

RU

Эволюция форм обращения в русском и хинди: от общих истоков к уникальным особенностям

Тивари Саурабх

Аннотация. Цель исследования – выявление сходств и различий в функционировании звательного падежа в русском языке и самбодхан-карака в хинди на основе анализа их исторического развития, грамматических характеристик и социокультурного контекста. В статье рассматриваются тенденции к редукции звательной формы в русском языке, прослеживаемые от праславянского периода до современных языковых явлений, а также сохранение самбодхан-карака в хинди, унаследованного из санскрита через пракриты. Сравнительное сопоставление форм, функций и культурных аспектов обращения позволяет выявить как общие черты, так и уникальные особенности данных систем. Научная новизна исследования заключается в выявлении конкретных факторов, обуславливающих различия в динамике развития и социокультурном значении звательных форм в русском языке и самбодхан-карака в хинди, что ранее не было предметом детального изучения в компаративном аспекте. В результате установлено, что, несмотря на общее индоевропейское происхождение, системы обращения в русском языке и хинди демонстрируют существенные различия, обусловленные уникальными историческими, культурными и социальными факторами.

EN

Evolution of addressing forms in Russian and Hindi: from common origins to unique features

Saurabh Tiwari

Abstract. The aim of the study is to identify the similarities and differences in the functioning of the vocative case in Russian and the Sambodhan-Karaka in Hindi, based on the analysis of their historical development, grammatical characteristics, and socio-cultural context. The article examines the tendencies towards reduction of the vocative form in Russian, traced from the Proto-Slavic period to modern linguistic phenomena, as well as the preservation of the Sambodhan-Karaka in Hindi, inherited from Sanskrit through Prakrits. A systematization of forms, functions, and cultural aspects of address reveals both common features and unique characteristics of these systems. The scientific novelty of the study consists in identifying specific factors that explain the differences in the dynamics of development and socio-cultural significance of vocative forms in Russian and the Sambodhan-Karaka in Hindi, which has not previously been the subject of a detailed study in a comparative aspect. As a result, it is established that, despite their common Indo-European origin, the systems of address in Russian and Hindi exhibit significant differences, due to unique historical, cultural, and social factors.

Introduction

The relevance of the study lies in a lacuna within contemporary comparative linguistics concerning the diachronic processes impacting grammatical categories related to direct address. Whereas case syncretism and grammatical category erosion have been attested in many languages, a **comprehensive** and comparatively **authoritative** history of the development of the vocative in the Indo-European language family is underdeveloped. Specifically, the near obsolescence of the vocative case in Russian, in contrast to the robust retention of the Sambodhan-Karaka in Hindi, presents an opportunity to examine the intricate interaction of internal linguistic factors (e.g., phonological change and competition with other case forms) and external sociocultural factors (e.g., evolving patterns of social interaction and formality) that contribute to the evolution of grammatical systems. A deepening awareness of such contradictory trajectories brings into focus wider theoretical issues **relevant** to the resilience and vulnerability of grammatical categories, with the processes of language contact and change and with the complicated interaction between grammar and sociolinguistic usage.

The tasks of this study are to:

- examine the historical development of the vocative case in Russian and the Sambodhan-Karaka in Hindi, tracing their formation, transformation, and influencing factors;
- analyze their syntactic, morphological, and functional properties within their respective linguistic systems;
- compare and contrast their usage in contemporary speech, considering social, cultural, and pragmatic aspects that shape their functions in communication.

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: 80000 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 research methods used in this study align with the stated objectives and tasks. The historical-comparative method serves as an **essential** tool for analyzing the vocative case in Russian and the Sambodhan-Karaka in Hindi. It allows us to trace the past of these grammatical categories and to observe how they changed within the historical development of their respective languages. The descriptive-analytical method is employed to systematically classify and describe the case structures in Russian and Hindi. The comparative-contrastive method helps identify similarities and differences in the use of cases between the two languages. Contextual analysis is used to interpret the functional and semantic roles of these cases in their respective linguistic contexts. Additionally, a corpus-based approach utilizes linguistic corpora to provide reliable examples and statistical data.

