

**Institute of Linguistic Studies Russian Academy of Science**

as a manuscript

**Dmitriy Kolyadov**

**Pragmatics of Address Terms in Face-to-Face Interaction**

Dissertation Summary  
for the purpose of obtaining  
academic degree Doctor of Philosophy in Philology and Linguistics

Academic Supervisor:  
Evgeniy V. Golovko  
Doctor of Sciences

Saint Petersburg 2023

## **General description of the dissertation**

Dissertation is devoted to pragmatics of address terms in face-to-face interaction. Address terms are defined as linguistic means referring to addressee. Addressee is defined as participant to whom speaker directs attention and who is expected to react [Goffman 1981: 133]. In the dissertation I describe how various contextual meanings is realized in concrete interactions.

**The scientific relevance** is based on the fact that contextual meanings of address terms are understudied in Russian linguistics [Golovko 2008: 200, note. 1; Buras, Krongauz 2013: 122–122]. There are relatively few publications devoted to pragmatics. Mostly they draw on literary sources as a material. Recordings of spontaneous interactions are rarely used. In these publications address terms are investigated in connection to broad sociocultural context and notions like domain of communication and verbal culture. Scholars take huge populations of language users, defined on the base of such characteristics as age, gender, residence (urban or rural), level of education [Ajsakova 2008; Krysin 2004]. It is assumed that the notion of verbal culture encompasses all the speakers of language [Gladrow 2008; Krongauz 1999; 2004; Larina 2009]. However local aspects of contextual meanings, ascribed in concrete cases, remain neglected. Therefore one could ask: what are the bases of meaning ascription in concrete cases? The dissertation is focused on this question.

**The object** of study is address terms in spontaneous face-to-face interactions. **The subject** of study is the process by which participants construct pragmatics of address terms.

**The objective** of the dissertation is to analyze how participants construct meaning of address terms and what semiotic sources they draw on. In order to achieve this objective the following goals have been set:

- analysis of referential options to addressee in interaction: referential choice is examined in order to determine if its pragmatically marked; logics behind this choice is revealed; actions performed by given referential expression is described;
- determination of the scope of pronominal reference to addressee and analysis of its pragmatic import;
- description of social meanings in local context — working collective — based on ethnographic observations and comparison to other collectives;
- description of types of action, performed by usage of address terms;
- description of intradiscursive functioning of address terms.

## **Review of literature**

Terms of address have become popular subject in sociolinguistics and anthropology (cf. bibliography in [Philipsen, Huspek 1985] since seminal papers of R. Brown and his colleagues had been published [Brown, Gilman (1960) 1972; Brown, Ford 1961]. Lately there is seem to be surge of interest to the subject. Each annual bibliography published by International Network of Address

Research (INAR) since 2013 contain more than 200 positions. Current trend in the field, as scholars argue, is to withdraw attention from correlations between linguistic forms and social characteristics of speakers to local meanings and interpretations.

There are several papers and books on address terms in Russian devoted to traditional linguistic subjects: morphology [Daniel 2009; Parrott 2010; Yadroff 1996], syntax [Pronichev 1971], lexicography [Balakaj 2005], semantics [Gol'din 1987; Yanko 2009; 2011], historical studies of particular address terms [Somin, Gridneva 2020; Fufaeva 2020]. There are some publications connected to pragmatics: social distribution of address practices [Ajsakova 2008; Krysin 2004], contextual parameters that define speakers choice [Corbett 1976: 4, 8–9; Ervin-Tripp 1967: 14–17, 130], patterns and tendencies characteristic to particular domains of language usage [Buras, Krongauz 2013; Zhukova 2015; Ajsakova 2008], culture specific meanings [Gladrow 2008; Krongauz 1999; 2004; Larina 2009], communicative functions [Daniel 2008; Ryzhova 1981; Yanko 2010; 2012a; 2012b], including studies of prosody [Kodzasov (1998) 2009; Yanko 2008: 98–106] and position in discourse [Blinova 2019].

**Research methods** are conversation analysis and interactional linguistics and multimodal analysis, related to it and linguistic anthropology.

**Data** consist of several types: field notes, audio and video recordings of spontaneous interactions, interviews, written texts (memoirs, Internet comments).

