The comparative descriptive account of the treatment of case by various grammarians and linguists of Marathi and English exhibits the controversy regarding case in the grammatical studies of Marathi and English. The present study attempts to explore Marathi sentence structure in the framework of the case grammar model of Charles J. Fillmore (1971) with a view to finding out how far the model works, where it seems to fail and what adjustments are needed if the model is to be adopted. Cases, for Fillmore, are deep structure categories as against their being surface structure morphological or grammatical categories in the traditional grammars of Marathi and English. Fillmore's case notions comprise a set of universal, presumably innate, concepts which identify certain types of judgements human beings are capable of making about the events that are going around them; judgements about such matters as who did it, who it happened to, and what got changed. Thus, in the modern case grammar theory, developed not only by Fillmore but also by many other scholars like Chafe, Anderson, Gruber, Jackendoff, Walter Cook and others, case is regarded as case role or case relationship or case primitive.

This concept of abstract case roles as distinct from concrete case markers has become popular only recently, especially through the writings of Charles J. Fillmore. Case grammar theory assumes that a minimum number of case roles are required by a language for the adequate representation of the meanings of different sentences. It further assumes that the actual representation of these case roles, with the help of case markers such as prepositions, terminations, postpositions and other inflections is rather irregular and idiosyncratic in individual languages, and that the establishment of abstract case roles as distinct from that of the case markers would be helpful in removing these irregularities and thereby explicating the underlying structures or meanings of sentences. Fillmore regards these case roles or case relationships to be universal across languages which are labelled as Agent, Instrument, Object, Source, Goal, Location, Time and the like. He developed a case grammar model through
a number of articles (Fillmore 1968, 1969, 1971 and 1977) that is first of its kind in modern linguistics. He has presented it thoroughly first in his 1968 article ‘The case for case’ and later on, revised it in his 1971 and 1977 articles. It prompted many scholars to attempt a similar approach.

The other case grammar models developed by various scholars other than Fillmore are those of Wallace Chafe, John M. Anderson, Jeffery Gruber, Ray S. Jackendoff, Robert E. Longacre, Pike and Pike, Walter A. Cook, Stanley Starosta and Noam Chomsky (1981). Their treatment of case as either case role or case relationship or case primitive is presented briefly in Chapter IV along with the detailed account of Fillmore's case grammar. It helps to understand the shift of consideration of case as a formal category by the early Indian and Western grammarians to case as a deep structure semantic category by the modern linguists believing in the concept of Universal Grammar.

Traditionally, ‘case’ was a surface structure morphological or grammatical category in the grammars of both Marathi and English. It is quite obvious that the traditional grammarians of Marathi borrowed cases directly either from Sanskrit case system or from those of Latin-based English grammar whereas the traditional grammarians of English borrowed the cases from the Classical Latin grammar and explained their uses. It appears that they approached the problem of ‘case’ in terms of forms and functions. A definite set of cases, usually varying in number like either six or seven or eight along with the terminations they take, were provided in the Marathi grammatical works, and generally either six or five or four cases borrowed from Latin along with their different uses were provided by scholars in most of the early grammatical studies of English. Some traditional grammarians of English agreed to have two cases for nouns, and three for the pronouns based on their surface structures in a sentence.

Assumption of ‘case’ as a surface structure category in the traditional grammars of Marathi is clear through the way it was defined. For instance, a grammarian of Marathi, Appaji K. Kher defines case as "the
inflection of noun or pronoun to express its relation to other words ... the relation of the noun or pronoun with the verb or other words in a sentence is called 'Ka:raka'" (Kher, A.K. 1989 II Edn. A Higher Marathi Grammar: 130). Case is called Vibhakti in Marathi and either Kher’s definition of case or M.K. Damle’s insistence on the form-based classification of cases or Ashok Kelkar’s classification of case as a VARIABLE TERM and the three classes of markers provided by him offering themselves as suitable candidates to be called ‘case’ indicate that case is generally an overt morphophonemic category for the grammarians of Marathi. Without any agreement in regard to the number of cases, the various grammarians provided either six or seven or eight ka:rakas or meanings of cases such as Karta:, Karma, Karan, Samprada:n and the others. They too were borrowed from the Sanskrit grammar. It will be relevant to understand the term ka:raka in Sanskrit. ‘Ka:raka’ in Sanskrit with the meaning ‘in a special relation to a word expressing an action’ was explained in Shrisa Chandra Vasu’s English translation entitled The Siddha:nta Kaumudi: of Bhattoji Dixit as follows:

“Anything that helps towards the accomplishment of an action is a ka:raka. Thus, in 'cooking', the fire, the furnace, the vessel, the cook are all helpers in the accomplishment of the action. Thus, ‘Rama cooks food in a vessel, by the fire from the furnace for his master’. Here ‘Rama’ is Agent ka:raka, ‘fire’ is an instrumental ka:raka; ‘furnace’ is the ablative ka:raka and ‘master’ is the dative ka:raka. The word ‘ka:raka’ is thus synonymous with the word ‘cause’ (hetu) and ‘occasion’ (nimitta). All the various causes and occasions that are required to complete an action will be ka:raka. Out of the seven cases in which a Sanskrit noun is declined, six represent such relation with an action. The Genitive or the sixth case can never be directly related with an action, and thus, can never stand in the relation of a ka:raka to a verb”. (Vasu, S.C. ed. and trans. The Siddha:nta Kaumudi of Bhattoji Dixit Vol. I, 1906: 327).
The ka:\textit{rakas} in the traditional Marathi grammars are meanings of cases or vibhaktis or semantic relationships of the nouns and pronouns with the verb in a sentence. Ka:\textit{rakas} seem to be covert or deep structure categories that are realized syntactically by the inflectional case-endings of nouns and pronouns in Sanskrit. The ka:\textit{rakas} in Marathi, too, have the deep structure base, but we do not observe uniformity in the opinions of various grammarians in regard to the number of ka:\textit{rakas} in Marathi for some agreed to have six, or some to have seven or for some there are eight ka:\textit{rakas} in Marathi with their own reasons for the same. We come across one Vibhakti carrying a number of ka:\textit{rakas} and also one ka:\textit{raka} for different vibhaktis. These might be the consequences of borrowing of cases in the Marathi grammar directly from the Classical Sanskrit grammar.

Similarly, the case system in traditional grammars of English borrowed from that of Latin results in serious problems of incompatibility. Borrowing the case system in English from that of Latin creates ambiguity and differences of opinions about cases, their number, forms and uses among the grammarians of English. It is apparent in these studies that case in English too is an overt or surface structure category. As the cases in Latin have inflections, some grammarians of English agree to have form-based cases in English, which are two for nouns, the Nominative and the Genitive such as ‘Robert’ and ‘Robert’s’ and three for pronouns, the Nominative, the Genitive and the Objective such as ‘I’, ‘my’ and ‘me’. Further they discuss the different uses of these cases. Some scholars of early times like John Wallis disagreed to include the category of case in the grammar of English because the nouns in English have no inflections. In his grammatical work he discussed the uses of ‘nominative words’ and ‘accusative words’ and the uses of prepositions in English.

The structuralists are totally concerned with the sentence patterns in English for they believe that structures are the devices used to make signal and to convey meanings. Leonard Bloomfield, Trager and Smith, Archibald Hill, A.S. Hornby, Eugene A. Nida and the other struc-
turalists do not care to define the parts of speech and we come across no discussion on case in their studies of English. They assume that the terms like nominative, accusative and dative, necessary for Latin grammar, are of little value in the study of English (Hornby, 1959 edn.: Intro. X).

On the contrary, in the latter half of the twentieth century, Transformational Generative grammar begins with deep structure phenomenon or base component and tries to trace its history systematically until the actual utterances are arrived at. Within this school two different types of approach have emerged. One is the syntactic grammars and the other is semantic grammars. Charles Fillmore's (1968 and 1971) Case Grammar model belongs to the latter type. It will be noticed that the base component in Fillmore is semantic component as against Chomskyan syntactic component, and Fillmore argues that his Case Grammar model tries to establish an abstract or conceptual system of case roles or relations and Fillmore has claimed these cases to be universal.

It appears that valid insights on case relationships are missing in traditional grammars of both English and Marathi. However, various uses of cases in the traditional grammars of English and kaː rakas in Marathi indicating different meanings or relations of the nouns and pronouns with the verb in a sentence have semantic base. The traditions of classical grammar, both English and Marathi, identify the cases in which nouns could be inflected and list with each case the 'uses' to which it could be put. It is apparent that perhaps these grammarians were wrong in confusing what was 'to be explained' with what was to be taken as 'given'. In this view, what was taken as given was the information that the language has such-and-such cases, and what the grammarians needed to explain was how each of the cases could be used.

