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Abstract. Russian in comparison with some ancient Indo-European languages (Sanskrit, Ancient Greek, Latin), functional and grammatical features of infinitive phrases and their transformations were considered in this study in order to identify traces of the ergative system in modern Russian. In the course of the study, it was possible to determine the structural features of semi predicative infinitive turns, to characterize the infinitive as the grammatical core of semi predicative turns in the diachronic aspect, and also to find the relationship between the forms of the infinitive historically fixed in the studied languages and the features of the syntactic organization of semi predicative constructions in ergative and nominative languages. It is determined that the accusative case of a turnover with the meaning of a complex complement is not the norm for all languages. The choice of the case of such a semi-predicative construction is also due to the agreement of the "logical subject" and the "logical predicate".
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Introduction

The problem of interpreting constructions similar in meaning in the languages of the nominative and ergative structure, as well as the problem of the typology of ergativity itself, has long attracted the attention of domestic and foreign linguists: Gamkrelidze T.V., Zhirmunskiy A.V., Ivanov V.V.,...
Kantselson S.D., Klimov G.A., Meshchaninov I.I., Patrakeev M.M., Stepankov Yu.S., Tenier L., Dixon R.V. However, it should be admitted that many issues have not yet been fully resolved. With a fairly deep coverage of this topic in the scientific linguistic literature, there are practically no short and clear criteria for the differentiation of nominative and ergative languages. And this is due to the fact that in the languages of the nominative structure there are quite often some grammatical anomalies, which suggest that one or another nominative language currently goes back to the ergative primordial basis. This, in turn, suggests the prevalence of ergative languages over nominative in more ancient times. This hypothesis can also be supported by research in neuro psycholinguistics, based on the general laws of glotto genesis and the evolution of grammatical structure. This area of linguistics is currently poorly researched, therefore, it is so necessary to pay attention to the study of various types of individual grammatical anomalies in languages, allowing us to assume traces of an ergative structure in a modern nominative language.

**Objective** – to characterize the functional and grammatical features of infinitive turns in the history of the Russian language in comparison with some ancient Indo-European languages (Sanskrit, Ancient Greek, Latin) and, on the basis of this characteristic, to identify individual traces of the ergative structure in modern Russian language.

**Research tasks:**

1. Provide a brief description of the grammatical system of languages of the ergative structure in comparison with nominative languages.
2. Consider the definition of the concept of ergativity from the standpoint of neuro psycholinguistics.
3. Determine the structural features of semi-predicative infinitive turns.
4. Describe the infinitive as the grammatical core of semi-predicative turns in the diachronic aspect.
5. Find the relationship between the historically entrenched forms of the infinitive in the studied languages and the peculiarities of the syntactic organization of semi-predicative constructions in ergative and nominative languages.

**Proposed Methodology:** Comparative-historical and semantic-grammatical analysis of linguistic material. This method is used in a deep study of the search for analogs of infinitive phrases in Indo-European languages that go back to the languages of the nominative and ergative system. Contextual analysis method. It is used in the study of the material of ancient languages due to the impossibility of relying on colloquial practice.

**Block Diagram:** the article consists of an Introduction, the Main part, which includes the study of the features of formation and turnovers with the meaning of a complex addition in languages that go back to the ergative and nominative system, Analysis of research results, Conclusions and Recommendations.

**Algorithm:** The study begins with a general definition of the concept of ergativity and a comparison of the structural features of the languages of the nominative and ergative systems. Then the concepts of ergativity and nominativity are considered from the standpoint of neuro
psycholinguistics in the aspect of the general laws of interaction between external and internal speech. At the end of the analysis, a relationship is established between the features of the grammatical forms and syntactic functions of the infinitive historically fixed in the language and the predominance in the language-based features of the ergative or nominative structure. In conclusion, it is concluded that the prevalence in languages that go back to the nominative primordial basis, turns with the meaning of a complex addition, over languages that have elements of ergativity.

Flow Chart:

1. Definition of the concept of ergativity (on the example of the Sumerian language).
2. Psycholinguistic foundations of ergativity.
3. Grammatical forms of the infinitive in the studied Indo-European languages.
4. Functional and structural features of turns with the meaning of a complex addition in the studied languages.

Main part
At the heart of the grammatical system of ergative languages, in contrast to nominative languages, lies the opposition of two syntactic constructions: ergative and absolute. The ergative design is based on two essential components - the agent and the patient. There is only one subject in an absolute construction. The languages of the ergative system include one of the most ancient deciphered languages - Sumerian. The meanings of subject and patient in Sumerian are conveyed using the absolute case. The semantics of the subject in the ergative construction is expressed by the ergative case. There is no nominative case (subject / object) and accusative case (object), which is typical for nominative languages, in ergative languages. As an example, let us analyze the structure of the Sumerian absolute and ergative constructions.

