

RU

Сравнительное изучение категории именительного падежа в русском языке и карта-карака в хинди: типологический и функциональный аспекты

Тивари Саурabh

Аннотация. Цель исследования – выявить типологические и функциональные параметры именительного падежа в русском языке и карта-карака 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 работы заключается в систематизации этих падежных систем и выявлении их сходств и различий. Результаты исследования показывают, что в русском языке именительный падеж морфологически маркируется с учетом рода, числа и падежа, тогда как карта-карака в хинди остается немаркированной и требует использования послелогов. Анализ выявил различия в синтаксической организации: в русском языке наблюдается свободный порядок слов, в то время как в хинди он фиксирован. Семантический аспект продемонстрировал функциональное сходство обеих конструкций в идентификации подлежащего при сохранении отличий, обусловленных грамматическими традициями языков. Полученные данные подчеркивают структурное и функциональное разнообразие данных систем и открывают перспективы для дальнейших сравнительно-типологических исследований.

EN

Comparative study of the category of nominative case in Russian and karta-karaka in Hindi: Typological and functional aspects

Saurabh Tiwari

Abstract. This study aims to identify typological and functional parameters of the nominative case in Russian and the karta-karaka 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. The scientific novelty of the study consists in systematically categorizing these case systems and identifying their similarities and differences. The findings of the study show that the nominative case in Russian is morphologically marked, taking into account gender, number, and case, while the karta-karaka in Hindi remains unmarked and requires the use of postpositions. The analysis revealed differences in syntactic organization: Russian allows a flexible word order due to morphological marking, whereas Hindi employs a fixed word order. The semantic analysis demonstrated a functional similarity between both constructions in subject identification, while preserving distinctions influenced by the grammatical traditions of each language. The results highlight the structural and functional diversity of these systems and suggest prospects for further comparative-typological research.

Introduction

The relevance of this study is connected with exploring the very basic grammatical structures that underlie the syntactic and functional organization of two linguistically disparate languages, Russian and Hindi. The nominative case in Russian is the primary marker of the subject of a sentence and is of crucial importance in the structure and meaning of sentences. Similarly, in Hindi, the karta-karaka, *according to the Paninian tradition of grammar*, refers to the doer or agent of an action and forms the basis of the syntactic structure of the language. The present study of these two units fills the gap in comparative linguistics and points out the cross-linguistic similarities and differences contributing to our knowledge of typological diversity found in natural languages.

The tasks of this study are to:

- examine the nominative case in Russian and the karta-karaka in Hindi as fundamental grammatical constructions underpinning sentence formation;
- analyse the syntactic, morphological, and functional properties of such constructions within their respective linguistic systems;
- compare and contrast the nominative case with the karta-karaka, bringing out their similarities and differences in an attempt at discovering broader linguistic insights.

The research methods follow from the goals and objectives as stated above. In studying the nominative case in Russian and the karta-karaka in Hindi, the historical-comparative method is essential for tracing the historical development of these grammatical categories and pondering how they have changed within the context of language development. The descriptive-analytical method is applied to the systemic description and classification of case structures in Russian and Hindi. This is done with the purpose of applying the comparative-contrastive method to establish similarities and differences between the two languages in using cases. Contextual analysis is performed for the interpretation of functional and semantic roles of the cases in their respective linguistic contexts.

The research materials were taken from large linguistic corpora and lexicographical sources in Russian and Hindi, considering morphological, syntactic, and semantic features of the case systems in both languages. Also, the materials provide texts and examples to ensure a thorough analysis. The main 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.
- 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 background of the study is based on the principles of functional typology, syntactic theory, and cognitive linguistics. The current study is based upon the fundamental works that provide the general overview of language typology, syntactic structures, and cognitive approaches toward linguistic phenomena. The works by F. P. Filin (Филин, 1981), V. V. Vinogradov (Виноградов, 1952), A. A. Zaliznyak (Зализняк, 1977) and R. S. Sharma (1990) were the first to establish a framework for the analysis of syntactic and grammatical theory, focusing on the structural diversity of languages. More elaboration on the classical formulations of Paninian grammar was developed by G. Cardona (1999), S. M. Katre (1989), S. D. Joshi and J. A. F. Roodbergen (1986), K. Kapoor (1994), from which the complex interdependencies between syntax, semantics, and morphology of the Indic languages came into light. These studies are complemented by works on argument structure and case theory by M. Butt (2006) and T. Mohanan (1994), which provide critical insights into syntactic organization in South Asian languages. Other important works in this regard are by A. E. Kibrik (Кибрик, 1997) and D. Pesetsky (2013), which give perspectives on nominal cases in Russian, thereby enriching the comparative framework of this study. The structural complexities of Hindi and other Indo-Aryan languages are discussed in the works by M. K. Verma (1976), Y. Kachru (2006) and R. Pandharipande (1990), which provide valuable typological parallels for the Russian linguistic system. Recent advances in linguistic typology are represented in the works of N. A. Andreeva (Андреева, 2020), S. Schnell and N. N. Schiborr (2022), as well as in the works of H. Hledíková and M. Ševčíková (2024); these works are instrumental with their corpus-based approaches and semantic analyses, which supply tools for cross-linguistic comparison. Similarly, J. E. Rosés Labrada (2023) brings fresh insights into the typological diversity that underpins analytical scope of this study.