What Charles Fillmore, as a generative grammarian intends to do is to reverse the position taken by the traditional grammarians. He takes the 'case uses' as the base and regards the observable 'case forms' as derivable from them by the rules of the grammar. He agrees with
Hjelmslev (1935: 1) who suggests that the study of case could be pursued more fruitfully if we abandon the assumption that an essential characteristic of the grammatical category of case is ‘the expression in form of affixes on substantives’. Consequently, Fillmore uses the term ‘case’ to identify the underlying syntactic-semantic relationship, and the term ‘case form’ to mean the expression of a case relationship in a particular language whether through affixation, suppletion, use of clitic particles or constraints on word order. It is felt that case in Marathi studied from Fillmore’s point of view may not necessarily be called Vibhakti in Marathi as Fillmore’s case appears to correlate with the term ka:raka in either Marathi or Sanskrit, indicating the deep structure relationship of the nouns with the verbs in a sentence. In other words, Fillmore’s cases — Agent, Instrument, Source, Goal, Object and others may not be called Vibhaktis but are equivalent to ka:rakas in Marathi.

As far as the candidate is aware, no study of the deep cases in Marathi based on Fillmore’s Case Grammar is so far done. However, some scholars like Lakshmi Bai Balchandran (1973), B. K. Sinha (1981), M. P. Aheja and S. Rajendran (1980) have attempted the realization of Fillmore’s case roles in Hindi and Tamil. An attempt is made in this study to examine whether Fillmore’s deep cases (of the revised version of 1971) are applicable to Marathi and state explicitly the problems faced while doing so. However, the study is intended to be purely descriptive and no claims whatsoever are made here to any contribution to the theory. This work attempts to explore the possibilities of the application of Fillmore’s Case Grammar (1971) to a language other than English, that is, Marathi which, as far as the candidate knows, has not been described so far.

A number of critical arguments are made to support Fillmore’s Case Grammar while several counter-arguments against his model also exist. They are critically accounted for in Chapter V. While doing so, Fillmore’s claims and principles introduced in his theory are examined with the help of a few Marathi sentences which helped to point out certain problematic areas in regard to their application to the Marathi language.

INTRODUCTION
Since this kind of study has not much precedence in Anglo-Marathi comparative linguistics, the investigation is presented with utmost caution and care, and no claim to any originality is made here. However, it is tempting to state that the syntactic realization of Fillmore's semantic case relations in Marathi in this work may lend support to his theory. However, the investigation of the semantics of Fillmore's case roles by way of their application to Marathi throws light on some specific features of the language as also it leads to mark out certain 'lapses and fringes' of his theory. It was felt not infrequently that India also has a strong linguistic tradition since the very early times, and in this light, Panini's Ka:raka Theory perhaps can be a powerful model for the study of the semantic aspect of language. Therefore, a brief descriptive account of his ka:raka system is given in Chapter II. The account of the Case Grammar models from the West and that of the Ka:raka Theory of Panini from India in the present study may motivate the fellow workers to evaluate these models through critical and rigorous application to either Marathi or some other Indian languages. It would help to examine their universal validity, and perhaps it may further lead to find out a better semantic-based Case Grammar model. The author feels that the study of this kind could never be 'complete' in itself and awaits further investigation.

**Methodology**

The critical survey of the treatment of case by various grammarians of Marathi and English is presented in a chronological sequence in Chapters II and III. It leads to observe the controversies of opinions among these grammarians about case in Marathi and English.

The names of the most well-known scholars and grammarians of Marathi and English are mentioned in the Contents of Chapters II and III, but the details of the treatment of case by many other grammarians too is included in these chapters.

The Marathi sentences selected as illustrations are either borrowed from the well-known grammatical works of Marathi or else they are
the author's own. Since Marathi is the mother-tongue of the author, she has used her own judgements about the acceptability or otherwise of Marathi sentences used therein. She is aware that there may be differences of opinion about this.

The surface realization of Fillmore's case relationships in Marathi is not presented in detail following the transformational generative projection or rewrite rules, but the sentences are chosen with the direct illustrations of Fillmore's case roles or otherwise. Along with this, the morphophonemic changes in oblique forms of the nouns and pronouns in Marathi when they are case-marked by different terminations and postpositions are also not discussed in this work for they have no bearings on deep grammar.

Since it is a comparative study of case semantics in English and Marathi, a number of quotations from grammatical works of English and Marathi are included for the sake of clear understanding, and the more significant arguments are translated by the candidate herself from the original Marathi texts.

Nearly all the English and Marathi sentences taken as illustrations throughout this work include certain words in them printed in bold type which are illustrative of the case in discussion. The transliteration of Sanskrit words into Roman script are printed in italics, and in the transliteration of Sanskrit and Marathi words and sentences the phonetic symbols /a:/ and /i:/ and /u:/ are used to distinguish /a/ from /a:/ and short /i/ from long /i:/ and short /u/ from long /u:/ in the standard pronunciation of the respective words.

All the references in the body of the text are given by referring to the name of the author and the year of publication. At the end of the work, a consolidated bibliography is provided in alphabetical order of the names of authors.