Chapter VII

CONCLUSION
Chapters II and III end with detailed concluding remarks and no attempt is made here to recall all of them but just a few are listed here as the general observations.

The comparative study of case semantics in English and Marathi in this work reviewed in Chapters II and III provides the evidences of similarities and differences in these two languages in respect of the forms and meanings of cases. To some extent the behavioural patterns of Marathi and English as two different languages within the Indo-European family of languages are revealed through the application of Fillmore's case grammar model — that claims the universality of its case relationships — to Marathi sentence structure.

A broad survey of the treatment of case in Marathi and English by the various grammarians from the very early period till the twentieth century reveals the similarity of controversies regarding the forms, number and meanings of cases in both the languages.

It is noticed that the detailed and reasonably good works of Marathi grammar were produced only in the nineteenth century by the grammarians. Their account for cases in Marathi seems to be influenced either by Sanskrit or English traditional grammar (Chapter II, Concluding Remarks). A brief introduction to Panini's Kaːraka Theory is presented in Chapter II.3.1 that helps to understand the direct borrowing of cases and their meanings from the Sanskrit grammar in Marathi. Although a good number of grammatical works of Marathi were produced by various grammarians in the nineteenth century, no originality in the treatment of cases (Vibhaktis) in Marathi is evident among them. Of course, the need for the same is expressed by a few grammarians in the twentieth century. Nevertheless, M. K. Damle in his monumental work Shaːstriya Marathi Vyaːkaran and K. S. Arjunwadkar in his Marathi Vyaːkaran - Waːd aːni Pravaːd are cognizant of the principles of controversy in regard to cases in Marathi. Both of them, in their own way, try to treat the element of case (Vibhakti) in Marathi independently, that is, without its being based on either the
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Sanskrit or English grammar although the names of the cases listed by them are derived from those in Sanskrit. The cases listed by various grammarians of Marathi are either form-based or meaning-based and each of the form-based cases introduced by various grammarians consists of a number of meanings, whereas the meaning-based cases introduced by some have no uniformity.

The chronological perspective of the grammatical works of English with special reference to case in Chapter III shows that the earlier works were Latin-based. 'Case', for the most grammarians of English is a purely grammatical or morphological category. We notice the controversies in regard to the number and the meanings of the cases among English grammarians too, whereas some of them did not accept 'case' as a grammatical category at all. In modern linguistics, especially after Chomsky (1965) a theoretical shift towards 'semantically based' grammar is observed and it is motivated by an increasing recognition of the fact that a sentence is understood not in terms of its 'surface structure' alone but also by the relations held between nouns and verbs in the 'deep structure' of language. These relations are considered as case roles or case relations or case primitives by the various case grammarians such as Charles J. Fillmore, Wallace Chafe, John M. Anderson, Jeffery S. Gruber, Robert E. Longacre, Ray S. Jackendoff, Pike and Pike, Walter A. Cook, Stanley Starosta and Noam Chomsky as well.

In their Case Grammar models there is a basic agreement that the 'deep structure' is a semantic representation of the propositional content of a clause. Charles J. Fillmore's Case Grammar (1968, 1971 and 1977) presents one of the earliest models that can be seen as an attempt to provide for abstract notions of grammatical relationships. Following early grammarians, Fillmore interprets case endings and prepositional phrases as basic reflections of a number of constant semantic case relationships such as Agent, Instrument, Object, Source, Goal, Location, Benefactive and others. On the basis of his claims for universality of his
case roles or relationships, the syntactic realization of his case roles (1971 model) in Marathi and the analysis of the principles in his model based on a number of Marathi sentences are attempted in this work which help to draw some conclusions.

1. Fillmore's Case Grammar model itself requires to be presented still more systematically and coherently because it is found that many of the issues raised are not substituted and elaborated sufficiently.

2. The close examination of the case roles described by Fillmore and their realization in Marathi (sections VI.2.11 and VI.2.12) gives the feeling that the given ones are to be further clarified, better defined and illustrated in detail.

3. It is observed that the NP’s in some Marathi sentence structures cannot be assigned to any of Fillmore's (1971 model) case roles, or they appear to have the need to postulate some new case roles in order to qualify to be universals of language.

4. The present study indicates that application of Fillmore's case relationships to Marathi is not self-sufficient to describe the language fully. It appears that Fillmore relies upon the intuitive ideas of the situation that is being represented by the sentences and this appears to be an insecure guide; so the claims made by Fillmore have to be supported by testable discovery procedures which in this study has attempted on the basis of Marathi.