The practical significance of the article lies in its application to language teaching, translation, and linguistic typology. Insights into the nominative case and the karta-karaka are directly applicable in courses like Theoretical and Practical Grammar (Russian/Hindi), Contrastive Linguistics, and Translation, informing teaching materials and improving translation accuracy between Russian and Hindi. The findings can also enhance textbooks and online resources. Furthermore, this research contributes a valuable case study to typological linguistics, enriching our understanding of language universals and specificities.

Discussion and results

The study of grammatical cases gives a very rich and insight-providing look into the structure and functioning of different languages. In this study, we are going to take a closer look at two fundamental grammatical features: the nominative case in Russian and the karta-karaka in Hindi, which provide the base for sentence building in these languages. The nominative case is one of the six grammatical cases in Russian, and it usually indicates the subject of a sentence. In Hindi, the karta-karaka is one of the most important grammatical elements, since it indicates the doer of an action. While both of these linguistic structures have the same syntactic functions, morphological and syntactical aspects of their functioning in these languages are quite different.

Cases are an integral part of the grammatical systems of both Hindi and Russian in the sense that they define the relationship between words in a sentence, making it clear who is doing what to whom. Of these, the nominative case in Russian and the karta-karaka in Hindi are particularly important since they not only serve to identify the subject but also determine agreement from other elements of the sentence such as verb conjugation and word order. Since Russian is a highly inflected language, while Hindi has a relatively free word order, comparison of such cases will bring out how case marking works in these two very different linguistic traditions.

While much of the literature deals with the individual use of the nominative case in Russian and the karta-karaka in Hindi, what is lacking is a comparative and contrastive analysis between the two. Most studies proceed to focus solely on either Russian or Hindi, bypassing the possibility of making a study of the similarity and differences expressed by the nominative case and by the karta-karaka. An appreciation for these contrasts and comparisons will give us a deeper insight into the structure of these languages and, in fact, into the general study of linguistic typology.

The article tries to fill the gap in this respect with a detailed, comparative analysis of the nominative case in Russian with the karta-karaka in Hindi. A major aim will be to outline a comparison in the syntactic, morphological, and functional features of the two grammatical structures with reference to their similarities and differences. This paper tries to contribute to a better knowledge of case systems of world languages and their influence on sentence formation and sense.

The nominative case in Russian

The nominative case (именительный падеж) in Russian is a grammatical category indicating the subject of a sentence. It has been described as the base or dictionary form for nouns, adjectives, and pronouns. The nominative case in Russian is central to sentence structure in that it most commonly functions as the subject indicator. According to A. A. Zaliznyak, "The nominative case is the unmarked form of nouns, typically denoting the actor in a clause" (Зализняк, 1977, p. 43). Similarly, D. Pesetsky notes that "the nominative case is the syntactic head, controlling verb agreement, and it is the default subject assigner" (2013, p. 102). As stated by F. P. Filin, the nominative case is the basic way of expressing the performer of an action in a sentence (Филин, 1981). As per the information given by V. V. Vinogradov, the nominative case is the cornerstone of syntactic organization, which acts as a starting point for syntactic structures (Виноградов, 1952).

Morphologically, the nominative case is mostly unmarked for singular masculine and neuter nouns, while singular feminine nouns usually end in "-а" or "-я". In plural, nouns take the endings "-ы" or "-и" (for masculine and feminine) and "-а" or "-я" for neuter nouns.

Syntactically, the nominative case is indispensable for building the subject-verb relationship.

A. E. Kibrik explains that "the nominative case occupies the central position in verb-subject agreement, providing coherence in grammatical forms of the sentence" (Кибрик, 1997, p. 88).

