

RU

Сравнительное изучение падежных систем в русском языке и хинди:
типологические и функциональные аспекты

Тивари Саурабх

Аннотация. Цель исследования – выявление типологических и функциональных параметров русской падежной системы и системы караков в хинди. В статье проведён сравнительный анализ морфологических, синтаксических и семантических средств языка на уровне категории падежа, выделены ключевые аспекты: прототипические характеристики, синтетические и аналитические стратегии, разнообразие грамматических средств. Научная новизна заключается в систематизации падежных систем русского языка и хинди, выявлении их различий и сходств. Установлено, что русская система опирается на синтетические грамматические средства (флексии), а хинди – на аналитические (постпозитивные элементы). В результате исследования определены основные различия в функционировании падежных систем обоих языков, что раскрывает особенности их синтаксической и семантической организации.

EN

Comparative study of case systems in Russian and Hindi:
Typological and functional perspectives

Saurabh Tiwari

Abstract. This study aims to determine the general objective of the typological and functional comparison of the Russian case system and the karaka system in Hindi. The article presents a comparative analysis of morphological, syntactic, and semantic phenomena, emphasizing aspects such as prototypical characteristics, synthetic and analytic strategies, and variance in grammatical means. Scientific novelty consists in the systematization of case systems of Russian and Hindi with specification of their differences and similarities. The findings show that the Russian system follows a synthetic strategy (inflection), whereas Hindi adopts an analytic strategy (postpositive elements). As a result of the study, we have determined the main differences in the functioning of the case systems of both languages, which revealed the features of their syntactic organization and semantic interpretation.

Introduction

The **relevance** of this study lies in the increasing interest in comparative linguistics and an apparent need to make sense of how syntactic and semantic relationships are differently encoded across languages in their case systems. The typological differences between Russian and Hindi, despite their shared functional richness, make them an ideal case study for investigating cross-linguistic parallels and divergences in case marking. A comparative study of their case systems is important to modern linguistics at least in the sense that it allows insights into language universals, functional typology, and the function of the case in syntactic and semantic structuring.

The tasks of this study are:

- to create a typological framework for the analysis of the case systems in Russian and Hindi;
- to identify and justify the functional roles played by different cases in both languages, with emphasis on their syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic dimensions;
- to compare and contrast the morphological and syntactic realizations of the case in Russian and Hindi, highlighting their similarities and differences;
- to formulate conclusions on the typological and functional implications of these findings for comparative linguistics and language theory.

The methods of research follow from the above-stated purpose and tasks. The descriptive-analytical method is applied in order to describe and classify systematically case structures in Russian and Hindi. The comparative-contrastive method is applied with a view to specifying the similarities and differences between the two languages

in using cases. Contextual analysis is performed in order to interpret the functional and semantic roles of cases in their respective linguistic contexts. A corpus-based approach exploits the use of language corpora to provide authentic examples and statistical data. Lastly, the inductive method allows for generalization from observed patterns to broader linguistic principles.

The research materials were taken from large corpora and lexicographic sources in Russian and Hindi, considering morphological, syntactic, and semantic features of case systems in both languages. Materials also included texts and examples to make sure analysis is thorough. Primary sources are:

- Национальный корпус русского языка (НКРЯ). <https://ruscorpora.ru/>.
- Ожегов С. И., Шведова Н. Ю. Толковый словарь русского языка: 80 000 слов и фразеологических выражений. М.: Азбуковник, 2010.
- Словарь русского языка: в 4 т. / под ред. А. П. Евгеньевой. Изд-е 4-е, перераб. М.: Русский язык; Полиграфресурсы, 1999. Т. 1-4.
- McGregor R. S. *The Oxford Hindi-English Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Platts J. T. *A Dictionary of Urdu, Classical Hindi, and English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1884.