The theoretical foundation of this study is based on the works of V. V. Vinogradov (Виноградов, 1975; 1978), A. A. Zaliznyak (Зализняк, 2004), and L. V. Shcherba (Щерба, 1974) on Russian grammatical categories and case systems, as well as A. Timberlake (2004) and R. Sussex & P. Cubberley (2006) on Russian syntax and morphology. For Hindi, the study relies on Y. Kachru (2006), M. Shankar (2009), and R. S. McGregor (1977), along with A. Montaut (2004) and C. P. Masica (1991) on Indo-Aryan linguistic evolution. The typological framework is informed by J. Cenoz et al. (Cenoz, Jessner, Van der Velde, 2001) and M. Everaert (2017), while the sociocultural aspects of address forms are examined through S. C. Levinson (1983) and B. B. Kachru (2015). Additional insights into historical influences come from A. Singh (2018) on Prakrit's impact on Hindi and E. A. Kostina (Костина, 2018) on Hindi grammar. These works collectively provide a comparative framework for analyzing the vocative case in Russian and the Sambodhan-Karaka in Hindi.

The practical significance of this work lies in its application to the study of the grammatical systems of Russian and Hindi. This research will be a **crucial** resource for courses in General and Russian Linguistics. The findings will be useful for Theoretical and Historical Grammar classes, Linguistic Typology, and for students working on coursework and dissertations. The comparative analysis of the vocative case and the Sambodhan-Karaka offers deeper insights into the points of convergence and divergence between Slavic and Indo-Aryan languages. Furthermore, this research paves the way for creativity in comparative linguistics and has applications in artificial intelligence and machine translation, improving the accuracy of language models dealing with Russian and Hindi, particularly in tasks related to recognition and generation of vocative expressions.

Discussion and results

Address forms are not merely *structural components* of language but *functional mechanisms* for communication. They do not give a name to an interlocutor but enable interpersonal relationships, convey respect and feelings, and signal social roles. This phenomenon of language is highly associated with cultural, social, and historical elements and, therefore, the research on this domain provides significant information about language development nuances. At a linguistic as well as a cultural level, these forms present an extremely fascinating field of research.

In Russian, address forms have always been inextricably linked with the vocative case, a morphological trait characteristic of Old Russian. Even though the vocative case has almost vanished from contemporary spoken Russian, remnants of its presence exist and can be observed especially in formal or stylistically enhanced writing. These verbal leftovers remind us of the cultural value placed even on most archaic language traits.

In contrast, Hindi features a single course. The language also retains a category called the Sambodhan-Karaka, which traces back to classical Sanskrit. Unlike the vocative case in Russian, the Sambodhan-Karaka not only did not die out but survived and remained dynamic. The system continues to be rich and highly flexible, responding to varying social and emotional situations, illustrating the **adaptability** and durability of linguistic structures. A comparative study of the Russian vocative case and Hindi's Sambodhan-Karaka provides valuable insights into the evolutionary patterns of these two languages. It highlights both their unique characteristics and shared Indo-European roots.

The Vocative Case in Russian

The Russian historical vocative case was an independent grammatical form for direct address. Old Russian possessed a special vocative case with characteristic endings such as “-e” and “-yu” (e.g., “Боже” (God), “старче” (elder)).

During the 19th century, the vocative case was maintained as an independent grammatical class. But in the late 19th century, productivity of the vocative case decreased significantly (Зализняк, 2004, p. 56).

Loss of the vocative case in Russian is due to a general tendency to simplify the case system. In the 14th-15th centuries, distinction of the vocative case from the nominative case had already started to be lost. Gradually, this resulted in the marginalization of the vocative case in contemporary Russian (Виноградов, 1975, p. 215).

The Sambodhan-Karaka in Hindi

Unlike in Russian, where the vocative case has become obsolete as a distinct category, Hindi's Sambodhan-Karaka remains integral to the language. It facilitates direct address to individuals, deities, and even objects, adding layers of emotion, respect, and emphasis. Its origins trace back to Sanskrit, where the vocative case served to mark direct address explicitly. In modern Hindi, the Sambodhan-Karaka is realized through both morphological and syntactic means.

