

SCTMG 2020

International Scientific Conference «Social and Cultural Transformations in the Context of Modern Globalism»

SYNTACTIC CATEGORY OF HOMOGENEITY IN RUSSIAN: DIFFICULT CASES

Danilova Elena Aleksandrovna (a)*, Yurkina Tatiana Nikolaevna (b), Pastukhova Lyudmila Borisovna (c), Yakushkina Zinaida Nikitichna (d), Denisova Tatiana Vitalievna (e), Akhvanderova Alina Davydovna (f)

*Corresponding author

(a) Chuvash State Pedagogical University named after I.Y. Yakovlev, Cheboksary, Russia, sergeymuratovo@mail.ru

(b) Chuvash State Pedagogical University named after I.Y. Yakovlev, Cheboksary, Russia, tanya-yurkina@yandex.ru

(c) Chuvash State Pedagogical University named after I.Y. Yakovlev, Cheboksary, Russia,

lydmila.pastukhova.57@mail.ru

(d) Chuvash State Pedagogical University named after I.Y. Yakovlev, Cheboksary, Russia, zinaalevtinina@mail.ru

(e) Chuvash State Pedagogical University named after I.Y. Yakovlev, Cheboksary, Russia, tatyana.docka@yandex.ru

(f) Chuvash State Pedagogical University named after I.Y. Yakovlev, Cheboksary, Russia, antus2003@mail.ru

Abstract

This article presents the analysis of the homogeneity syntactic category in Russian. It describes the main criteria of homogeneity of sentence members, describes the typical means of homogeneity expression and provides examples of their implementation. The study identifies difficult cases of analysis of sentences complicated by homogeneous narratives and definitions and suggests ways to solve problematic issues. Thus, to justify the homogeneity of definitions it is necessary to check such criteria as: 1) uniformity of the syntactic position, 2) uniformity, 3) uniformity. Simultaneous realization of the given attributes allows to speak about homogeneous or, on the contrary, inhomogeneous definitions, and consequently, promotes competent punctuation registration of the constructions containing them. The homogeneity of the said features also requires: 1) structural commonality; 2) semantic proximity of verbs; 3) coincidence of grammatical forms (voice, modal, temporary, personal). However, in modern linguistics, there are still debates about the monopredicacy or polypredicacy of sentences with homogeneous predicates. It is obvious that the predicate is homogeneous in a simple sentence in the presence of a secondary member of a sentence and a common verbal unit in composite verbal and nominative predicates. Another syntactic problem, also in terms of methodology, is the question of the status of such members of the sentence that are very similar to, but not homogeneous because they do not have all the features necessary for this. These are the so-called single-functional members of the sentence (*all and always*) and the members in constructions with the secondary conjunction connection (*gift flowers, notebooks*).

2357-1330 © 2020 Published by European Publisher.

Keywords: Syntax, homogeneity category, homogeneous predicate, homogeneous definitions.



This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 Unported License, permitting all non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

1. Introduction

Compound relation is one of the main types of relations between the members of a simple sentence, as well as between the predicative units that make up a complex sentence. The essay's essence is defined on the basis of its opposition to another basic type of connection – subordination: unlike subordination, the work embodies a connection of grammatically equivalent components. For example: *Clouds float lazily and heavily in the blue heat of the sky* (Blok, 1987). The grammatical equivalence of the work is characterized by the fact that in its implementation neither the form of words in a simple sentence nor the structures of predicative units in a complex sentence undergo any grammatical changes due to their entry into the composition.

There are three types of compositional relation in a simple sentence: 1) homogeneous terms, 2) single-functional but heterogeneous terms; 3) constructions with secondary conjunctive (compound) relation.

2. Problem Statement

This research is topical because the homogeneity category is one of the most difficult in the Russian syntax. There are still unsolved questions about the status of sentences with homogeneous narratives (simple or complex), there are no common criteria in the method of explaining the homogeneity/uniformity of definitions, which, in turn, generates difficulties for students in setting punctuation marks.

3. Research Questions

The category of homogeneity is a multi-dimensional syntactic phenomenon that represents a compound relation in a simple sentence and requires a functional approach to analysis. It is implemented under a number of conditions and with special means of communication, such as: intonation of enumeration, compositional unions, as well as forms of words that act as a common dependent component or auxiliary component in a compound predicate, prepositions, particles, etc.

4. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the work is to present a complete analysis of the homogeneity category in the Russian syntax, to develop methods for qualification of sentences with homogeneous narratives, and to propose a methodology for applying uniform criteria to identify homogeneity/uniformity of definitions.

5. Research Methods

The research involved descriptive-analytical, contextual-logic methods, as well as elements of transformational and contextual analysis.

6. Findings

Homogeneous members – the main type of representation of the compound relations in a simple sentence. The most important features of **homogeneous members of the sentence**, implementing the main type of compositional relations in a simple sentence, are the following: 1) replacement of the same syntactic position (homogeneity of the syntactic position), 2) homogeneity, 3) homogeneous functionality.

Uniformity of syntactic position is conditioned by the same lexical-grammatical character of relations of composed components to the same sentence member. Thus, a verb "to gift" can have three word forms as dependents due to its lexical-grammatical nature, occupying, respectively, three different syntactic positions: the Dative case with the meaning of the addressee (to whom? – *mum*), the Accusative case without an excuse with the meaning of the direct object (what? – *flowers*), the Accusative case with the meaning of the motivation (for what? – *care*). At the same time, each of these positions can be represented in a specific statement not by just one word form, but by two or more: *Gift mom and sister flowers and sweets for attention and care*, etc. This creates a similarity of syntactic positions.

Compound members of a homogeneous series are more likely to be *uniform*, for example, appearing in the form of the same case: *She looked either at her father or her mother...*

Unifunctionality presupposes semantic unification, for example, the presence of two or more members of the sentence indicating the place of action: ***Here and there***, *their voices were heard*. Compliance with these three criteria allows solving the problem of **homogeneous and inhomogeneous definitions** and their punctuation. Thus, it is possible to compare the two constructions: 1) *We bought red, yellow, blue balls*. – homogeneous definitions, since all three adjectives replace the same syntactic position, each of them equally enters into an attributive relationship with the defined word "balls" (there is a parallel connection: *red balls, yellow balls, blue balls*), they are uniform and single-functional (qualitative adjectives with color designation semantics.); 2) *We bought a prom Italian red dress* – inhomogeneous definitions, because adjectives are not functional (relative adjectives with the semantics of purpose and production, qualitative adjectives with the semantics of color), they replace different syntactic positions in relation to the defined word *dress*, so there is a consecutive relation (*dress* (which one?) *red*; *red dress* (which one?) *Italian*; *Italian red dress* (which one?) *prom*.). Because of these criteria, pronouns and adjectives, when used as definitions, do not form a homogeneous series, for example: *Show me your new dress*. At the same time, the presence of a single base – a single logical plan for identifying features that characterize the subject – allows us to act as homogeneous definitions that can be expressed by qualitative and relative adjectives, with features mutually clarifying and complementing each other, such as: *The day was an August, hot and tiresomely boring day*. – *Here August* does not simply indicate the season, but along with adjectives *hot and tiresomely boring* draws the burden and heat of this day (Shapiro, 2017). There are also homogeneous definitions if one is expressed by a turn of phrase and the other by a single adjective or a participle in the preposition of a participial clause, for example: *It was a new, unknown feeling*.

The second type, which implements compound relations in a simple sentence, is **single-functional but inhomogeneous** members. They are usually expressed in questioning, negative or qualifying

pronouns and pronouns that provide a common semantics, such as: **Everyone** has been talking about this incident. **No one** will ever forget it.

The third type – structures with secondary conjunctive (compound) relation, having mixed character. Their essence is that the subordinate relation, implemented in the word combination, is superimposed on the compound relation, represented by the compound conjunction, for example: *I got a book, but not an interesting one.*

The main **means of homogeneity** are the intonation of the enumeration, the compositional unions, as well as the forms of words that act as a common dependent component or auxiliary component in a compound predicate, prepositions, particles and some others.

Listing intonation is one of the main and constant characteristics of homogeneous members, it is an obligatory tool for expressing homogeneity. It is distinguished by the uniformity of the pronunciation of all homogeneous terms, manifested by the same tone height when pronouncing each homogeneous term, by the presence of the same power accents on each of them and by the pauses, for example: *And then in the crackle of insects, in the suspicious figures and mounds, in the blue sky, in the moonlight, in the flight of a night bird, in everything you see and hear, you begin to wonder the triumph of beauty, youth, the flowering of strength and passion for life ...* (Chekhov, 1990).