The nominative case in Russian, as it appears in Old Russian texts in their linguistic norms – for example, birch bark manuscripts – has a number of central grammatical functions. First, it is used to indicate the subject of a sentence: it clearly identifies the entity that is performing the action or is in a certain state. Thus, in the sentence "Ты ми любо" (You are dear to me) from Грамота № 752 (13th century), the word "Ты" (you) is in the nominative case, marking the subject performing the action. Second, the nominative case appears in predicate constructions with the verb "to be" ("быти" in its Old Russian form), equating two nouns. Thus, in the sentence "Се есть грамота" (This is a letter), occurring in Грамота № 531 (12th century), "грамота" (letter) is in the nominative case because it is used to define or identify "се" (this). Furthermore, the nominative is used for emphatic identification, particularly in verbless constructions, which are frequent in the concise and direct style of birch bark letters: "Господине!" (Lord!) from Грамота № 497 (12th century), where the nominative case is used emphatically to refer to or identify a person. Finally, the nominative case is very common in titles, headings, or inscriptions, being a standard form for denomination. Such texts as "Новгородская земля", witnessed by numerous manuscripts, testify to this rule and show how nominative constructions served to deliver meaning in the most economical way in official or meaningful texts. These authentic examples from Old Russian manuscripts represent the vital role of the nominative case in the structure and interpretation of early East Slavic language.

The nominative case in Russian is one of the most basic grammatical features that marks the subject of the sentence and has very distinct morphological and syntactic properties. Morphologically, nouns in the nominative case are varied according to gender – masculine, feminine, or neuter, and number – singular or plural. For example, in singular, the masculine noun "кот" (cat) differs from its feminine form "кошка" ("cat"); the plural for both genders is "кошки" ("cats"). Adjectives modifying nouns in the nominative case have to agree with the noun in gender, number and case: compare "красивый кот" (beautiful cat), where "красивый" (beautiful) agrees with the masculine singular noun "кот" (cat).

Syntactically, the nominative case marks the basic subject of a sentence which determines verb agreement. Thus in "Кот играет" (The cat is playing), "кот" (cat) is the nominative case as the subject to govern the verb "играет" (is playing). Besides, the nominative case is the unmarked form for uninflected nouns in verbless sentences or exclamations, such as "Зима!" (Winter-time!). Many examples from Russian texts illustrate its use: in simple sentences like "Дети читают книгу" (Children are reading a book) "дети" (children) is the nominative subject. In the predicate nominative constructions, such as "Он – врач" (He is a doctor), the nominative case determines the subject and its attribute. In even more complex sentences with multiple subjects, each performing their actions, which are described by their respective verbs: "Кот спит, а собака грызет кость" (The cat is sleeping, and the dog is gnawing a bone).

Through its morphological flexibility and syntactic centrality, the nominative case plays a crucial role in sentence building and meaning within the Russian language.

The karta-karaka in Hindi

In Hindi grammar, कर्ता (karta) refers to the "doer" of an action, while कारक (karaka) indicates the semantic relationship between the action and its participants. According to Panini's Ashtadhyayi, karaka is a functional element

governing syntactic roles (Sharma, 1990). The karta-karaka aligns closely with the nominative case in Indo-European languages, as it identifies the agent of an action. For example:

लडका खेल रहा है। (The boy is playing).

Here, "लडका" (ladka, boy) is the karta, the doer of the action.

The concept of karta-karaka can be traced to very ancient scholars whose definitions continue to influence the study of language today:

- **Panini (Ashtadhyayi):** According to Panini, karta is defined as the "doer" or "agent" who is independently responsible for the action and primarily connected to it (Cardona, 1999).
- **Katyayana:** Katyayana makes clear that karta is the doer who begins and finishes the action by his conscious effort (Katre, 1989).
- **Patanjali (Mahabhashya):** Patanjali defines karta as that for which the action is done, or the focus of the action, and identifies the karta-karaka with nominative function in the sentence structure (Joshi, Roodbergen, 1986).

These ancient scholars pioneered the understanding of the grammatical relation between the karta and the verb, bringing to light their vital role in the construction of meaningful sentences. Panini, Katyayana, and Patanjali are foundational figures in the study of linguistics, especially in the realm of Sanskrit grammar. Through his *Ashtadhyayi*, Panini formalized the structure of Sanskrit with a set of rules that revolutionized the understanding of language, introducing concepts like karaka to define the semantic roles in a sentence. Katyayana refined and expanded Panini's work with his *Vartikas*, providing clarity and practical interpretations of Panini's rules. Patanjali, in his *Mahabhashya*, further commented on and preserved these systems, integrating philosophical insights with linguistic analysis. Their contributions not only codified the rules of Sanskrit but also laid the groundwork for modern linguistic theories.