In the Sumerian language, a name in the absolute case, depending on the type of construction, can occupy different positions. In an absolute construction, acting as a subject, it is at the beginning of a sentence. In the ergative construction, when functioning as a patient, it is usually positioned directly in front of the conjugated verb. At the same time, the main verb, as in most ancient languages, completes the sentence [6, p. 28].

An example of an ergative design: “lugal-e (A) ê (P) mu-un dû” «the king built the temple» [6, p. 28].

An example of an absolute construction: “lugal (S) é-a i-ku(r)4” «the king entered the temple» [6, p. 28].

The ergativeness of the grammatical structure of the Sumerian language, which is one of the most ancient deciphered languages, serves as one more confirmation of the hypothesis of the precedence of the ergative structure to the nominative one. From the standpoint of neuro psycholinguistics in the history of the evolution of the human brain, the synthetic type of thinking preceded the analytical one, since the program of internal utterance is initially synthetically predictive [Vygotsky, p. 364]. Ergative constructions in their structure are closer to the program of internal utterances, and subsequently, the automation of the process of transforming internal utterances into external ones contributed to the transformation of synthetic elements of the structures of ancient languages into analytical ones, and later into a general desire for analyticism in
many Indo-European languages, which we already know as representatives of the nominative system.

The primacy of synthetism of human thinking in relation to analyticism also explains the predominance of parataxis over hypotaxis in the grammatical structure of ancient languages, which, in turn, contributed to the emergence and widespread dissemination of various transitional type constructions in them, the predicative center of which were infinitive and participial forms. In some works, we have already considered the features of the structure and functioning in the ancient Indo-European and Semitic languages of various semi-predicative turns [1, p. 265]. Now we would like to draw attention to the connection between the ergative or nominative structure of individual Indo-European languages with the possibility of forming infinitive phrases in them with the meaning of a complex object, which in classical grammars are classified as Accusativus cum infinitivо.

Based on the name itself and the structure of constructions, it becomes clear that the main and necessary condition for the appearance and consolidation of such a turnover in the language is the nominative structure of the designated language, since the very concept of "ergative structure" denies the presence of the accusative case in the meaning of direct addition.

Consider the structure of the turnover of Accusativus cum infinitivo. This construction is usually a concentrate of an explanatory-object clause where the accusative name or pronoun is used as the "logical subject", and the infinitive is used as the "logical predicate". This turnover usually depends on verbs with the meaning of "speech and thought", like most explanatory-object constructions, and into new languages it is more often translated by an explanatory-object clause. As a classic example of such a turn, you can imagine the Latin expression "Scio me nihil scire" - "I know that I do not know anything". Some new languages (Urdu, Punjabi, Czech, Slovak, Lithuanian, Latvian, Danish, Swedish, Norwegian, Yiddish, English, German, Portuguese, Italian, French, etc.) now have similar expressions, which allows translating Accusativus cum infinitivо without violating the syntactic structure of the construction. However, the Russian language excludes a literal translation of this turnover and in most cases requires replacing it with a clause.

Taking into account the fact that the predicative center of the infinitive turnover is the infinitive, one should consider what this verb name is in different ancient languages and how exactly the peculiarities of the formation of infinitive forms can indicate that this or that language goes back to the nominative or ergative primitive stem. The infinitive, in fact, is an ancient verbal name of a substantive nature, going back to the verbal-nominal substrate of the oldest form of the Proto-Indo-European language. As a result of a comparative historical analysis of the forms of the infinitive and ordinary nouns in different Indo-European languages, it can be established that, in terms of its morphological characteristics, the infinitive was once an analogue of the noun of the neuter singular, did not change in numbers, but declined, since at a certain moment of linguistic evolution froze in one or more case forms, and then was already used in the corresponding constructions, preserving the general meanings and functions of the established case [1, p. 36]. As mentioned above, the general primary attraction to the synthetism of ancient languages contributed to the formation of a large number of different semi-predicative phrases, the center of which were various forms of ancient verbal names of a substantive or adjective nature; and these phrases served to spread and complicate simple syntactic constructions in that period of linguistic evolution, when neither subordinate unions differentiated by meanings nor complex sentences were formed in ancient languages. The following are the results of a comparative analysis, to which case forms...
according to certain morphological characteristics the infinitives can ascend in several ancient Indo-European languages: Ancient Greek, Latin, Sanskrit and Old Russian.