The theoretical foundation of this study is based on the works of M. T. Baranov, N. A. Ippolitova, and T. A. Ladyzhenskaya (Баранов, Ипполитова, Ладыженская et al., 2001), L. A. Barkhudarova (Бархударова, 1976), A. A. Zaliznyak (Зализняк, 1973), and I. A. Mel'čuk (Мельчук, 1997), which address grammatical categories and case systems in Russian and other languages. Additionally, the comparative analysis of case systems in Turkic languages is informed by O. I. Valentinova and M. A. Rybakov (Валентинова, Рыбаков, 2022). The research also considers the works of V. V. Vinogradov (Виноградов, 1972) and A. M. Peshkovsky (Пешковский, 1956) on Russian grammar and syntax, as well as L. I. Rakhmanova and V. N. Suzdaltseva (Рахманова, Суздальцева, 1997) on lexical and morphological aspects. A key reference is N. Y. Shvedova's comprehensive Russian grammar (*Русская грамматика*, 1980). Further, the study incorporates insights from N. V. Safronova and E. N. Kayuda (Сафронова, Каюда, 2018) on the influence of native language in learning Russian, and L. V. Shcherba (Щерба, 2004) on language systems and speech activity. Cross-linguistic perspectives are drawn from R. Jakobson's (1984) studies on Russian and Slavic grammar. These works collectively form the theoretical basis of this study.

The **practical significance** of this study includes language education, translation studies, and computational linguistics. The results of the research can be applied in the development of curricula for comparative linguistics courses and improvement of methodologies in teaching Russian and Hindi as foreign languages. It provides very important material for developing language processing tools, including machine translation systems that require subtle knowledge of case semantics and syntax.

Discussion and results

The grammatical category of case is one of the cornerstones of syntactic and semantic structuring of Russian sentences. In contrast, the *karaka* system in Hindi, which uses postpositions to express syntactic relations, performs this role. Although these classes of linguistic frameworks come from different typological traditions, their common goal is to clearly identify syntactic roles, e.g., subject, object, and indirect object. Notwithstanding their divergences, both systems tend to perform similar communicative and structural roles.

Recent typological work highlights the importance of cross-linguistic diversity in the syntactic and morphological systems of various languages, which often exhibit surprising differences in underlying grammatical functions despite typologically similar structure (Schnell, Schiborr, 2022). This is especially relevant in crosslinguistic comparison of case systems, e.g., Russian and Hindi. However, Russian and Hindi use different means, Russian inflects its nouns for a morphological or syntactic case, while Hindi performs the same function through postpositions, but both achieve the same function, that is, the marking of grammatical roles, such as subject, object, agent, etc.

For instance, H. Hledíková and M. Ševčíková have mentioned that the typological differences of grammatical categories, such as nouns and verbs, were considered in English and Czech, which revealed important patterns that may also be present in other languages. While the study focuses on English and Czech, the general principles of grammatical category distinctions have been extended to the comparative analysis of Russian and Hindi in the way nouns and verbs interact with case markers (Hledíková, Ševčíková, 2024).

Nowadays, the typological study of case system development based on data from structurally diverse and unrelated languages is a relevant aspect of grammatical research (Валентинова, Рыбаков, 2022). For example, although Russian and Hindi are both Indo-European languages, their case systems show the reflection of different historical paths, which were predetermined by syntactic structure and cultural context.

Furthermore, corpus-based studies have shown that typological patterns can be better investigated, when both written and spoken language corpora are combined. This is particularly important in the investigation of case systems, since spoken languages usually display patterns that are less accessible or more difficult to observe if focusing on written forms only (Schnell, Schiborr, 2022). In the case of Russian and Hindi, adding data from spoken languages could provide new insights into how case systems function in real-life communication.

From a broader perspective on grammatical well-formedness, Zhuang Qiu, Xufeng Duan, and Zhenguang Cai (2024) point out that the well-formedness of grammatical structures has been a focus of recent computational models, which shed light on how grammatical cases are processed in language technologies. This perspective opens up the possibility of applying computational methods to analyze the functional typology of Russian and Hindi case systems.

By applying computational tools, one can get a pattern that might have been difficult to obtain by purely using linguistic analytical procedures.

S. Schnell and N. N. Schiborr (2022) observe that recent typological research underlines that cross-linguistic variation in syntactic and morphological systems may indicate that seemingly similar structural features of different languages in fact display far-reaching differences concerning underlying grammatical functions. This observation underlines the relevance of a comparative approach. A typological study may preliminarily suggest that Russian and Hindi have similar morphological case systems, but further examination reveals crucial functional differences between them. Hence, this view puts an emphasis on taking cross-linguistic variation as a core factor in typological studies.