**The novelty** of the dissertation is determined by approach to the subject using conversation and multimodal analysis combined with ethnographic methods. The dissertation contribute to the studies of contextual meanings from the perspective of face-to-face interaction. Context is viewed phenomenologically - as dynamic unstable configuration of different semiotic sources, unfolding here and now, rather than list of parameters (social roles, statuses, etc.) given in advance. Intradiscursive functions of Russian address terms are systematically described for the first time.

**The main propositions of the study:**

1. Meaning of address in discourse inevitably contains pragmatic component.
2. Pragmatics of address terms is heterogeneous and sometimes cannot be reduced to identification of addressee by reference terms and to getting or holding addressee's attention. Action, performed by address, can be based on conventional functions of particular linguistic form, but not always can be reduced to them.
3. Some of the pragmatical meanings of address terms are typical and stable but there are local meanings as well. In both cases pragmatics of address term is not known in advance. In order to reveal it contextual analysis is required.
4. Field of pragmatical meanings are not closed. On the contrary new actions, usages, identities can be encompassed.

5. Address term can be directed not just to addressee, but to discourse as well marking topical changes in interaction.

**Theoretical significance** of the study is determined by approach to pragmatical meaning as a phenomenon that the participants create in the course of interaction with various linguistic and non linguistic resources. Its practical significance lies in the possibility of using its results in lectures and seminars in interactional linguistics, linguistic anthropology, sociolinguistics, discourse analysis.

**The main results** of the study were discussed at the following international and Russian scientific conferences and seminars: «Anthropology. Folkloristics. Sociolinguistics» (European University, Saint Petersburg, March 2017), XLVII International philological conference (Saint Petersburg State University, Saint Petersburg, March 2017), «Anthropology. Folkloristics. Sociolinguistics» (European University, Saint Petersburg, March 2018), «Forensic linguistics: theory and practice» (Institute of Linguistic Studies, Saint Petersburg, April 2018), «Exhibition of the Academic Research Achievements» (European University, Saint Petersburg, November, 2019), Sociolinguistic seminar (European University, Saint Petersburg, April 2018), Seminar of the Department of the Theory of Grammar (ИЛИ РАН, Санкт-Петербург, июнь 2018), research and literary seminars at the Anthropology Department (European University, Saint Petersburg, 2015–2018), Seminar of the Laboratory of Anthropological Linguistics (Institute of Linguistic Studies, Saint Petersburg, June 2021).

The following papers have been published on the topic of the dissertation:

1. Kolyadov, D. M. Obraschenie as discourse marker // *Voprosy yazykoznaveniya*. 2020. № 6. S. 7–30. (Scopus, Web of Science)
2. Kolyadov, D. M. Audience as participant // *Antropologicheskiy forum*. 2019. № 42. S. 135–173. (Scopus)
3. Kolyadov, D. M. Pragmatica oskorbleniya: interakcionniy podhod k unizheniyu chesti i dostoinstva // *Acta Linguistica Petropolitana. Trudy instituta lingvisticheskikh issledovaniy*. 2019. Vol. 1. № 15. S. 164–183. (Scopus)
4. Kolyadov, D. M. Rec. na kn. Charles Goodwin. *Co-Operative Action*. N.Y.: Cambridge University Press, 2018. 521 p. // *Antropologicheskiy forum*. 2019. № 42. S. 231–241. (Scopus)
5. Kolyadov, D. M. Rec. na kn. Catrin Norrby, Camilla Wide (eds.). *Address Practice as Social Action: European Perspectives*. Basingstoke; N.Y.: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015. 151 p. // *Antropologicheskiy forum*. 2018. № 36. S. 209–218. (Scopus)

**Structure of the dissertation**

Dissertation consists of five chapters, introduction, conclusion, list of references, appendix.

*Introduction* substantiates the relevance of the subject of research, its novelty, theoretical and practical significance. Object and subject of the research are defined. Review of literature and description of theory, methods and data are presented as well.