It is indispensable to include their definitions in our article, for their understanding of the grammatical concepts like the karta-karaka is still applicable in both classical languages studies and modern theories of linguistics. Their works are not outmoded; these ancient scholars have worked out and given meaning to deep-rooted semantic structures imbibed in language theory and its development through time.

The karta-karaka of Hindi is the grammatical subject or agent of the sentence. It is one of the most basic syntactic and morphological categories in the grammar of Hindi, serving to specify the doer or performer of an action. In other words, "The Karta-Karaka is the major agentive participant in a sentence, frequently (though not necessarily) matching with the subject of other languages; its semantic compass, however, goes beyond mere initiators to include non-prototypical events" (Kachru, 2006, p. 152). Similarly, it has been pointed out by Pandharipande, that "the Karta-Karaka is not only syntactically significant but also morphologically integral to understanding verb agreement and sentence structure in Hindi" (1990, p. 88).

Syntactic function of the karta-karaka

Syntactically, the karta-karaka is characterised by its relationship to the verb in a sentence. It typically marks the nominative case in Hindi, indicating the performer of an action. Hence:

1. राम किताब पढ़ता है। (Ram reads a book).

Here, राम – "Ram" is the karta-karaka, performing the action of reading (पढ़ता है/ padhta hai).

According to C. P. Masica, "In Hindi, the Karta-Karaka functions as a syntactic anchor, governing verb agreement based on number, gender, and person" (1991, p. 223). For example:

2. बच्चे खेल रहे हैं। (The children are playing).

In the above sentence, बच्चे (children) is the plural karta-karaka, and the verb खेल रहे हैं (are playing) agrees in the number and gender.

Morphological properties of the karta-karaka

Morphologically, the karta-karaka is normally unmarked in the nominative case, but in ergative constructions – that are extremely common in Hindi, particularly in past tense transitive sentences – it is marked with the **ergative marker -ने(-ne)**, e.g.:

3. राम ने खाना खाया। (Ram ate the food).

In this example, राम ने (Rām ne) is an example of the karta-karaka and is marked with the ergative-ने (-ne) because of the past perfect tense.

As M. Butt clarifies, "The ergative marking on the Karta-Karaka is a unique feature of Hindi syntax, distinguishing agentive roles in specific tenses and aspects" (1995, p. 57). An implication of such ergative alignment is apparent in verb-agreement; very often, a verb in the sentence agrees with the object but not with a subject.

Examples demonstrating the karta-karaka

4. लड़की स्कूल जाती है। (The girl goes to school).

लड़की (Ladki, the girl) is the karta-karaka in the nominative case, performing the action of going (जाती है / goes).

5. सीता ने दरवाजा खोला। (Sita opened the door).

सीता ने (Sita) is the karta-karaka marked with -ने (-ne) in the ergative case, initiating the action of opening the door.

6. गाय घास खाती है। (Cow eats grass).

गाय (Cow) is the karta-karaka, the unmarked nominative subject in the present tense.

The karta-karaka is the central part of Hindi syntax and morphology; it is actually a grammatical and semantic core of the sentence structure. As defined by Mohanan, "The Karta-Karaka serves as a nexus point in Hindi grammar, linking verb agreement, case marking, and sentence semantics" (1994, p. 201). Let us take a look at the syntactic and morphological features of this system, and we shall come to understand more about how Hindi constructs its sentences and conveys meaning through its advanced grammatical structure.

Comparative-contrastive analysis: The nominative case and the karta-karaka

Typology is useful in linguistic investigation, especially while pursuing comparative-contrastive analysis of the kind to be carried out here – namely, the nominative case in Russian versus the karta-karaka in Hindi. Linguistic typology is an area of inquiry that focuses on the structural and functional diversity of languages, looking at patterns and variation across different grammatical systems. This work will investigate how the case systems of Russian and Hindi function differently under unique morphosyntactic and cultural influences, although they are typologically comparable by virtue of both languages belonging to the Indo-European family. The present approach goes deeper in the cross-linguistic variation and shows how grammatical categories that appear similar can diverge in their application and underlying functions. Typological analysis, therefore, provides the theoretical underpinning to the comparison and contrast between the nominative case and the karta-karaka in enriching our understanding of their roles in these languages.