Finally, J. E. Rosés Labrada (2023) effectively contextualizes this research within a broader theoretical perspective, noticing that recent developments in grammatical typology emphasize the importance of comparative descriptions for revealing crosslinguistic regularities. This corresponds to the purpose of the present work, too, since a comparison of case systems of Russian and Hindi gives a more distinct view of both topological diversity and functional similarity. It, therefore, presents a robust theoretical framework to approach grammatical case analysis across languages of various morphosyntactic alignments through an integration of such scholarly perspectives.

The case as a grammatical category

The concept of case is central to the morphosyntactic organization of both Russian and Hindi. In Russian, case primarily governs syntactic relationships through inflectional morphology, such as suffixation. The Russian case system facilitates sentence structuring by marking grammatical roles of nouns, pronouns, and adjectives. For instance, the nominative case identifies the subject, the accusative case marks the direct object, and the genitive case is often used for possession or negation. Some more examples of these are dative (for indirect objects), instrumental (for means or agency), and prepositional (when used with prepositions to indicate location or subject matter). Instead Hindi uses the **karaka** system, where the postpositions behind the nouns mark the syntactic and semantic roles. In contrast to Russian, which uses morphological inflection to indicate the case, Hindi uses particles like *ने* (ne) for subjects (*karta karak*) or *को* (ko) for direct objects (*karma karak*). This structural difference leads Russian to allow relatively free word order due to syntactic roles being determined by morphological endings, while Hindi has a stricter word order where postpositions specify syntactic roles.

Although Russian and Hindi differ significantly in their grammatical structure, they ultimately achieve similar functional goals: both languages clarify the specific role of each element within a sentence and establish the relationships between those elements. For instance, the case endings in Russian serve a purpose comparable to that of *karaka* and postpositions in Hindi. These intriguing parallel highlights the underlying universality of grammatical systems in enabling languages to realize fundamental linguistic functions.

Theoretical perspectives on the case

An attempt at integration of the formal and semantic approaches to the case can be seen in Russian Grammar – 80, which defines the case as “an inflectional category of nouns, expressed through contrasting forms that denote a noun’s relationship to other words within a phrase or sentence” (Русская грамматика, 1980, p. 58). V. V. Vinogradov considers the case “a form of a noun that expresses its relation to other words in speech, being a grammatical-semantic centre where spatial, temporal, possessive, and causal relations meet” (Виноградов, 1972, p. 38).

While the case is often seen as an inflectional category marking word forms with lost morphological distinctions, its semantic meaning arises through interaction with governing elements in the sentence (Рахманова, Суздальцева, 1997, p. 468-469). A. M. Peshkovsky emphasized the case as a syntactic phenomenon, noting its role in expressing logical-semantic relationships, such as subject-predicate connections (Пешковский, 1956, p. 134; Баранов, Ипполитова, Ладыженская et al., 2001, p. 32).

On the other hand, R. Jakobson (1984, p. 63) treated the case as essentially morphological category, considering its functions to be not inherently syntactic in nature. In turn, functional-semantic approaches deal with the case in relation to the utterance meaning, attributing a subject or classifying objects (Баранов, Ипполитова, Ладыженская et al., 2001, p. 32).

I. A. Mel’čuk distinguishes several classifications of cases, such as primary and secondary, simple and compound, syntactic and semantic. He also believes that there are ten cases in Russian, which can further be divided into full and partial ones: “Full cases – nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, instrumental, and prepositional – apply to all nouns, while the remaining partial cases – partitive, locative, vocative, and adnumerative – are used only with a limited subset of nouns” (Мельчук, 1997, p. 56).

In Hindi, the notion of *karaka* as developed in Pāṇinian grammar is embedded in functional semantics. Patañjali defines *karaka* as “that which performs an action” (Le Mahābhāṣya de Patañjali..., 1968, p. 4-23), emphasizing its role as a mechanism to express relationships between verbs and nouns. The seven traditional *karaka* in Sanskrit grammar – a basis to understand the syntactic organization in Hindi – are: *karta*, *karma*, *karaṇa*, *sampradāna*, *apādāna*, *adhikaraṇa*, and *sambodhana*. In modern usage, these are adapted (Le Mahābhāṣya de Patañjali..., 1968).