The main feature of Hindi grammar is the employment of Vibhakti Chih (case markers) to denote the grammatical function of nouns and pronouns. Russian employs inflectional endings (e.g., "друг" (drug, 'friend'), "друга" (drug, 'friend's'), "другу" (drug, 'to the friend')); Hindi employs particles and postpositions.

Despite this decline in Russian, Hindi actively maintains the vocative case. Y. Kachru writes that "In Hindi, the vocative, or sambodhan, is marked by specific particles that signal direct address" (2006, p. 56). R. S. McGregor concurs in saying that "Hindi employs the vocative case to address individuals directly, often using specific suffixes or particles" (1977, p. 89). R. K. Agnihotri further clarifies that "The vocative form in Hindi is used to call or attract attention, typically marked by the particle "हे" (he)" (2010, p. 45). A. Montaut describes the phonetic and syntactic uniqueness of Hindi's vocative system, explaining that "The vocative, or sambodhan, in Hindi is characterized by its unique intonation and the use of particles" (2004, p. 102).

The Hindi system of address is rich and nuanced, utilizing various particles to convey different levels of formality and emotional nuance:

- **हे (he)** – a marker of respect, as in हे भगवान (O God).
- **अरे (are)** – is used in informal or friendly contexts, as in अरे दोस्त (Hey, friend!).
- **ओ (o)** – a neutral or friendly form, as in ओ दोस्त (O friend).
- **ऐ (ai)** – expresses urgency or strong emotion, as in ऐ लड़की (Hey, girl!).
- **हाय (hai)** – conveys pain, surprise, or fear, as in हाय राम (Oh, Ram!).

In colloquial Hindi, intonation alone can function as a vocative marker, reinforcing meaning without additional particles (Kachru, 2015, p. 102).

A Comparative Perspective

While the Russian vocative case has largely faded, Hindi's Sambodhan-Karaka remains a fully functional grammatical category. This divergence may be attributed to linguistic tradition, which in Hindi has preserved and actively utilized formal markers in both spoken and literary discourse. The sustained relevance of these forms underscores the cultural importance of respect and emotional expression in communication.

In Old Russian, the vocative case was a significant grammatical tool, used in everyday speech **extensively**. Nevertheless, due to linguistic evolution and system simplification, it was lost throughout history. As A. A. Zaliznyak claims, in the Middle Ages, the vocative case was a central component of Russian grammar. It went out of usage by the 16th century and by the 19th century had mostly disappeared, being replaced by the nominative case with special intonational use (Зализняк, 2004, p. 56).

Hindi, however, has been able to retain the Sambodhan-Karaka as part of its grammar. In contrast to Russian, where the vocative function has been assimilated into intonational use, Hindi still retains overt morphological markers. For instance, the research by B. B. Kachru (2015, p. 102) finds that while other Indo-Aryan languages have experienced a decline in total case categories, Hindi has been able to retain Sambodhan-Karaka as a core element of its grammar. The vocative case is quite pivotal to linguistic form in numerous languages, most notably Indo-Aryan and Slavic cultures. C. P. Masica has commented that "The vocative case in Indo-Aryan languages often retains distinct forms, reflecting its historical usage in direct address" (1991, p. 237). The above observation is to point to the continuity of the vocative markers in Hindi, as compared to Russian, where the vocative case hardly exists anymore. The employment of particles like हे (he) and ओ (o) and honorific suffixes (अरे (are)) adds a yet richer component to the language's expressive function.

A comparative-typological analysis provides revealing perspectives on the different ways in which Russian and Hindi employ grammatical resources for fulfilling similar communication needs. Both languages used to avail themselves of exclusive case forms in direct address but developed differently. While the Russian vocative case receded into obsolescence, Hindi's Sambodhan-Karaka remained active in formal and informal speech alike. As noted by L. V. Shcherba and V. V. Vinogradov, Hindi employs Sambodhan-Karaka across various registers, from addressing a revered guru to calling out to a friend (Щерба, 1974, p. 215; Виноградов, 1978).

