978). One heretic branch (Starosta, 1978) has even suggested that the direct link between Fillmorean Case and participant role be severed, so that Cases are looked on primarily as primitives of SYNTACTIC theory, primitives whose main distinguishing property is that only one instance of each can occur per sentence: apparently, it is a purely arbitrary matter of lexical selection which Cases accompany with verb or adjective. Not even an outline is given of what, on the new view, the relevance of the Cases is to semantic interpretation” (Ostler, 1980: 20-21).

An article entitled ‘Some remarks on Case Grammar’ (1970) by Rodney Huddleston includes the examination of Fillmore’s (1968) four cases out of six, the Agentive, the Instrumental, the Dative and the Objective. According to Huddleston the definitions of these cases and their subsequent exemplification raise a number of questions.

The feature of animateness applied to identify and distinguish
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Fillmore’s 1968 case Agentive from Force, and Dative from Objective was considered to be irrelevant to participant roles by Huddleston. It is discarded by Fillmore himself in his 1971 model. Fillmore’s claim that each case relationship occurs only once in a simple sentence is considered not to be necessary by Huddleston. He remarks that the Objective case is defined by Fillmore (1968) in purely negative terms, so it is contended by Huddleston that there are empirical grounds for recognizing some simple sentences with two occurrences of a single case. The examples illustrated by him are:

The post office is on the right of / opposite the bank.

The bank is on the left of / opposite the post office.

However, in accordance with the Fillmore 1971 model the two cases in the above sentences would be labelled as the Object and the Location.

Fillmore’s Case Grammar is analyzed by Gunter Radden (1985) as an improvement on Chomsky’s standard theory to distinguish systematically between syntactic and semantic categories and relations in a sentence. In terms of economy of description, case grammar meant an improvement over existing models in reducing the number of senses which certain lexical entries like ‘to open’ have and ‘to please’ or as near synonyms such as ‘to see’ and ‘to look’. This was achieved by postulating semantically constant relationships, the so-called deep cases or case roles. But these claims have to be supported by testable discovery procedures. Fillmore (1971) suggests three such principles which should help to identify and discriminate the cases: 1. The principle of singularity, 2. The principle of contrast and 3. The principle of complementarity (Gunter Radden, 1985 : 186).

V.4 Use of Fillmore’s Case Grammar for pedagogical purposes

In spite of the lapses and weakness of Fillmore’s Case Grammar model, it was felt that its practical application for the pedagogical pur-
poses cannot be neglected.

Various scholars have shown that Case Grammar can be a very sound pedagogical tool for teaching and learning languages. For example, Don N. F. Nilsen (1971) and Walter Cook (1985) try to show how Case Grammar can be of some use for teaching English as a foreign language. As the Case Grammar has a universal base and a semantic rather than syntactic base, Nilsen hopefully points out that the case frames in English are also present in the native languages of all the students of EFL programme. It would, therefore, be possible to begin instruction on this common ground, and proceed to the study of how these common cases happened to be signaled in English surface structure. Its semantic base enables the materials to be at the same time structured and situationally-oriented. For example, as Nilsen suggests, a situation might be suggested which involves various types of transactions. In talking about a departmental store, one might use such verbs as 'buy, sell, exchange, take, give, receive, trade, deal' etc. realizing that all the verbs appropriate to this situation have basically the same case frame: Agent, Source, Goal and Object, both in the native and in the target language. In the same way, verbs of creation, destruction, perception and communication etc., have exactly the same deep cases in all the languages we know. It is possible, as Nilsen indicates, to build a semantically oriented EFL (English for Foreign Learners) programme (or class), which at the same time could be highly structured grammatically. It would allow the students to go from known (the deep structure, which is there in all languages) to the unknown (the surface structure of English). It would enable the students to handle concepts and entire semantic areas in place of individual words and considerable psychological reinforcement would come from the fact that the students could have real-life 'hooks' upon which to hang thousands of vocabulary items (Nilsen, 1971: 298-299). In short, The students would be taught to use conceptual (as well as syntactic) clues in learning new vocabulary items. He proves it by pre-
senting case frames for different types of verbs like verbs of transfer, verbs of exchange, verbs of attachment, verbs of motion, descriptive adjectives allowing only the Object case, verbs of ownership, verbs with three-place case frames of Agents, Instruments and objects and the like.