L. A. Barkhudarova distinguishes eight cases in Hindi: genitive, nominative, accusative, locative, dative, ablative, instrumental, and vocative (Бархударова, 1976). Meanwhile, Chandra Kapila distinguishes eight oblique cases in Hindi: nominative, accusative, instrumental, dative, ablative, genitive, locative, and vocative (Чандра Капила, 2003). Sulabha Kulkarni points out: “It is to be noted that the case system is highly distinctive in Hindi. Different postpositions convey various case meanings, while nouns remain in their nominative form. Generally, in Hindi, eight cases are recognised in relation to oblique cases” (Сулабха Кулкарни, 1998, p. 16).

“The concept of case includes a set of universal, apparently innate ideas that identify several types of judgments people are capable of making about the phenomena occurring around them. These are judgments of the following nature: who did it, who it happened to, and what has changed” (Мымрина, 2010, p. 198).

In Russian, the category of number is closely related to the categories of gender and case in nouns. This interrelationship brings about important distinctions in how these grammatical categories are manifested in Russian and Hindi (Сулабха Кулкарни, 1998, p. 17). In Russian, the change of word form is affected mainly by case inflection, which determines the grammatical role played by a noun or pronoun in a sentence. These are affected by means of case markers, which in their turn are affixes in general – suffixes or postfixes attaching at the end of a word. Sometimes they may be referred to as final suffixes. In Russian, there exist six grammatical cases: nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, instrumental, and prepositional. Each case is assigned to a certain syntactic function, marking the subject (nominative), possession (genitive), direction (dative), direct object (accusative), means or accompaniment (instrumental), and location or topic (prepositional). Thus, for example, the noun “стол” (“table”) changes its form according to the case: “стол” (nominative, subject), “стола” (genitive, possession), “столу” (dative, recipient), “стол” (accusative, object), “столом” (instrumental, means), and “о столе” (prepositional, location). Those morphological changes are quite important for Russian sentence structure because case markers replace strict word order, making the sentence more flexible but still keeping its meaning clear.

Alongside monosyllabic postpositions used only as grammatical means, which express case relations in Hindi, according to N. V. Safronova and E. N. Kayuda (Сафронова, Каюда, 2018, p. 29), there exist complex postpositions whose meaning is alike to that of Russian prepositions. This opposition in the case marker employment points to the specificity of both languages and their specific ways of expression concerning grammatical relationships.

Comparative syntax and morphology

Russian and Hindi do mark agent, object, and instrument in their respective systems: in Russian, for instance, the nominative singular for “girl”, “девушка”, becomes genitive plural, “девушек”, to express possession or quantification. Hindi, however, keeps the noun in its nominative form लड़की, “girl”, for example, but then it combines with the postposition से, “se”, to form an instrumental: लड़की से, “by the girl”. Such examples bring out how Russian exploits morphological variability, whereas Hindi relies on postpositions to encode similar grammatical relations.

Russian is a highly inflectional language; its nouns decline for number, gender and case. Thus, “книга” (book) becomes “книгу” in the accusative singular and “книгами” in the instrumental plural. Many such inflections involve elaborate phonological alternations: thus, “мать” (mother) appears as “матери” in the genitive singular (Sewell, 2010, p. 256). Hindi, by contrast, employs less elaborate morphology on nouns to signal the grammatical role, making use of invariant forms of the noun combined with postpositions. Thus, लड़का, “boy”, remains unchanged but combined with the postposition को, “ko”, to form an object लड़के को, or से, “se”, in the case of an instrument: लड़के से.