Recent typological studies have rightly emphasized the fact that cross-linguistic variation in syntactic and morphological systems often points to deeper differences in the underlying grammatical functions of superficially similar structural features. As S. Schnell and N. N. Schiborr (2022) point out, such diversities call for a comparative approach in order to understand how languages with typologically comparable features may functionally diverge. The comparative analysis of Russian and Hindi, in that sense, is extremely relevant because these languages have inflectional case systems that, though typologically comparable, are functionally quite different. This view reinforces the greater importance of cross-linguistic variation as an integral part of typological studies.

J. E. Rosés Labrada (2023) situates such comparative work within a greater theoretical framework, underlining that grammatical typology increasingly depends on comparative descriptions to uncover cross-linguistic regularities. This aligns directly with the goals of the present study, as the investigation into the case systems of Russian and Hindi throws light on their topological diversity and functional similarities. These insights are integrated in the present work in the ongoing effort of analysing grammatical cases across languages with differing morphosyntactic alignments in order to strengthen the theoretical foundations of cross-linguistic typological analysis.

Moreover, typological research on case system evolution in structurally diverse languages has become one of the key aspects of modern grammatical research (Валентинова, Рыбаков, 2022). For example, Russian and Hindi, although both belong to the Indo-European family, represent two quite different case systems that have been shaped by their syntactic structures and cultural contexts in distinct historical ways. Russian, with its relatively streamlined system, contrasts sharply with the richly marked case paradigm of Hindi, showing how functional divergence is influenced by typological factors.

Further consideration of individual instances within these systems makes for some interesting comparisons. Thus, for instance, the vocative case illustrates the active interplay of form and function in typological research. The vocative in Russian has largely become an intonational and contextual phenomenon, while it is maintained via explicit grammatical markers in Hindi. In the words of N. A. Andreeva, these divergent approaches achieve similar communicative purposes but through entirely different mechanisms (Андреева, 2020, p. 113). To put it differently, where Russian makes use of subtle tonal shifts, Hindi uses overt morphological markers, reflecting a typological dichotomy in how languages structure social and pragmatic functions.

This typological lens broadens the scope of the present analysis and situates the case systems of Russian and Hindi within a global framework of morphosyntactic and functional diversity.

The nominative case in Russian and the karta-karaka system in Hindi do indeed both mark the subject of a sentence and establish a crucial syntactic role, but they differ considerably in their morphological, syntactic, and functional properties.

Similarities:

1. **Subject identification:** In both languages, the nominative case and the karta-karaka identify the grammatical subject that agrees with the verb in person and number, and sometimes also in gender.

2. **Core grammatical role:** Basic to both, in establishing the sentence structure, is the function of the pivot of syntactic relations.

3. **Semantic functionality:** Both provide the agentive function of the subject in an action or state (Kapoor, 1994).

Morphologically, the nominative case in Russian inflects for gender and number. Thus, for example, nouns in the nominative case are distinguished by gender – masculine, feminine, neuter, and number – singular, or plural – as in "кот" (cat, masculine singular) and "кошки" (cats, plural). Conversely, Hindi does not mark the nominative case inflectionally as Russian does, instead the subject (karta) is usually unmarked while postpositions mark other cases. The relationship of the subject to the verb in both languages is, however central, in that the nominative case in Russian and karta in Hindi each function to identify the doer of an action.

Differences:

1. **Case marking:** Russian morphologically marks the nominative case in nouns (e.g., endings like "-a", "-o", "-ы"). In Hindi, the karta-karaka is normally unmarked unless postpositions like *ने/से* are used in order to indicate emphasis or complex structures (Sharma, 1990).

2. **Gender agreement:** Russian nominative nouns inflect for gender, number and case (Зализняк, 1977). In Hindi, the karta does not have inherent case inflection, but the verb inflects for gender and number to agree with the karta (Verma, 1976).

3. **Syntax and word order:** Russian has a freer word order (SVO or SOV) because of case marking, whereas Hindi follows mainly SOV word order, and the postpositions give the grammatical clarity (Butt, 2006).

Syntactically, the nominative case is highly instrumental for building the sentences in Russian, especially as it is instrumental in subject-verb concord. The word order is flexible in Russian, but the nominative case will necessarily mark out the subject of the verb. Russian word order may allow for subject-verb inversion, but the nominative case ensures the syntactic salience of the subject; in Hindi, the word order is freer due to postpositions and other grammatical markers that confer a lot more freedom upon sentence construction. Karta, the "doer" of the action in Hindi, also precedes the verb but is much less rigid in its placement than Russian nominative case constructions.