Typological analysis reveals that forms of address are not mere grammatical conventions but essential social tools. They enable polite communication, affect expression, and social relation management. The Russian vocative case has developed from being inflectional to having essentially intonational nature. In contrast to Russian, Hindi has retained overt grammatical marking of direct address as a reflection of ongoing communicative salience of formal contrast. Typologically, B. Comrie and M. Polinsky highlight that "The vocative case serves a unique function in direct address,

distinguishing it from other grammatical cases" (1998, p. 130). Its functional character goes even further on the discourse and pragmatics level, as claimed by S. C. Levinson: "The use of vocatives plays a crucial role in the pragmatics of conversation, signalling attention and social relationships" (1983, p. 71). A historical analysis further clarifies the trajectory of these linguistic changes. The vocative case formed part of the grammatical system in Old Russian, but simplification of the system led to it being merged into the nominative case. Scholars like Vinogradov and Zaliznyak have detailed this trend in great detail (Виноградов, 1975, p. 80; Зализняк, 2004, p. 52). The descriptive and analytic methods used here underscore the long-term salience of these grammatical categories in the two languages. While Russian has moved toward the use of intonational means for direct address, Hindi still uses a strong system of morphological markers, illustrating the flexibility and longevity of linguistic mechanisms across cultures.

Historical Examples of the Vocative Case in Birch Bark Manuscripts

1. **NBG (Novgorod Birch Bark Letter) No. 605 (1100-1120):** "I bow to you, my little brother..." – a warm address to a brother.
2. **NBG No. 834 (1120-1140):** "Here Ilko bestows a name..." – an example of a name-based address.
3. **NBG No. 682 (1160-1180):** "I appeal to the lady..." – a respectful address to a woman.
4. **NBG No. 414 (1340-1360):** "...You, brother Semen..." – a colloquial use of the vocative case, demonstrating its presence in everyday speech.

These examples confirm that the vocative case was not merely a literary norm but was actively used in daily communication.

The development of the vocative case in the remaining Slavic languages is irregular. It has declined virtually completely in Bulgarian, with some vocative forms remaining active in Czech and Polish. However, even these languages, just like Russian, see the use of the vocative case relatively rarely, normally confined to poems and formal circumstances. Its exceptionality gives it an emotional intensity – such an archaic form from centuries ago tells us so beautifully and tastefully about its architecture. In the remaining Slavic languages, the vocative case has been changed, but retained in some way or another. In Bulgarian, it **became obsolete**, and the nominative case is used more frequently. For instance: "Mama, küde si?" (Mom, where are you?). In Czech, the vocative case has been retained, but is used less frequently. For instance, the greeting "Pane učiteli, můžete mi pomoci?" (Mr. Teacher, can you help me?), where "Pane" is the vocative of "Pán" (mister). In Polish, the vocative case works actively, mostly in formal or intimate speech, e.g., "Mój przyjacielu, co robisz?" (My friend, what are you doing?), where "przyjacielu" is the vocative of "przyjaciel" (friend).

In Russian, the vocative case lived only in the archaic forms, e.g., "Боже!" (from "Бог" (God)) or "Господи!" (from "Господь" (Lord)), and in colloquial speech, the address usually corresponds to the nominative case: "Мама, где ты?" (Mother, where are you?). One of the common features for all Slavic languages is the use of vocative forms in poetry and official language, e.g., "О, родная земля!" (O, native land!) in Russian or "Господи, помилуй!" (Lord have mercy!) in church use. The vocative case continues to exist, particularly when it is a matter of laying stress on the address or developing an emotional stress. Decline of the vocative case in Russian earlier was an intrinsic part of Old Russian grammar, and direct address depended largely on it.

Nevertheless, linguistic change increasingly resulted in the decline of the vocative case due to the fact that vocative forms got intermingled with the nominative case. The vocative case has been a widespread feature of direct address among different language families. In Russian, the vocative case was originally a distinct grammatical category with strange endings like "-e" and "-yu" (e.g., "Господи" (Lord) and "отче" (father)). Though, its decline can also be observed even in contemporary Russian where it lives on merely in fossilized forms or even in informal use.