While structural differences between Russian and Hindi point to different linguistic traditions, they nevertheless seem to converge to a common purpose: clarity in sentence organization. Whereas Russian allows a free word order through its relational information encoded into case endings, Hindi, reliant upon karaka and postpositions, necessarily falls into more fixed syntactic patterns. For example, in the Russian sentence “Девушка учится” (Devushka uchitsya, “The girl is studying”), the subject is in the nominative case, whereas in “Девушки учатся” (Devushki uchatsya, “The girls are studying”), the plural subject is in the nominative case. In Hindi, the sentence “लड़की पढ़ रही है” (Ladki parh rahi hai, “The girl is studying”) presents a singular subject marked by the karta karak, while in “लड़कियाँ पढ़ रही हैं” (Ladkiyan parh rahi hain, “The girls are studying”), the plural subject follows a similar construction. The important thing that appears in both systems is how grammar and meaning are related; this indeed asserts their universal role in structuring linguistic expression.

Concluding thoughts on grammatical systems

Russian and Hindi, in their respective ways, inflectional morphology versus postpositional syntax, arrive at the same result, namely the establishment of semantic and syntactic coherence. As L. V. Shcherba aptly puts it, “case embodies universal concepts that enable humans to interpret actions, agents, and outcomes” (Щерба, 2004, p. 23). This analysis brings out the typological divergence between these languages while reinforcing their functional unity in the organization of thought and communication.

According to A. A. Zaliznyak, the case is a grammatical category based on the opposition of two or more specific cases (Зализняк, 1973, p. 54). In linguistic research, the term “case” can have two interpretations: semantic and formal. The semantic interpretation presupposes recognition of two different cases even in the case when they are indistinguishable from the outside; a specific case is viewed as “an element of a word, a specific semantic relationship” (Зализняк, 1973, p. 55). The formal approach, by contrast, relies on external expression and defines a certain case as a set of word forms, each of which can express both its main meaning and the meanings of one or several semantic cases (Зализняк, 1973, p. 58).

The dual interpretation, semantic and formal, emphasizes the multifunctionality of the case as both a morphological and a semantic device. By circumscribing roles and relations, case forms create intelligible and meaningful syntactic patterns across languages from different typological groups, such as Russian and Hindi.

Grammatical structures in Russian and Hindi

Grammatically, both Russian and Hindi exhibit systematic manipulation of grammatical relations among the elements of sentences. The six main Russian cases (nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, instrumental, prepositional) mark

the grammatical roles like subject, object, direction, and possession. Hindi, in contrast, utilizes its eight *karaka* to perform comparable functions, such as *karta* to mark the agent, *karma* – the object, *karana* – the instrument, and *sampradāna* – the recipient. Although structurally distinct, both systems ultimately contribute to syntactic and semantic clarity, revealing an underlying typological parallelism. Russian and Hindi reveal similarly complicated word-formation processes, both determined by such morphological keys as case, number, gender, and syntactic functions. Their grammatical actualization is realized quite differently in these two languages, however, this reflects their typological differences.

In Russian, noun declension is a predominantly inflectional process, whereby nouns assume morphological forms that are congruent with their syntactic function in the sentence. The inflectional paradigm is determined by three main grammatical categories: the number (singular versus plural), the gender (masculine, feminine, neuter), and the case (nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, instrumental, and prepositional). These interrelated categories determine the suffix to be attached to the noun root. For example, the noun “книга” (book) becomes “книгу” in the accusative singular and “книгами” in the instrumental plural, illustrating the diverse range of inflected forms.

While Russian relies heavily on inflectional endings to encode syntactic relationships, Hindi uses postpositions combined with noun stems. This basic structural difference preordains differences in strategy in the expression of grammatical relationships, but both systems fulfil the same universal function: the structuring of sentence elements to deliver specific semantic and syntactic information.

The Hindi karaka system and nominal forms: A comparative perspective

The **karaka** system in Hindi serves as a functional counterpart to the case system in Russian, providing a framework for expressing syntactic relationships. Unlike Russian, which predominantly relies on inflectional morphology (through suffixation) to mark grammatical roles, Hindi employs a combination of inherent nominal forms and **postpositions** to define syntactic functions. These postpositions follow nouns, acting as external markers to clarify their roles in a sentence.