The homogenous members of the proposal may have an conjunctive relation, with the composition unions acting as a means of expressing homogeneity, along with the intonation. Different semantic relations are established between the homogeneous members of the sentence: connective, opposing, separating, gradational, explanatory, causal and temporal. The purpose of penultimate unions is to convey these relations, and this is the functional aspect of various categories of compounds, respectively: connective, divisive, oppressive, connective, comparative unions.

Compound relations characterize the expression of one-planned notions consisting of homogeneous members of the proposal, with the functioning of compounds **AND, YES, NEITHER ... NOR**, for example: *A kettle with a mug, a bucket to spare, a featherbed, and a pillow – Germans are in a difficulty, we are okay* (Tvardovsky, 1987); *Gerasim was a strict and serious man* (Turgenev, 1994). Moreover, repetitive unions emphasize the incompleteness (openness) of the row, and single unions indicate the completeness of the enumeration and signal that the homogeneous row is closed, for example: *The river carried both blue ice floes and waves, and a thin fragment of an oar* (Block, A.) – *The river was carrying blue ice floes, waves and a thin piece of oar.*

Adversative relations are characteristic of a series of homogenous members formed by the defining word forms: one characteristic may be opposed to another as in some respect limiting or substituting it. The opposing unions are **BUT, YES, THOUGH, THOUGH NOT, ON THE OTHER HAND, HOWEVER**, for example: *She got her own life, but a life alone* (Turgenev, 1994); *Writes slowly but carefully; makes very specific, however useful comments.*

Distinctive relations point to the incompatibility of the links of all homogenous members with the qualifying word, with each of these links separately possible, for example: *The technician will bring the project himself or send it with a courier.* To express the distinctive relations, conjunctions **OR, EITHER...OR, THAT...AND THAT..., NOT THAT...AND NOT THAT..., ALL, OF COURSE**. Repeated

union of the *THAT... AND THAT* denotes a series of real-life links, which are implemented alternately:
And in front of him all the horses and red bricks were glimpsing.

Comparative relations assume the existence of a gradational relationship in the functioning of the unions *NOT ONLY... BUT NOT ONLY... NOT SO MUCH, AS..., THE SAME ... AS IS* etc. An example: *It is obvious that we are not so much fighting, but fights in our surroundings (Simonov K.); He cried not so much from pain as from resentment.*

Joint relations are accompanied by gradational relations, with the second member of the homogeneous series having an additional informative character. For expressions of this type of relations, there are unions *YES, AS WELL AS, AND ALSO*, for example: *For Mayakovsky, as well as for other poets, time went vertical, from top to bottom; The tail of the peacock, green, poured in bronze, and also coloured with huge "eyes", was dragged on the ground like a plume.*

Prepositions are one of the means of expressing the meaning of homogeneity. As a rule, it is typical means at homogeneous attributes or the adverbial modifiers of one indirect case with a preposition. A preposition may be used for every member of a homogeneous series, for example: *Red spots from the fire were shaking on the mountain, on the trees, on the bridge, on the dryer.* If the preposition is used only for the first homogenous member, it serves as an additional means of expressing homogeneity, as it is evidence of the equal subordination of all homogenous members, for example: *He accused himself of selfishness, inattention, greyness.*

In general, the term "complicated sentence" itself hints at a certain proximity of constructions with complicated elements with complex sentences. For example, Babaytseva (2011) speaks about the "transitivity scale" between simple and complex sentences. This term implies a very variegated set of different syntactic forms: here we have sentences complicated by references, introductory and insertive constructions, and sentences with different kinds of separate components, including sentences with different homogeneous members, main and minor ones. Each of these constructions contains a number of problem.