Functionally, both are the starting points of sentence formation and denote the doer of the action. In Russian, for instance, the nominative is the basic case that usually occurs in predicate constructions or in emphatic expressions, such as "Ты – мой друг" (You are my friend). Similarly, karta in Hindi denotes the agent of an action and governs the agreement of the verb: लड़का खेल रहा है (The boy is playing), ladka, "the boy", being the karta, the one who carries out the action of playing.

In general, while both the nominative case in Russian and the karta-karaka in Hindi share the function of marking the subject and agent in a sentence, Russian has more inflectional morphology, whereas Hindi has free syntactic structure with postpositions. Each of these makes central contributions to the syntax and semantics of the sentences in respective languages.

Conclusion

Thus, we come to the following conclusions. Firstly, this study examined the nominative case in Russian and the Hindi karta-karaka as major grammatical structures that are the foundation of sentence structure. Both structures have the fundamental function of marking the subject and therefore are essential to the syntactic structure of each language. The results are that while the constructions are functionally parallel, they are variation within the grammatical traditions of Russian and Hindi, and important to typological language study.

Secondly, the analysis of the syntactic, morphological, and functional properties of the nominative case and the karta-karaka revealed both common features and distinctions. The results confirm that in Russian the nominative case is morphologically indicated on nouns considering gender, number, and case. Yet the karta-karaka in Hindi is typically unmarked and relies on postpositions to express distinctions of case. These differences lead to the creation of various syntactic structures and inflectional systems in the two languages. Therefore, the properties of these constructions represent various methods of expressing subject-verb relations and the agentive status of the subject.

Thirdly, the comparison between the nominative case in Russian and the karta-karaka in Hindi showed their similarities and differences, providing more insights into the macro-structure of these languages. The result is that although both are performing the same function of marking the subject, the methods of realization differ significantly: Russian uses morphological marking and flexible word order, and Hindi employs fixed word order and the employment of postpositions. These differences indicate unique paths of grammatical development and syntactic system functioning in the two languages.

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. Андреева Н. А. Типология грамматических категорий в русском и хинди. М.: Наука, 2020.
2. 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>
3. Виноградов В. В. Очерки по русскому языку. М., 1952.
4. Зализняк А. А. Грамматика современного русского языка. М.: Наука, 1977.
5. Кибрик А. Е. Именные падежи в русском синтаксисе. М.: Московский государственный университет, 1997.
6. Филин Ф. П. Русский синтаксис и грамматическая теория. М.: Наука, 1981.
7. Butt M. The Structure of Complex Predicates in Urdu. Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information, 1995.
8. Butt M. Theories of Case. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
9. Cardona G. Pāṇini: A Survey of Research. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 1999.
10. 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>
11. Joshi S. D., Roodbergen J. A. F. Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya: On Pāṇini's Grammar. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1986.

12. Kachru Y. Hindi. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, 2006.
13. Kapoor K. Pāṇini: A Survey of Research. Delhi: Indian Institute of Advanced Studies, 1994.
14. Katre S. M. Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini (Translation and Commentary). Austin: University of Texas Press, 1989.
15. Masica C. P. The Indo-Aryan Languages. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
16. Mohanan T. Argument Structure in Hindi. Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information, 1994.
17. Pandharipande R. Hindi Syntax: A Government-Binding Approach. Dordrecht: Springer, 1990.
18. Pesetsky D. Russian Case Morphology and the Syntactic Structures. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2013.
19. Rosés Labrada J. E. Grammar Highlights 2023 // Linguistic Typology. 2023. Vol. 28. Iss. 3. <https://doi.org/10.1515/lingty-2024-2001>
20. Schnell S., Schiborr N. N. Crosslinguistic Corpus Studies in Linguistic Typology // Annual Review of Linguistics. 2022. Vol. 8.
21. Sharma R. S. Paninian Grammar: A Study of Karaka Theory. New Delhi: D. K. Printworld, 1990.
22. Verma M. K. The Notion of Subject in Hindi Grammar. New Delhi: Bahri Publications, 1976.

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): ; опубликовано online (published online): 06.03.2025.

Ключевые слова (keywords): карта-карака; именительный падеж; типология; категория падежа; грамматика хинди; karta-karaka; nominative case; typology; case category; Hindi grammar.