This structural difference significantly impacts the syntactic dynamics of the two languages. While Russian allows for considerable flexibility in word order due to the explicit marking of grammatical relationships by case endings, Hindi’s syntax tends to exhibit greater rigidity. In Hindi, word order often plays a crucial role in maintaining clarity, particularly in distinguishing subject-object relations

Morphological variability in Russian and Hindi

These two contrasting ways of marking grammatical relationships reflect the broader typological differences between the two languages. Russian is a highly inflectional language, in which the syntactic function of a noun is represented by changes in its internal morphology. The addition of suffixes indicates at one and the same time the case, number, and gender, and thus, the syntactic function is embedded in the form of the noun. For example, the word “стол” (table) takes the forms “стола” in the genitive singular and “столами” in the instrumental plural. In contrast, Hindi is a postpositional language, meaning that postpositions are appended externally to relatively invariant noun stems. For example, लड़का (ladka, “boy”) is the unmarked nominative form, which, when followed by the postposition को (ko), produces लड़के को (ladke ko, the object). With the postposition से (se), it becomes लड़के से (ladke se), showing the instrumental or ablative relation. This is an example of analytic morphology, where grammatical relations are indicated not by internal changes but by external markers. Although the lack of internal inflection reduces the morphological complexity of Hindi, it places greater burden on word order and syntactic patterns for explicitness.

Despite these structural differences, the basic grammatical function of the Russian case system and the Hindi *karaka* system remains the same: to arrange sentence elements and provide specific syntactic and semantic relations. In fact, both systems can mark roles such as subject, object, agent, and recipient, though through different morpho-syntactic strategies. For example, in Russian, “Книга лежит на столе” (Kniga lezhit na stole, “The book is on the table”) uses the case ending -e to mark the prepositional case, whereas “Я читаю книгу” (Ya chitayu knigu, “I am reading a book”) uses the case ending -y to mark the accusative. The use of a postposition has in some languages become quite inflexion-like, or an inherent relation forming one word: for instance, location with Hindi किताब मेज़ पर है (Kitab mez par hai, “The book is on the table”), marking of an object by Hindi मैं किताब पढ़ रहा हूँ (Main kitab padh raha hoon, “I am reading a book”). These examples, thus, show that while the surface realizations of grammatical roles in Russian and Hindi diverge, their deep linguistic functions converge for both systems. Morphology and syntax are inextricably intertwined in accomplishing this universal linguistic function of packaging sentences. This analysis brings into relief the unique morphosyntactic paths that Russian and Hindi have traversed while pointing to their shared endpoint of enabling speakers to communicate intelligibly and coherently.

Comparative analysis: Case and karaka systems in Russian and Hindi

The **case system in Russian** and the **karaka system in Hindi** serve as mechanisms to denote syntactic roles, particularly the subject and object within sentences. Despite their typological differences, Russian’s reliance on inflectional morphology and Hindi’s use of postpositions, both systems aim to fulfil the universal linguistic function of clarifying these relationships.

Subject Roles: Nominative Case vs. Karta Karak

In Russian, the subject of a sentence is marked by the nominative case. This case is morphologically indicated by the base or unmarked form of the noun. For example, “Девушка читает книгу” (Devushka chitayet knigu) means “The girl reads a book”, where the noun “девушка” (devushka, “girl”) is in the nominative case, signaling that it is the subject performing the action. In contrast, Hindi employs the *karta karak* to denote the subject. The *karta*

karak is often unmarked in basic sentences or accompanied by the postposition ने (ne) in ergative constructions (typically in the past tense for transitive verbs). For instance, “लड़की किताब पढ़ रही है” (Ladki kitab parh rahi hai) means “The girl is reading a book”, where the noun लड़की (ladki, “girl”) serves as the subject in the karta karak role.

Comparison:

- In both languages, the subject role is unmarked in simple constructions and forms the core of sentence structure.
- However, Hindi distinguishes between ergative and non-ergative contexts, introducing the ने postposition in certain cases, whereas Russian relies solely on morphological changes.

Object Roles: Accusative Case vs. Karma Karak

In Russian, the direct object is marked by the accusative case, which is expressed by means of suffixation. Thus, “Книгу положили на стол” (Knigu polozhili na stol) means “The book was placed on the table”, where the noun “книгу” (knigu, “book”) carries the accusative suffix -у. In Hindi, the direct object is represented by the karma karak, which is typically marked by the postposition को (ko). Thus, “किताब को मेज पर रखा गया” (Kitab ko mez par rakha gaya) means “The book was placed on the table”, wherein the noun किताब (kitab, “book”) retains its base form, but with the addition of को to mark it as an object.