5. His case role, Object (1971 model) which is still considered as a wastebasket needs more clarification and amplification. His Source and Goal cases are not merely local but are extended to the domain of change of state and transfer of property. This leads to the problems regarding allotment of case roles to the NP’s in some Marathi sentences. His Instrument case has multiple definitions which requires wider examination of this case role and perhaps this may lead to split it in a number of cases.
Although the basic concept behind his Case Grammar model is very attractive, it does not necessarily fulfill the requirement of accounting for all the sentence structures in Marathi.

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

The Marathi equivalents of the English verbs such as ‘marry, quarrel, discuss, argue’ can be as follows:

- marry - लग्न करणे
- quarrel - भाइण करणे
- discuss - चर्चा करणे
- argue - वाद घालणे

Here the Marathi equivalents of the English verbs have the form ‘NP + Operator’. The problem is whether they can be regarded as the Compound verbs. For the sake of convenience in this project, they are taken to be the Compound verbs but the eminent grammarians of Marathi like M. K. Damle and K. S. Arjunwadkar do not accept them as Compound verbs in Marathi. If so, the nouns ‘लग्न, भाइण, चर्चा, वाद’ in these sentences require to be assigned some case roles. There are a number of English verbs which have their Marathi equivalents in the form of Noun + Operator:

- try - प्रयत्न करणे
- chat - गप्पा मारणे
- prohibit - मनाई करणे
- praise - स्तुती करणे
- water - पाणी देणे
- cook - स्त्रधंपाक करणे
- insult - अपमान करणे
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defeat - पराभव करणे
pray - प्रार्थना करणे.
worship - पूजा करणे.
al low / permit - परवानगी देणे / संमती देणे
shower - वर्षाव करणे.
rain - पाऊस पडणे
dance - सृत्य करणे
inspire - प्रेरणा देणे
encourage - प्रोत्साहन देणे
work - काम करणे.
love - प्रेम करणे.
apply - अर्ज करणे.
request - विनंती करणे.

The detailed examination of the verbs stated above with the help of the illustrative sentences may throw some light on these verbs and their structure. Fillmore in his Case Grammar theory includes the verbs and the adjectives in his category of V (Verb), whereas the Marathi equivalents of the English verbs in the above list have the form Noun + Operator.

9. A number of analyses of Fillmore’s Case Grammar model are currently competing, somewhat unequally, of course, for acceptance. Among them are Walter Cook, N.D. Arutjunova, Peter Sgall, Don L.F. Nilsen. Gunter Radden, Starosta Stanley, Mellema, Nicholas Ostler and many others as discussed in chapter V. Such a list does not exhaust the possibilities of emerging some other Case Grammar models like those of Wallace Chafe, John M. Anderson, Jeffery Gruber, Robert E. Longacre, Ray S. Jakendorf, Pike and Pike, Walter A. Cook, Starosta Stanley and Noam Chomsky too. Their Case Grammar
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models are presented in brief in Chapter IV, which show the richness of developing a number of variants in the field of modern linguistics with particular reference to Case Grammar or Relational Grammar with a semantic base.

10. It is also noteworthy that many of the earlier accounts in the traditional grammars have direct relevance to whatever is discussed in the current trends in linguistics. For instance, the theta-roles that are discussed widely in the current literature in linguistics or the different case 'roles', 'relations' or 'primitives' with semantic base are nothing but *Ka: rakas* or semantic roles as discussed by Panini in his *Ka: raka* Theory. Further investigation of these *Ka: rakas* by Panini with a systematic methodology to test its universal validity, which is not claimed by Panini, can be tried.

Several models of Case Grammar differ at various levels. Some of the most obvious differences are only superficial and relatively unimportant. Among these are certain matters of terminology or forms of expression. Such differences can be overcome by close comparative study of them and the similarities can be discovered. At the deeper level are the differences of description that seem not necessarily to be incompatible, though most linguists want neat uniformity of analysis and statement. There are many parallels today which may be studied in still greater details that may lead to compare these models by applying them to either Marathi or other Indian languages and examine their universal validity as well as the other claims made by the respective linguists. In regard to Marathi we come across one example by R. V. Kulkarni (1988) who, in his unpublished Ph.D. dissertation entitled *Case in English and Marathi* attempted to examine case-assignment in English and Marathi along with a few issues in these languages within the framework of Noam Chomsky's theory of Government and Binding. The comparison of different Case Grammar models along with their application or realization in Marathi or
other languages not studied so far, may lead to develop a comprehensive and universally valid semantic model of relational grammar and it may help to learn, to teach and to analyse comprehensively any language in the world. It may also prove to be a good tool for translations and machine translation.

This study has considered a few problems in regard to Marathi language while applying Fillmore's Case Grammar model to it. Case being the most controversial issue in grammar, no further study in this area can avoid taking it up for further research. A very hopeful sign in modern comparative linguistics is that despite all drawbacks noted in this study, there has been no resistance to recognizing the gap between depth and surface of language in the investigation of case relations.