In most of the ancient and new Indo-European languages of the Western type [1. p. 32] the infinitive is a frozen form of the nominative and accusative cases of the ancient verbal substantive noun [1. p. 36]. And since this name was supposedly neuter, in fact, it is one and the same form. In this research, infinitives in the ancient Greek and Latin languages are considered for comparative analysis.

In ancient Greek, the infinitive had a large number of temporary and mortgage forms. In fact, it was present in almost any verb paradigm and could be formed from different temporal and collateral stems. At the same time, formally, this verb name was not already declined in classical ancient Greek, however, it could have case forms, which were expressed in the declined form of the definite article used with the substantivized infinitive [16. p. 328]. Thus, in classical ancient Greek, the infinitive is found in the nominative, accusative, genitive and dative cases, more often without a preposition, less often (but possible) with a preposition, for example: “Ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν ἡμᾶς ἰδίως ἐκπλήσσει ὁ θάνατος ἀπὸ τοῦ πολέμου” «virtue is everywhere due to (its) immortality» [16. p. 340]. In this construction, the infinitive from the verb “to be” is included in the predicate with the nominal part in the nominative case, and the preposition “ἐκ” defines the dative case of the entire substantivized construction, as indicated by the definite article “ὁ” in the dative case. We previously referred to such constructions as cases of extensive substantivation [1. p. 228]. This phenomenon in the classical ancient Greek was well spread due to the specificity of the grammatical structure of the given language, which in the ancient state gravitated more towards synthetism than towards analyticism. However, the same definite article “ὁ” However, the same definite article “ὁ” ὁδικός, which in most cases accompanies the Greek substantivized infinitive, is proof that in ancient Greek this verb name was frozen in the nominative-accusative singular neuter, and therefore was usually used as subject or complement (more often direct). It was in this form that the infinitive was part of the semi-predicative explanatory constructions Accusativus / Nominativus cum infinitivo, as a logical predicate, agreeing with the accusative and nominative forms of the name: “(ΚΔ) οὐερ θεὸς λομεν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν εἰρήνη ἡμᾶς” [22, p. 167]. And this circumstance is one more proof of the nominative structure of the most ancient forms of the Greek language and its pre-Greek substrate. Over time, this verb name in Greek gradually fell out of use. There is no infinitive in the modern form of Greek.

In Latin (classical) language, in contrast to ancient Greek, the infinitive had only six forms, characterized by a temporal and collateral difference. Finals of synthetic forms –re, -ri, -i, -isse. According to the system of endings and its functional and semantic features, the Latin classical infinitive is an ancient verbal name of a substantive character, frozen in the singular form of the neuter nominative / accusative cases. The forms of other indirect cases (genitive, dative and deferred) are represented in Latin by a different verbal name - a gerund [17, p. 338]. Taken together, the gerund and the infinitive make up the complete case paradigm of the ancient verbal-nominal substrate, but unlike the ancient Greek language, classical Latin did not have a declined definite article in its system, and the case meaning was expressed in an inflectional manner. At the same time, the endings of the gerund completely repeat the endings of nouns in the corresponding cases, and the final of the infinitive only partially (if we consider specifically -e and not completely -re). This, in turn, suggests an earlier period of “solidification” and verbalization of the infinitive
relative to the gerund: the classical Latin infinitive managed to lose its connection with the case endings and acquire temporary and mortgage forms, while the gerund was still relatively inflected.

The forms of the Latin infinitive had extensive syntactic possibilities, which was reflected in many Romance languages, most of which have a grammatical connection with folk Latin. The nominative origin and the presence of temporary and mortgage forms allowed the infinitive to be used in semi-predicative turns with the meaning of a complex object and a complex subject. And such constructions had a wide frequency of use: “Existimare debes, omnium oculus in te esse conjectos unum” «You must think that everyone’s eyes are on you alone» [17. p. 302]. Other cases of similar constructions, except for the nominative and accusative, were not used in Latin, which once again proves the origins of the nominative nature of the Latin language and its substrate.

Thus, we can conclude that the ancient Latin and ancient Greek infinitives in their forms and syntactic functions do not violate the main criteria for the nominative structure of these languages.

In languages of the eastern type, the grammatical forms of the infinitive go back to other cases, which are more often used in ergative constructions [Patrakeev, p. 253].

In Sanskrit, the infinitive is a substantive verb name, usually tracing back to the "middle" verb root by adding the suffix-tum: bhū - bhavitum «to be» [10. p. 125].