Comparison:

- In both the systems, the direct object is marked overtly by grammatical means – suffixation in the case of Russian and postpositions in Hindi.
- In Russian, the accusative case is essentially a matter of the morphology of the noun, which permits freedom of word order. In Hindi, the karma karak depends on postpositions along with rigid word order for preventing ambiguity.

Synthesis

The nominative case and the karta karak signal the subject, whereas the accusative case and the karma karak signal the object. Their actualization, however, is according to different linguistic traditions: Russian is inflectional, marking roles by morphological changes and allowing free word order, whereas Hindi is analytic, making use of postpositions, depending on fixed syntactic patterns for clarity. The two systems are similar in one key respect: they are designed to arrange and convey grammatical relations between sentence elements efficiently.

Unique features in Hindi: The concept of apādāna karak

The Hindi karaka system introduces some unique elements not found in the Russian case system. A notable example is the apādāna karak: separation, an origin, or source is explicitly marked. This provides a distinct grammatical framework for such a relationship, usually then realized with the postposition से (se). An example of the apādāna karak is “वह दिल्ली से आया” (Vah Dilli se aaya, “He came from Delhi”). In the above sentence, the postposition से (se) indicates Delhi as the source or origin of the action, hence there is some kind of separation between the subject and the location.

In Russian, the relations of origin or separation are expressed by means of prepositions combined with cases, but there is no separate grammatical category that would correspond to the apādāna karak in Hindi. Thus, in the sentence “Он приехал из Дели” (On priekhal iz Deli), which means “He came from Delhi”, the preposition “из” (iz, “from”) combined with the genitive case of “Дели” (Delhi) shows origin. On the other hand, Hindi uses the apādāna karak for the formal and semantic categorization of origin and separation as a distinct grammatical function. The postposition से (se) in Hindi always marks a source or separation across contexts, providing a uniform way to express these relationships, as in the sentence “वह दिल्ली से आया” (Vah Dilli se aaya), which means “He came from Delhi”. Russian, however, uses different prepositions like “из” (from) or “от” (from, of) together with case markers (genitive or dative) to express similar meanings, and thus, it is more variable. While Hindi has an analytic grammar, this function is overtly expressed with external postpositions like से, whereas in Russian it is synthetic: embedded in case morphology and prepositional usages, the role is less overtly defined as a grammatical category.

The apādāna karak highlights Hindi’s ability to articulate specific grammatical relations with precision, a feature that reflects its analytic linguistic structure. Russian, with its inflectional system, achieves similar expressions through prepositional phrases and case markers but lacks the explicit formalization seen in Hindi’s karaka system. This distinction exemplifies the typological differences between the two languages while underscoring the flexibility and specificity afforded by Hindi’s karak-based grammatical framework.

Conclusion

Thus, we come to the following conclusions. The typological framework developed for the analysis of case systems in Russian and Hindi proved effective in systematically categorizing and comparing their morphological, syntactic, and functional properties, thereby serving as a robust tool for linguistic comparison.

The conducted analysis of the functional roles of cases in Russian and Hindi revealed distinct patterns of syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic usage. Russian exhibits a more intricate system of case distinctions with a strong emphasis on syntactic and semantic precision, while Hindi highlights functional clarity through its interplay of inflectional and postpositional structures.

The comparative examination of morphological and syntactic realizations of cases in both languages demonstrated that Russian predominantly employs inflectional morphology, whereas Hindi employs a hybrid system combining morphological marking with postpositions. These findings underscore the varied strategies languages employ to encode grammatical relationships.

The findings of this study have typological and functional implications for comparative linguistics and language theory. They highlight the adaptability and diversity of case systems while providing insights into broader principles of linguistic structure and typology.

As prospects for further research, we can name the exploration of diachronic changes in the case systems of Russian and Hindi and their implications for the evolution of morphosyntactic structures in Indo-European and Indo-Aryan languages.