For the first time in Russian linguistics, Ovsyaniko-Kulikovsky (1989) did not accept the concept of a "compound sentence". Analyzing sentences like *Before they could go out and look around, there were about a dozen cells hanging between the windows and on the wall* (Turgenev , 1994, p. 76), he notes that in all these and similar cases, Union I connects the same parts of the sentence: two subjects, two predicates, two objects, etc. (Ovsianiko-Kulikovsky, 1989). However, the term "homogeneous members of the sentence" does not belong to him, but to A.M. Peshkovsky, who in his book "Russian syntax in scientific coverage" considers "merged sentences" as taking an intermediate position between a single sentence (simple) and a complex one. At the same time, he believes that the second homogeneous member can be interpreted as an incomplete sentence in which "the said sentence is borrowed from the previous one", e.g., in the book "Russian Syntax in Academic Papers": *He always threw himself at the light sun of motion, not at the disputants* (as cited in Danilova, 2018).

Shakhmatov (1908) opposed the study of sentences with several predicate like "*Caesar came, saw, won*" as a combination of several sentences. He claimed: "We hardly have reason to think that the presence of several predicate sentences corresponds to the presence of several sentences and that, for example, in the sentence "*Caesar came, saw, won*" we have a composite 3 sentences: "*Caesar came,*

Caesar saw, Caesar won" (Valgina, 2003). But at the same time, Shakhmatov (1908) does not single out homogeneous members of the sentence and, in general, homogeneity as a structural-semantic category of syntax.

Therefore, in syntactic science again and again address this problem, in particular, the problem of homogeneity of the predicate. It is known, for example, that linguists of the Czechoslovak school have put both this concept and the evaluation of sentences containing two or more sentences as simple ones under great doubt. Their arguments are sufficiently strong, and in the works of our scientists, for example, Beloshapkova (2008), they have been taken into account: with regard to the provision that any members of a sentence can be homogeneous except for the predicate ones (and the verbs can be predicted, while the name predicate ones are homogeneous), Beloshapkova (2008) writes: "The lexical top of a sentence is a hierarchical top of a sentence, therefore, a sentence with several lexical ones is a polypredicative construction, a complex sentence" (p. 38). This provision is also reflected in WG-80, where sentences with several predicate sentences are considered as complex (Russian Grammar, 1980). This provision is also reflected in WG-80, where sentences with several predicates are considered as complex (Russian Grammar, 1980). With respect to constructions with named predicate, the following solution is proposed: if the predicate as a whole or a related component are connected by an compound relation, then this is a complex sentence; if only the related name components are connected by an compound relation, then these are monopredicative simple sentences with a common subject. There is also a special kind of predicate – the consequence of different types of syntactic relationships, for example: *Coming, coming; I'm going to ask; I just wrote it; laughing very hard*. (Shvedova, 2003). In our interpretation, these are not homogeneous predicate forms, but complicated forms of a simple verb predicate.

Among the proposals containing "transient phenomena" from monopredictivity to polypredictive constructions, the majority of syntaxists agree that the phenomenon of homogeneity should be noted if a number of simple predicate has a common dependent term, e.g.: *Passengers would walk, sit and lie on deck*. Here the presence of a common dependent component, in the case of a common subject, is a strong argument in favor of talking about a single syntactic position of the predicate.

Propositions with nonproliferation of verb-subjectives (*stars pale and fade out*) refer to proposals with homogeneous predicate as monosubjective constructs.

Homogeneity of the predicate suggests the following requirements: 1) structural commonality of the predicate; 2) semantic proximity of verbs (these are either synonyms or words belonging to the same semantic group); 3) coincidence of grammatical forms (voiced, modal, temporary, personal).

On the basis of homogeneity / heterogeneity, on the one hand, simple sentences are opposed to a homogeneous set of predicate words having a common distributor, e.g.: *Kids play, walk, dine in the garden*; and, on the other hand, structures with personal distributors, such as: *He was often at the outpost, had physical training sessions, knew many border guards*. First of all, there is no semantic unity of the verb line in sentences of the second type. According to Babaytseva's (2011) observation, the set of homogeneous verbs in such sentences is "on the verge of disintegration". The semantic diversity of verbs included in the homogeneous series promotes private distribution and the formation of sufficiently isolated verb nodes, each of which carries independent information. In each of such verb centres one can distinguish independent groups of word combinations which have no points of contact with each other,

which is typical for polypredicative units. Besides, between the components of such a polypredicative complex (after all, sentences with common predicate units are a kind of polypredicative complex unit, in which several predicate relations are formed, directed from several predicate units to the subject, and therefore "several relations of utterance to reality arise"), there appear relations inherent in complex sentences: these are most often conditional, investigative, causal relations; these relations are especially brightly manifested with the participation of lexical components *because, because of that, therefore etc.* (Skoblikova, 2012). Polypredicative structures can be easily transformed into a complex subordinate sentence with subordinate conjunctive elements, for example: *He is very well mannered **and therefore** does not oppress his interlocutor with his gloom and his knowledge.* – To compare: *He is very well mannered, **so** he does not oppress the interlocutor with his gloominess and his knowledge* – there is a cause-and-effect relation.