*Chapter 1* is devoted to referential aspects of vocative expressions, namely their communicative functions. Some scholars argue that «primarily communicative function of referential expressions is to indicate the subject of utterance» [Arutyunova 1982: 20], and meaning of a referential expression or word serves as a guidance that helps speech act participants to find the referent [Paducheva 1985: 8–9]. However analysis of address terms in discourse demonstrates that functions of the semantic aspect that designates to the referent particular properties are not always reduced to identification of the addressee. The following example from a working meeting seems illustrative. During the argument on the employees' obligations one of the participants asks colleague:

(1) *Za chto ya dolzhna otvechat' v tvoem ponimanii, director?*

*What am I responsible for to your opinion, director?*

Address term *director* in this example is semantically adequate, since the addressee is indeed incumbent of the position in the organization. However this term differs from common address practice among colleagues in this collective: reciprocal use of a first name (in a reduced form, if such form exists). It motivates searching for an implicit meaning. At the same time there are reasons to consider this meaning as somehow connected to the term *director*. It indicates official relations between participants, and corresponding rights and obligations, related to their positions at work (*director, coordinator, educator, assistant*).

Some types of address terms not just express properties of an addressee, but actualize particular relations between the speaker and the addressee. It typical for different role terms and terms conventionally tied to particular types of situations: *bol'noj* (patient), *doktor* (doctor), *oficiant* (waiter), *Vasha Chest'* (Your Honesty), *mama* (mommy) etc. Such address terms are related not just to the referent but to the fragment of reality, situation.

Terms of address can refer not only to real property of the addressee or part of the reality. There are cases of usage of semantically anomalous word and expressions as well. Such usages can be both conventional, e.g. to address a stranger using kinship terms (*brat* (brother), *dochka* (daughter), etc.), and occasional. The latter is illustrated by the following example from the talk-show. The host tells to the guest - priest and theologian - about her difficulties in the choice of an address term, that would be appropriate to him. She concludes with the question:

(2) *Chto mne delat'? Doktor?*

*What should I do? Doctor?*

Address term *doktor* (doctor) is supposedly refers to particular speech genre - joke - and to one of the typical subject - dialogue between patient and physician. Whereas in the joke the address term seem to be redundant, in the dialogue between the host and the guest connection of the host's question to corresponding type of joke is not obvious. The pragmatics of the address term can be interpreted as joke intended for enhancing relations between participants.

Such examples are seemingly rare. However they are illustrative since, they demonstrate that choice of a noun or noun phrase may not be connected to identification of the addressee on the base of his properties. At the same time such examples shows that pragmatics of referential expression can be based on its semantics.

*Chapter 2* is devoted to instances of non-vocative reference to an addressee. This field of meanings is usually described in terms of personal deixis, i.e. roles of speakers as participants in interaction. Notion of address traditionally is related to category of 2nd person used to indicate to the role of the addressee, contrasted by 1st person and the role of the speaker. In the chapter two other options are described: 3d person singular and 1st person plural reference to addressee. The chapter also demonstrates that category of personal deixis not always fits to 1st and 2nd person plural forms including the addressee.

Typically participants are addressed by 3d person in formal interactions. Formality implies particular goals of the interaction, rules, participant framework. This framework often consists of at least three positions: chairman or moderator (person who is responsible for guidance of the interaction), current speaker and audience. Following example illustrates the case of address in 3d person:

(3) *Nu i s planami na segodniashniy den' nas poznamomit Tania.*

*Well, Tania will tell us about the agenda.*

Such usages could be interpreted as means of orientation to audience as separate participant. 3d person address helps to construct speaker's turn as inclusive to all the participants rather than interaction between the speaker and the addressee in the presence of others.

Another typical context for 3d person address is a conflictual communication.

(4) *Net, nu vy posmotrite na nego!*

*Oh, look at him!*

In such instances 3d person implies «exposition» of the addressee — highlighting of his actions that frustrated the speaker for the real or imagery audience (cf. [Chelovecheskiy faktor 1992: 206; Shahmatov 2001: 264]). In the same way threats and objections can be described, e.g.:

(5) *Seichas kto-to dogovoritsia!*

*Someone is talking too much!*

In such instances addressing may be obvious due to the contextual information. Therefore indefinite pronouns or even non-referential expressions can be used:

(6) *Čto za zvuki ya slyshu?!*

*What's the sounds I hear?!*

There is also such thing as indirect address when utterance is supposedly directed both at the immediate addressee and another participant, mentioned by the speaker. However indirect address is ambiguous phenomenon since mentioning of the present participant by 3d person not always means addressing him. Therefore there is a problem of a distinction between just mentioning and indirect targeting. Possible solution is to take into account the perspective of the participants: to examine whether the participants themselves recognize 3d person reference to one of them as addressed or non-addressed and act accordingly [Levinson 1988:213–216].