As reported by A. Timberlake, "In Russian, the vocative is primarily archaic, used only in a few frozen forms and in the colloquial usage of some areas" (2004, p. 89). This implies that although the vocative case is no longer productive in Russian, yet it still performs certain sociolinguistic purposes. R. Sussex & P. Cubberley **reiterate** that "Among the Slavic languages, the vocative case has experienced varying degrees of retention and decline" (2006, p. 157). G. Corbett further elaborates that "The vocative case in Slavonic languages often retains a distinct form, though its usage varies widely" (1993, p. 311).

Even though the vocative case has largely **declined** in modern Russian, residual forms persist in specific contexts, particularly those that are religious or expressively evocative. Terms like "God!" (*Боже!*) and "Mother!" (*Матушка!*) retain expressive force, echoing the emotional impact the vocative once provided. However, these forms are now largely stylistic, eliciting a sense of nostalgia and linguistic richness rather than serving as standard, unmarked forms of address.

Sociocultural Factors in the Decline of the Vocative Case

As society evolved, so did language evolve to accommodate new contexts. Several key factors contributed to the loss of autonomy of the vocative case:

1. **Social Mobility and Language Simplification:** Earlier, as societies evolved, languages simplified. The vocative case, which was earlier characteristic of formal and ceremonial contexts, slowly became obsolete as individuals' social lives became more level. The economy of language preferred simplicity over complex grammatical distinctions.
2. **Ecclesiastical and Religious Influence:** The Church maintained the vocative case for religious prayers and liturgical compositions. Uses such as "God!" and "Holy One!" maintained their formal flavor, remaining in usage for religious discourse.
3. **Urbanization and Cultural Changes:** Along with the growth of cities in the 18th century, formal forms of addressing were made less frequent through standardization of the language. Literature and official discourse remained to possess the vocative case for beauty and impact.

4. Influence of Western Languages: Interaction with German and French, both of which lacked vocative contrasts, affected Russian to incorporate address forms without distinguishing vocative endings.

Evolution and Role of the Sambodhan-Karaka in Hindi

The Hindi vocative case, known as the Sambodhan-Karaka, also developed similarly to that of its Slavic equivalent. Ancient Sanskrit used complex vocative endings like “-e” for masculine and “-am” for neuter nouns. Prakrit languages simplified these with their evolution. In contemporary Hindi, the vocative case continues to be functionally active but less formal compared to ancient Sanskrit. Although name-based addresses like “Rama” or “Devi” still bear vocative features, respect and politeness are increasingly expressed by intonation and speech manner.

Forms of Address as a Reflection of Society

Address forms are not words; they are a type of social code. They convey the status, familiarity, age, and even gender of the interlocutor. In Hindi, just like in Russian, the choice of address can say a lot about us and how we perceive others.

1. Expression of Status and Social Position

In Hindi, the address depends on the status, age, and the interlocutor’s position. It is a **complex system of address**, dependent on:

- **Respect and Formality:** Respectful forms are employed in the instance of older and authoritative individuals, including the employment of the ending “-o”, such as “हे देवी!” (O goddess!). *This invocation serves as a verbal expression of reverence.*

- In the family circle and among friends, we soon take on the form with “-o” or “-a”, it is so easy, so cozy and intimate, for instance: “अरे, राहुल!” (Hey, Rahul!).

2. Language and Gender

As in other languages, appeals are often structured around perceived differences between genders. For example, the use of “भैया” (brother) and “बहन” (sister) in Hindi can evoke familial intimacy and traditional gender roles within a speech act. Russian, of course, also utilizes gender distinctions in its linguistic resources; however, in Hindi, these terms are often used in greetings and addresses, contributing to their perceived lighter or more cheerful tone.

3. Forms of Address and Age

Formal forms, like “O”, are required for communication with older people, e.g., “हे बाबूजी!” (O father!). With youth or peers, everything is simpler: free forms create a friendlier mood. It is like a polite “you” and a friendly “you” in Russian, only more specific.