Источники | References

1. Баранов М. Т., Ипполитова Н. А., Ладыженская Т. А., Львов М. Р. Методика преподавания русского языка в школе. М.: Академия, 2001.
2. Бархударова Л. А. К проблеме категории падежа в индоарийских языках // Индийская и иранская филология. Вопросы грамматики / отв. ред.: Н. А. Дворянков. М., 1976.
3. Валентинова О. И., Рыбаков М. А. Падежные системы тюркских языков Южной Сибири (сравнение с геометрическим моделированием) // Научный журнал Волгоградского государственного университета. Лингвистика. 2022. № 21 (2). <https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu2.2022.2.6>
4. Виноградов В. В. Русский язык. Грамматическое учение о слове. М.: Высшая школа, 1972.
5. Зализняк А. А. О понимании термина «падеж» в лингвистических описаниях // Зализняк А. А. Проблемы грамматического моделирования. М.: Наука, 1973.
6. Мельчук И. А. Курс общей морфологии: в 5 т. М. – Вена: Языки русской культуры; Прогресс; Vienna Slavic Almanac, 1997. Т. 1.
7. Мымрина Д. Ф. К вопросу о теории падежа // Молодой ученый. 2010. № 12 (23). Т. 1.
8. Пешковский А. М. Русский синтаксис в научном освещении. М.: Учпедгиз, 1956.
9. Рахманова Л. И., Суздальцева В. Н. Современный русский язык. Лексика. Фразеология. Морфология. М.: Московский университет; ЧеРо, 1997.
10. Русская грамматика: в 2 т. / гл. ред. Н. Ю. Шведова. М.: Наука, 1980. Т. 1.
11. Сафронова Н. В., Каюда Е. Н. Принцип учета родного языка при обучении индийских студентов русской грамматике // Мир науки, культуры, образования. 2018. № 3 (70).
12. Сулабха Кулкарни. Лингвометодические основы обучения русскому словоизменению индийских студентов с родным языком хинди: начальный, средний этапы: автореф. дисс. ... д. пед. н. М., 1998.
13. Чандра Капила. Имя существительное в русском языке как объект изучения говорящими на хинди и английском языках: морфологический аспект: дисс. ... к. пед. н. М., 2003.
14. Щерба Л. В. Языковая система и речевая деятельность. М.: Эдиториал УРСС, 2004.
15. Hledíková H., Ševčíková M. Conversion in languages with different morphological structures: A semantic comparison of English and Czech // Morphology. 2024. Vol. 34. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11525-024-09422-1>
16. Jakobson R. Russian and Slavic Grammar Studies 1931-1981. Berlin – N. Y. – Amsterdam: Mouton Publishers, 1984.
17. Le Mahābhāṣya de Patañjali avec le Pradīpa de Kayata et l'Uddyota de Nāgesa / ed. by S. D. Joshi, J. A. F. Roodbergen. Pune, 1968-1980.
18. Rosés Labrada J. E. Grammar Highlights 2023 // Linguistic Typology. 2024. Vol. 28. Iss. 3. <https://doi.org/10.1515/lingty-2024-2001>
19. Schnell S., Schiborr N. N. Crosslinguistic corpus studies in linguistic typology // Annual Review of Linguistics. 2022. Vol. 8.
20. Sewell A. Phonological and Morphological Variation in Russian: A Detailed Analysis // Linguistic Review. 2010. Vol. 22 (4).
21. Zhuang Qiu, Xufeng Duan, Zhenguang Cai. Evaluating Grammatical Well-Formedness in Large Language Models: A Comparative Study with Human Judgments // Proceedings of the Workshop on Cognitive Modeling and Computational Linguistics. Bangkok: Association for Computational Linguistics, 2024.

Информация об авторах | Author information



Тивари Саурabh¹

¹ Российский университет дружбы народов имени Патриса Лумумбы, г. Москва



Saurabh Tiwari¹

¹ RUDN University, Moscow

¹ tiwarisaurabh423@gmail.com

Информация о статье | About this article

Дата поступления рукописи (received): 18.12.2024; опубликовано online (published online): 10.02.2025.

Ключевые слова (keywords): русская падежная система; система караков в хинди; грамматическая категория; типологические исследования; Russian case system; karaka system in Hindi; grammatical category; typological studies.