1st person plural forms can be defined as addresses as well in instances where they apparently refer to a single participant:

(7) *Otkryvaem tetradi, zapisyvaem.*

*Let's open up copybooks, write down.*

Although some scholars call them forms of joint action, collaboration between speakers and addressees in such situations is excluded: addressee is the only person who supposed to perform corresponding action.

The rest of the chapter is devoted to 1st and 2nd person plural forms that refer to the addressee but not limited to other participants. Such forms may indicate that addressee belongs to particular group (stable or situational), organization or category:

(8) *ty [= addressee] grish- /vy [= those participants, including addressee, who adhere to particular point of view] grite za piat rebiatv tvoej gruppe.*

*You are [singular] telling... You are [plural] telling: for five guys in your group.*

(9) *I sejchas prishla k vam [= to the addressee as the member of the organization], da, kak k glavnojtakoj gradoobrazuiuschej kompanii.*

*And now I have come to you, right, as to main city-forming company.*

During the course of interaction scope of reference in plural may vary. The speaker can use both 2nd and 1st person plural forms in order to join to particular categories with addressee, or to contrast himself and the addressee. Referential choice may not only reflect the current state of affairs. The speaker can also perform other actions: give and take responsibility, guide the course of the interaction, criticize the addressee.

*Chapter 3* is devoted to social meanings ascribed to various types of address terms, contrasted to each other: *ty* (2nd person singular) and first name in reduced form, *vy* (2nd person polite) and name plus patronymic, etc. Formation of these meanings were investigated in the

context of nongovernmental organization, working with children and adults with difficult forms of disabilities and their families. During ethnographic observations following patterns were discovered:

- colleagues belonging to the same project or department mostly address each other by informal 2nd person singular forms and first names in reduced forms; tendency to reciprocal *ty* weakened in interactions between members of different departments;

- clients of the organization (adults and children with disabilities) and its members use reciprocal *ty* and first name in a reduced form;

- in most cases members of the organization and parents of the clients address to each other *vy* (and often both parties use first name in a reduced form).

From the outside these tendencies can be viewed as indicators of belonging or not belonging to the group. Choice between *ty* and *vy* indicates the border that separate insiders from outsiders: members of the organization and parents; members of different departments; those who work with people with disabilities directly (teachers, assistants) from those who don't (cook). These tendencies can be considered as local, although they are not unique to this NGO and supposedly can be discovered in other institutions as well. However it is impossible to tell in advance whether indication of belongingness/non-belongingness would be relevant in any given situation. In order to make such conclusion ethnographic information is needed: observations and interviews with members of the community. At the same time interpretation of social meaning from the outside is not the only possible as evidenced by members' views: they tell about closeness, establishing and maintaining personal boundaries, hierarchical relations, etc. These views about meanings, appropriateness of particular forms, boundaries of the community are not always shared by its members. Moreover, member's explanations of choice of particular form in a particular situation may be dependent on the context: the personality of the addressee, goals of the interaction. For instance, one of my informants explained to his manager his reluctance to address him *ty* drawing on difference in age and status in the organization. However in interview he told that he didn't want to be so close to the manager.

In *Chapter 4* address terms are described as actions. The chapter demonstrates that it is impossible to fully describe whole range of possible actions in terms of a single approach. Searle's version of speech act theory allows to describe attention getting (as directive) and expression of speaker's feelings toward the addressee (as expressive). Theory of linguistic politeness [Brown, Levinson 1987] gives an opportunity to describe terms of address as means of construction and changing social distance between participants. Address terms can be used both to support positive and negative face, and to threaten them. Negative face is supported by honorification of the addressee (using polite pronouns, titles, name and patronimic) or impersonalization and avoidance



of address terms. Positive face is enhanced by addressing with informal pronouns, terms, highlighting solidarity (*brat* (brother), *druzhische* (mate), *zemliak* (countryman), reduced forms of a name, etc.), sometimes ritual insults between members of a group.