4. Pragmatic Aspect of Communication

The Sambodhan-Karaka in Hindi is not merely grammar, but a fine means of communication. Use of address form can indicate the amount of respect, attitude, or even the boundary. If it is an unconscious process in Russian, then it is a near art in Hindi, which needs skill and knowledge of cultural patterns.

5. Social Competence Through Language

Address forms can reveal more about us than we are aware of. So, for instance, the appropriate application of the Sambodhan-Karaka signifies maturity in society and deference to the other person. And at its rightful time, it may establish a convivial climate. The skillful use of Hindi allows speakers to navigate these subtle accents of address, demonstrating social competence. In Russian and in Hindi also, address forms are more than grammatical remnants; they organize the way individuals are positioned towards each other, ensuring cultural identity and continuity over time.

Table 1. *The Vocative Case and the Sambodhan-Karaka: Common Features and Unique Nuances*

Characteristic	Vocative Case (Russian)	Sambodhan Karaka (Hindi)
Historical Development	Lost as an independent case, partially preserved in forms of address	Retains active usage
Grammatical Form	Archaic forms or merging with the nominative case	Use of markers (हे (he), ओ (o), अरे (are))
Functions	Primarily emotional and ritualistic	Addressing, showing respect, emphasizing the addressee

In analyzing Table 1, both languages demonstrate that forms of address are not merely a formality, but a crucial element of effective communication. However, their evolution has diverged significantly. Hindi, like a venerated artifact still in contemporary use, has largely retained its classical Sambodhan-Karaka form. Conversely, the Russian language, akin to an abstract expressionist painter embracing minimalism, has drastically reduced the use of the vocative case. While both languages demonstrably value forms of address, their developmental paths have led them to markedly different outcomes: Russian, possibly prioritizing simplification, gradually phased out the vocative, while Hindi preserved its classical structure.

Both the Russian vocative case and the Hindi Sambodhan-Karaka accomplish the same: call attention, convey feelings, and mark social differences. Still, the manner in which they are accomplished is extremely dissimilar. Russian vocative case is kind of an antique vestige which, although an exception, continues to function. It is influenced by gender, number, and a few grammatical adjustments. “Друг” (friend), for example, can become “дружище!” (druzhishche!), and “Мария” (Maria) can, under some conditions, assume the form of “Марья!” (Marya!).

Hindi has a flexible and well-organised system. The Sambodhan-Karaka is employed not only in the case of nouns but even of adjectives, pronouns, and verbs – a Russian convenience which does not exist. Suffixes and individual words shape its forms with **remarkable precision, lending intricacy to expression**. A mere particle can redefine the trajectory of discourse.

Nuances of Grammar That Cannot Be Ignored

Even though it has been simplified, the Russian vocative case is not entirely free of exceptions. For example, whereas “стол” (table) does not change, “друг” (friend) may become “дружище” (druzhishche), showing an irregular pattern. Feminine nouns show simpler patterns, with “Мария” (Maria) usually **becoming** “Марией” (Mariey), although archaic forms such as “Марья” (Marya) may occasionally be employed. Notably, the degree of formality may determine the choice of suffix (Виноградов, 1975, p. 432).

Hindi, however, is a bit more structured about it:

Firstly, the informal varieties usually have the suffix “-ey”, such as “अरे राहुल!” (Are, Rahul!), just as Russian has for “Hey, Rahul!” (Shankar, 2009, p. 139).

Secondly, honorifics employ the suffix “-o”, such as “हे भगवान!” (He Bhagavan!), to express seriousness just as “O, Lord!” does.

But dialectical difference and conversational situations occasionally shatter these conventions, much as an intimate close friend jarringly calling a person in a diminutive form but continuing in formal speech conventions.

Cultural Implications

The contrast between the Russian vocative case and the Hindi Sambodhan-Karaka is more than a matter of grammar; it has implications in culture. Russian, in effacing the vocative, appears to adopt a more streamlined communicative model. Hindi, on the other hand, uses a wide range of forms for expressing respect, emotions, and social status. While in Russian the vocative case is a literary relic of the past, in Hindi the Sambodhan-Karaka is still an active and context-dependent grammatical category that actively influences interpersonal communication.