Words *consequently, therefore* perform the function of "scraping" – a union and a modal word – with the meaning of transition to generalization, for example: *Different publications have different purposes **and therefore** imply different readings of the book. Then Arapov was introduced to Potapov, who said that Eurasianism developed in the UK **and therefore** could be used by the British.* In the latter example, along with semantic diversity of verb forms in the polypredicative complex, structural diversity is also observed – there are different types of predicate, different temporal attribution – in 1 predicate plan of the past (Perfect tense), in 2 – the Present tense.

A simple sentence should be characterized by one set of predictive values: one time plan, one objective, one subjective modality. Let us compare the sentences in two groups:

I. *The cars **drove away** from the central manor, went to the bridge and soon **disappeared** around the corner; for a whole month the whole team was puzzling over this riddle and sent out **worrying** letters to the participants of the meeting; the members of the organizing committee will **meet** at the conference in Baku and in a personal conversation will try to solve all these issues.*

II. *You **ate** borsh, now **finish** your tea and **go get** the newspaper; Vasya **flew away** yesterday, now sitting in Sverdlovsk, he **might** be late for a meeting; He was **supposed** to give his report the day before yesterday, but he wasn't on time for Monday.*

In the proposals of Group II the independence of modal-temporal characteristics of prediction is evident. And it is also obvious that it is impossible to characterize these sentences according to the canon developed for simple sentences – each composition of the predicate should be characterized separately, and we get as many set of attributes as in the phrase of such relations.

So, sentences complicated by simultaneous occurrence of two or more predicative compositions, closed to the common for them subject, cannot be considered simple in its own meaning of this term. They are not complex in their own sense, but they are clearly polypredicative. The characteristic in the face aspect of predictive compositions is common, as these structures are monosubjective. Therefore, it is more correct to qualify such proposals as monosubject polypredicative constructions.

7. Conclusion

Thus, the category of homogeneity, which implements a compound relation in a simple sentence and represents a complex syntactic phenomenon in Russian, requires a multidimensional functional

approach. It is especially relevant for solving transient phenomena from monopredicative to polypredicative constructions with homogeneous narratives. Based on authoritative sources, we have proposed a number of criteria allowing us to qualify the status of such sentences. We have also described the main cases that represent homogeneous and heterogeneous definitions.

References

- Babaytseva, V. V. (2011). *The system of sentence members in modern Russian*. Flint; Science.
- Beloshapkova, V. A. (2008). *Contemporary Russian Language. Syntax*. Academy.
- Blok, A.A. (1987). *Research and Materials*. USSR Academy of Sciences; Institute of Russian Literature (Pushkin House).
- Chekhov, M. P. (1990). *Around Chekhov*. However.
- Danilova, E. A. (2018). *Syntax of a simple sentence* (Textbook). Chuvash State Univer.
- Ovsyaniko-Kulikovskiy, D. N. (1989). *Literary and critical works in two volumes*. Hudozhestvennaya literature.
- Russian Grammar (1980). *Syntax*. Science.
- Shakhmatov, A. A (1908). *History of the Russian annals*. M.A. Alexandrov's printing house.
- Shapiro, A. B. (2017). *Modern Russian language. Punctuation*. ComBook.
- Shvedova, N. Y. (2003). *Essays on syntax of Russian colloquial speech*. Azbukovnik.
- Skoblikova, E. S. (2012). *Modern Russian language. Syntax of a simple sentence (theoretical course)*. Flint.
- Turgenev, I. S. (1994). *Collected works in 5 volumes*. Russian book.
- Tvardovsky, A. T. (1987). *Autobiography. From early poems (1925-1935)*. Soviet writer.
- Valgina, N. S. (2003). *Contemporary Russian Language: Syntax* (Textbook). Higher School.