There are some other action types that theory of politeness cannot encompass - different strategic uses of address terms in order to influence the addressee. For instance, addressing a stranger *brat* (brother), *drug* (friend) implies intimacy and reciprocity of relations between the speaker and the addressee. When the addressee answers, he therefore positions himself as close to the speaker. It may impose on the addressee some corresponding obligations. Another example of such strategic manipulation is addressing clients by their personal names in service encounters. Such usage can be construed as personal approach to the client.

Another type of action is connected to dialogue organization, described by conversation analysis (CA). CA examines address terms in context of a conversational sequence. Address term may function as summons, initiating interaction; as a turn-taking (for selecting next speaker), or turn-holding (for getting the floor) device. In an initial position of a reply it may also indicate disagreement with the addressee.

*Chapter 5* develops the subject of dialogue organization. In the chapter investigated those instances that seem to be not adequately described as means of management of addressee's attention, expression of social relations or interpersonal distance, indirect speech acts (orders, prohibitions, complaints, threats, etc.). It is argued that in such instances address terms serve as discourse markers dividing thematically separate fragments of talk. In order to reveal this discourse processing function, address terms are described at the level of organization higher than single utterances, namely at the level of sequences of utterances that constitute dialogue. From this perspective, address terms can be viewed as items placed at the border between two sequences, usually at the beginning of the second sequence. Each sequence appears to be topically bounded and two sequences divided by a term of address are devoted to different topics.

In *conclusion* the findings of the dissertation is presented. Construction (by participants) and reconstruction (by scholars) of pragmatics of address terms in concrete cases is based on linguistic properties: lexical and grammatical meanings, semantic and pragmatic presuppositions, conventions of language use. Semantic uncertainty of pronouns gives opportunities for ascribing participants to different groups and categories (including the speaker or not). Address terms are optional and syntactically free and it gives a possibility to use them as discourse markers. In pragmatically unmarked usages relevant aspects of addressee's identity and definition of a situation are conveyed semantically. Deviations from ordinary usages prompt one to search for additional meaning, connected to semantics of terms used. However linguistic properties of address term are just one kind of semiotic resources that present in a situation. Linguistic properties are intertwined with

other resources — prosody, interactional sequences, spatial arrangement, activity, material surrounding. All these resources taken together makes dynamic context of an interaction. Each time this context forms background for each new interpretation of given address term. It allows to argue that pragmatic meanings are systemic. However it is not lexical or grammatical system. Rather this system is made of various semiotic resources that constitute context of a situation that participants rely on.

## References

- Ajsakova, E. A. Social'naya i sociokul'turnaya differenciaciya obrashhenij v sovremennom russkom yazy'ke: dis. ... kand. filol. nauk. 10.02.01 / Ajsakova Elena Alekseevna. — M.: MGPU, 2008. — 200 s.
- Arutyunova, N. D. Lingvisticheskie problemy` referencii / N. D. Arutyunova // *Novoe v zarubezhnoj lingvistike. Vy`p. 13. Logika i lingvistika (Problemy` referencii)* / Pod red. N. D. Arutyunovoj. — M.: Progress, 1982. — S. 5–40.
- Balakaj, A. A. E`tiketny`e obrashheniya: funkcional`no–semanticheskie i leksikograficheskie aspekty`: dis. ... kand. filol. nauk. 10.02.01 / Balakaj Anna Anatol`evna. — Novokuzneczk, 2005. — 241 s.
- Blinova, O. V. Pozicionny`e svojstva russkix usechenny`x obrashhenij i diskursivny`x markerov tipa slushaj / O. V. Blinova // *Acta Linguistica Petropolitana*. — 2019. — T. 15. — №. 3. — S. 185–204.
- Brown, R., Ford, M. Address in American English / R. Brown, M. Ford // *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*. — 1961. — Vol. 62. — №.2. — P. 375–385.
- Brown R., Gilman, A. The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity / R. Brown, A. Gilman // *Language and Social Context* / Edited by P. P. Giglioli. — Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972. — P. 252–282.
- Brown, P., Levinson, S. Politeness: some universals in language usage / P. Brown, S. Levinson. — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987. — 345 p.
- Buras, M. M., Krongauz, M. A. Obrashheniya v russkom semejnomo e`tikete: semantika i pragmatika / M. M. Buras, M. A. Krongauz // *Voprosy` yazy`koznaniya*. — 2013. — №. 2. — S. 121–131.
- Chelovecheskij faktor v yazy'ke. Kommunikaciya, modal`nost`, dejksis / N. D. Arutyunova, T. V. Buly`gina, A. A. Kibrik i dr.; Otv. red. T.V. Buly`gina. — M.: Nauka, 1992. — 280 s.
- Corbett, G. Address in Russian / G. Corbett // *Journal of Russian Studies*. — 1976. — № 31. — P. 3–15.
- Daniel, M. A. Zvatel`nost` kak diskursivnaya kategoriya / M. A. Daniel // *Grammaticheskie kategorii v diskurse. T. 4* / Pod red. V. A. Plungyana, V. Yu. Guseva, A. Yu. Urmanchievoj. — M.: Gnozis, 2008. — S. 439–466.
- Daniel M. A. Novy`j russkij vokativ: istoriya formy` usechennogo obrashheniya skvoz` prizmu korpusa pis`menny`x tekstov // *Korpusny`e issledovaniya po russkoj grammatike*. M.: Probel–2009. — S. 224–244.
- Ervin-Tripp, S. Sociolinguistics / S. Ervin-Tripp. — Berkeley: Language–Behavior Research Laboratory of the University of California, 1967. — 145 p.