Conclusion

Thus, we come to the following conclusions, each corresponding to the research objectives set at the outset of the study:

1. The vocative case in Russian and the Sambodhan-Karaka in Hindi, while both serving as means of address, have undergone distinct historical transformations influenced by cultural, social, and linguistic factors. The Russian vocative case has experienced simplification and reduction over time, with its use now largely confined to archaic or stylistically marked contexts. In contrast, Sambodhan-Karaka in Hindi has retained a more intricate system, preserving historical forms that reflect deeply ingrained cultural and social structures. The differences in their evolution highlight the role of external linguistic pressures and cultural conventions in shaping address forms.

2. This study has systematically examined the syntactic, morphological, and functional characteristics of these address systems within their respective languages. In Russian, the vocative case has become an exception rather than a rule, surviving mainly in fixed expressions and literary language. Meanwhile, the Hindi Sambodhan-Karaka remains an active and dynamic grammatical category, allowing for a range of morphological variations that express social hierarchies and emotional nuances. The Hindi address system demonstrates greater adaptability and flexibility in conveying formality, familiarity, and respect compared to the restricted use of the Russian vocative.

3. The analysis of their present-day functions demonstrates how cultural, social, and pragmatic forces influence linguistic structures. The vocative case in Russian has largely disappeared from informal speech, signalling a shift towards analytical or periphrastic forms of address. On the other hand, the Sambodhan-Karaka continues to be an essential component of Hindi communication, actively reflecting social relationships and emotional expressions. This contrast underscores how languages adapt differently to changes in societal and communicative needs.

Thus, this research successfully fulfils its objectives by providing a comprehensive comparative analysis of the vocative case in Russian and the Sambodhan-Karaka in Hindi. Future studies can delve deeper into dialectal variations within both languages and explore their intersections with other grammatical categories such as politeness strategies and intonational patterns. Furthermore, a more detailed examination of the Russian case system in relation to the Karaka framework of Hindi could yield further insights into their structural and functional parallels.

Источники | References

1. Виноградов В. В. История русского литературного языка. М.: Академия наук СССР, 1978.
2. Виноградов В. В. История русского языка. М.: Высшая школа, 1975.
3. Зализняк А. А. Древнерусские грамматические формы. М.: Языки славянской культуры, 2004.
4. Костина Е. А. Теоретическая грамматика языка хинди. М.: Восточная литература, 2018.
5. Щерба Л. В. Русский язык: его структура и развитие. М.: Высшая школа, 1974.
6. Agnihotri R. K. Hindi: An Essential Grammar. L.: Routledge, 2010.

7. Cenoz J., Jessner H. H., Van der Velde J. H. Linguistic Typology and the Study of Language Change. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2001.
8. Comrie B., Polinsky M. The Great Daghestanian Case Hoax // Case, Typology and Grammar / ed. by A. Siewierska. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
9. Corbett G. G. The Slavonic Languages. L.: Routledge, 1993.
10. Everaert M. Typology of Case Systems: A Comparative Perspective. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2017.
11. Kachru B. B. The Indianization of English: The English Language in India. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.
12. Kachru Y. Hindi. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, 2006.
13. Levinson S. C. Pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
14. Masica C. P. The Indo-Aryan Languages. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
15. McGregor R. S. Outline of Hindi Grammar. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.
16. Montaut A. A Grammar of Hindi. Munich: Lincom Europa, 2004.
17. Shankar M. Hindi: A Critical Introduction. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2009.
18. Singh A. Prakrit Influence on Modern Hindi Syntax. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publ., 2018.
19. Sussex R., Cubberley P. The Slavic Languages. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
20. Timberlake A. A Reference Grammar of Russian. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Информация об авторах | Author information



Тивари Саурабх¹

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): 14.02.2025; опубликовано online (published online): 03.04.2025.

Ключевые слова (keywords): звательный падеж; самбодхан-карака; типология; грамматика хинди; категория падежа; vocative case; Sambodhan-Karaka; typology; Hindi grammar; case category.