Walter A. Cook (1985) like Nilsen, finds out the usefulness of Case Grammar in teaching English. He, too, finds possibilities of its application to help the learner to understand the content underlying each sentence as it has the semantic base stressing content rather than surface form. It concentrates upon what is said, not upon how it is said. This semantic analysis is then correlated with the surface expression of the language being studied. Semantic analysis is universal across languages. No matter whatever the cultural background, languages do not differ greatly in what they say, only in how they say it. The use of Case Grammar with its way of semantic analysis will make the learner to understand the content, and then one should be able to relate the semantic content in his own native language to the mode of expression in English.

About the possibilities of achieving vocabulary expansion while learning English, W. Cook (1985: 27) points out the problem of mastering adequate vocabulary. It can be solved by using Case Grammar model to expand one’s English vocabulary by showing the different meanings of the same verbs, how meanings are related in the lexicon, how verbs can be decomposed, and how different verbs can be used to express the same idea. He presents the case frames of multiple meanings of verbs like ‘see, run’ from their obvious meaning to their other uses. Case Grammar theory, according to Walter Cook (1989), is useful for natural language processing as well. He points out that there is a need for a more comprehensive classification of verbs. Case Grammar provides a semantic valence for the verb, a valence which predetermines the number and kind of noun phrases expected with the verb in context. It is no wonder then that computational linguists have turned to some form of Case Grammar Theory in the development of natural language parsers,
a movement that continues to expand in both academic and professional circles. The method or the model of learning vocabulary provided by Walter Cook can be used for learning Marathi. The different groups of verb types of Marathi as per their meanings can be prepared and learning Marathi vocabulary can be made easier.

George J. Suci and Jane H. Hamacher in the detailed account of their experiment on investigating language comprehension which is presented in their article 'Psychological Dimensions of case in sentence processing: Action role and animateness' (1972) point out that inanimate patients corresponded to Fillmore's (1968) Objective case, and inanimate Agents have semantic functions similar to some of those served by the Instrumental case. A series of four experiments by Suci and Hamacher (1972) aimed at comprehension processes in language that supported the psychological validity of two types of semantic units: action role, as defined by W. Chafe’s ‘agent’ and patient’ and case as defined by C. Fillmore’s (1968) ‘agentive’, ‘instrumental’, ‘dative’, and ‘objective’ cases. Psychological validity was assessed by them with the ‘question technique’ which measured time taken to process various elements of a sentence and they observed that adults reliably differentiated both types of units, with agent role and agentive case being processed most rapidly while children reliably differentiated action role units (again favouring agent) but not the case units, and generally, there was no interaction between the processing of semantic units and surface structure features of a sentence.

Donald M. Bergman in his article ‘Deep and surface case in Sanuma’ (1974) studies the surface case system of Sanuma, a language spoken by a tribe of approximately 1500 people who live on the Auaris River in Brazil and on the upper Caura, Ventuari and Matacuni rivers and their tributaries in Venezuela and he finds out that the study of only the surface case is inadequate to describe the clause structure and the verb in Sanuma. He states that in studying the surface structure, the neces-
sity of describing underlying roles soon becomes apparent, for surface cases have to be translated in a variety of ways (1974 : 5). Another difficulty is encountered in trying to classify verbs as to the obligatory or optional occurrence of accompanying surface case forms, because just any case form or combination of case forms occur with any type of verb. Therefore, as he remarks, he finds it most helpful to look into the semantics of the verb for the rationale of verb classification (1974 : 6). In his article, Borgman discusses the system of underlying semantic relationships described in terms of case roles that are the basis for the way surface cases are assigned.

'Subject, themes and Case Grammars' by W. J. Hutchins (1974) has the basic assumptions that no formal grammar can be considered to be adequate unless it can provide semantic representations of sentences which include some indication of case relations and unless it can account for the influence of discourse structure and situational context upon their face realizations (Hutchins, 1974 : 101). He examines the treatment of 'normal' sentences in some formal grammars which incorporate representations of case relations. His concern is with the treatments of subjectivization and thematization in Case Grammars for which he takes into account Fillmore (1968 and 1971), Chafe (1970), Halliday (1970), Anderson (1971), Firbas (1964, 1966), Chomsky (1971), S. Kuno (1972). His concern, here, is with the treatment of subjectivization and thematization in Case Grammars.