- Fufaeva, I. V. Istorija pojavleniya v russkom yazy`ke družheskix obrashhenij starina i starik / I. V. Fufaeva // Slovo.ru: Baltijskij akcent. — 2020. — №. 4. — S. 108–117.
- Gladrov, V. Sistema obrashheniya v russkom i nemeckom yazy`kax / V. Gladrov // Festschrift in Honour of Professor Arto Mustajoki on the Occasion of his 60th Birthday / Edited by J. Lindstedt et al. — Helsinki: Department of Slavonic and Baltic Languages and Literatures, 2008. — P. 38–48.
- Goffman, E. Footing / E. Goffman // Forms of talk / E. Goffman. — Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981. — P. 124 — 159.
- Gol`din, V. E. Obrashhenie: teoreticheskie problemy` / V. E. Gol`din. — Saratov: Izdatel`stvo Saratovskogo universiteta, 1987. — 127 s.
- Golovko, E. V. E`tnografiya rechi kak iskusstvo / E. V. Golovko // Natales grate numeras?: Sbornik statej k 60–letiyu Georgiya Axillovicha Levintona // Pod red. . — SPb.: Izdatel`stvo Evropejskogo universiteta v Sankt–Peterburge, 2008. — S. 199–205.
- Kodzasov, S. V. Prosodiya obrashhenij / S. V. Kodzasov // Issledovaniya v oblasti russkoj prosodii / S. V. Kodzasov. — M.: Yazy`ki slavyanskoj kul`tury`, 2009. — S. 161–174.
- Krongauz, M. A. Obrashheniya, kak sposob modelirovaniya kommunikativnogo prostranstva / M. A. Krongauz // Logicheskij analiz yazy`ka. Obraz cheloveka v kul`ture i yazy`ke / Otv. red. N. D. Arutyunova, I. B. Levontina. — M.: Nauka, 1999. — S. 124–134.
- Krongauz, M. A. Russkij rechevoj e`tiket na rubezhe vekov / M. A. Krongauz // Russian Linguistics. — 2004. — T. 2. — №. 28. — S. 163–187.
- Krysin, L. P. Russkoe slovo, svoe i chuzhoe / L. P. Krysin. — M.: Yazy`ki slavyanskix kul`tur, 2004. — 888 s.
- Larina, T. V. Kategoriya vezhlivosti i stil` kommunikacii: sopostavlenie anglijskix i russkix lingvokul`turny`x tradicij / T. V. Larina. — M.: Rukopisny`e pamyatniki Drevnej Rusi, 2009. — 507 s.
- Levinson, S. C. Putting linguistics on a proper footing: Explorations in Goffman's participation framework / S. C. Levinson // Goffman: Exploring the interaction order / Edited by P. Drew, A. Wootton. — Oxford: Polity Press, 1988. — P. 161 — 227.
- Norby C., Wide C. Introduction: Address as Social Action Across Cultures and Contexts // Address Practice as Social Action: European Perspectives / Edited by C. Norrby, C. Wide. — Basingstoke; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015. — P. 2–12.
- Paducheva, E. V. Vy`skazy`vanie i ego sootnesennost` s dejstvitel`nost`yu / E. V. Paducheva. — M.: Nauka, 1985. — 271 s.
- Parrott, L. A. Vocatives and other direct address forms: A contrastive study / L. A. Parrot // Oslo Studies in Language. — Vol. 2. — №. 1. — P. 211–229.
- Philipsen G., Huspek M. A Bibliography of Sociolinguistic Studies of Personal Address / G. Philipsen, M. Huspek // Anthropological Linguistics. — 1985. — Vol. 27. — №. 1. — P. 94–101.

- Pronichev, V. P. Sintaksis obrashheniya na materiale russkogo i serboxorvatskogo yazy`kov / V. P. Pronichev. — L.: LGU, 1971. — 88 s.
- Ryzhova, L. P. Kommunikativny`e funkcii obrashheniya / L. P. Ryzhova // Semantika i pragmatika sintaksicheskix edinic / Pod. red. S. A. Susovoj. — Kalinin: KGU, 1981. S. 76–85.
- Shaxmatov, A. A. Sintaksis russkogo yazy`ka / A. A. Shaxmatov. — M.: E`ditorial URSS, 2001. — 620 s.
- Somin, A. A., Gridneva, E. M. Obrashhenie Gospoda v istoricheskoy perspektive / A. A. Somin, E. M. Gridneva // Slovo.ru: Baltijskij akcent. — 2020. — №. 4. — S. 91–107.
- Yadroff, M. Modern Russian vocatives: a case of subtractive morphology / M. Yadroff // Journal of Slavic Linguistics. — 1996. — Vol.4 — P. 133–153.
- Yanko, T. E. Intonacionny`e strategii russkoj rechi v sopostavitel`nom aspekte / T. E. Yanko. — M.: Yazy`ki slavyanskix kul`tur, 2008. — 311 s.
- Yanko, T. E. Russkie obrashheniya: slovarnaya informaciya i vokativny`e konstrukcii [E`lektronny`j resurs] / T. E. Yanko // Komp`yuternaya lingvistika i intellektual`ny`e texnologii. Trudy` Mezhdunarodnoj konferencii Dialog 2009 po komp`yuternoj lingvistike i ee prilozheniyam — 2009. — S. 574–579. — Rezhim dostupa: <<https://www.dialog-21.ru/media/1639/89.pdf>> [Data poslednego obrashheniya: 10.01.2023].
- Yanko, T. E. Obrashheniya v strukture diskursa / T. E. Yanko // Logicheskij analiz yazy`ka. Mono-, dia-, polilog v razny`x kul`turax / Pod red. N. D. Arutyunovoj. — M.: Indrik, 2010, S. 456–468.
- Yanko, T. E. Leksicheskaya semantika obrashhenij: semanticheskie osobennosti russkix antroponimov i drugix imen, oboznachayushhix lyudej / T. E. Yanko // Yazy`k i rechevaya deyatel`nost`. — 2011. — №. 11. — C. 239–255.
- Yanko, T. E. Kommunikaciya vs. nominaciya: analiz russkix vokativov / T. E. Yanko // Kognitivny`e issledovaniya yazy`ka / Pod red. — 2012a. — №. 12. — S. 155–165.
- Yanko, T. E. Vokativny`e strategii v dialoge: problema imenovaniya slushayushhego / T. E. Yanko // Russkij yazy`k segodnya. X Shmelevskie chteniya. Institut russkogo yazy`ka im. V. V. Vinogradova RAN. 2012b. S. 473–484.
- Zhukova, T. S. Obrashheniya v reglamentirovanny`x sferax obshheniya: stanovlenie novej normy`: dis. ... kand. filol. nauk. 10.02.01 / Zhukova Tat`yana Sergeevna. — M.: RGGU, 2015. — 232 s.