It should be noted that, according to the derivational model, the Sanskrit infinitive is close to the Latin supine: the -tum- suffix should be interpreted as a combination of the -t- suffix with the neuter ending -um- of the Nominative and Accusative Singular. Like the Latin supin, the Sanskrit infinitive could denote a goal in verbs of movement: “gacchāmi kartum” (inf. sanskrit) = “eo factum” (supin lat.) = «going (to) do». However, the functions of the Sanskrit form in -tum- are broader than the functions of the Latin supine, therefore, these forms cannot be completely analogous [1. p. 79].

You should also pay attention to the peculiarities of the use of the Sanskrit infinitive in the meaning of the goal in combination with nouns. In these constructions, the infinitive reveals the semantics of the noun, showing what it is intended for: “Asti annam bhoktum” «There is food (to) eat» [21. p. 614]. “Saḥ muktaye Sivam bhajati” «He worships Shiva for the sake of liberation»; “Randhanāya sthali” «Dishes for cooking food»; “Hārāya suvrṇam” «Gold for the chain». At the same time, the non-sentence Dative case of a noun can occur in the verb of purposeful action instead of the infinitive: “Sa pākāya yāti” «He goes to prepare food (= cook food)»; “Aham bhramaṇāya emi” «I'm going for a walk (= going walk)» [21. p. 560]. The syntactic capabilities of the modern Russian language make it possible to practically literally convey the meaning of infinitive Sanskrit constructions. Hence, we can say that the infinitive in Sanskrit goes back to the dative-local forms.

On the other hand, the semi-predicative construction common for Latin and Ancient Greek, where the actions of the main verb and the infinitive refer to different subjects, is not correct for Sanskrit. For example, in ancient Greek and Latin, the following sentences are possible: “Ho stratēgōs ekeleue tous stratiōtas mē feidestai tōn polemōn” «The strategist ordered the soldiers not to spare their enemies - anc. Gr.» [9. p. 35]; “Livius narrat Romulum urbem Romam condidisse” «Livy tells that Romulus founded the city of Rome - lat.» [11. p. 168]. In Sanskrit, you cannot use the construction: “Pabhuh bhṛtyam gantum ādiṣati” «The owner orders the servant (lit. the servant) to go» [21. p. 617]. Instead of the infinitive “gantum” “to go”, the participle “gamanāya” “walking” is used in the construction, which stands in the form of the Dative singular, masculine / neuter. It is inconsistent with the accusative word “bhṛtyam” for “servant” representing the object of the main
verb. Therefore, one cannot say that a semi-predicative construction is used here: there is no agreement between the components of the grammatical base.

The impossibility of using such a construction is due to the discrepancy between the subjects of the infinitive and the main verb: "the master orders", "the servant will go". Instead of this sentence, the following is correct: “Pabhuḥ brātyam gamanāya ādiṣati” (let.) «The master to the servant, so that he was walking, orders» [21. p. 617]. Such constructions can be analogous to the phrases Nominative / Accusative + participle (Accusativus/Nominativus cum participio). In Latin, these phrases were not widespread, but they were widely used in the ancient Greek language. And in the Old Russian language, in general, they were practically the only analogs of semi-predicative Greek and Latin infinitive turns, with the exception of the Dative with an infinitive. Thus, the infinitive and infinitive semi predicative constructions in Sanskrit prove that this language is closer to the ergative than to the nominative primordial basis of the grammatical system. Given the great antiquity of Sanskrit sources, this is understandable.

In Old Russian (as well as in Old Church Slavonic), the infinitive is a Proto-Slavic verb name, which, even in the preliteracy era, stopped changing in gender, numbers and cases, frozen in the singular form of the neuter Dative case. Initially, this form was used exclusively as an indirect object for a verb or a noun: мнε подобает делати дъла пославшаго мнь. Most Old Church Slavonic verbs have the infinitive ending –ти. In the history of the Russian language [17, p. 89], the infinitive more and more passed into the verb system, as a result of which it lost some of its functions, for example, it ceased to be used as a "logical predicate" in some types of turns with the meaning of a complex object. At the same time, the Old Slavonic infinitive, after the loss of the supine forms, began to convey the meaning of the goal [5, p. 94]. However, Dative constructions with an infinitive are well-known in both Old Russian and modern Russian and do not require additional interpretation: «The prince ordered the soldiers to advance». It should also be noted that in the Old Russian language, turnovers with a double dative case were widespread, which can be considered analogous to the ancient Latin and Greek Accusativus and Nominativus duplex: «The same summer, insulting Novgorodians saying: as if to be a slave to us» (these constructions were later supplanted by the instrumental predicative). It should be mentioned that the phrases Accusative and Nominative with infinitives were also found in Old Church Slavonic and Old Russian, but over time they went out of use; rather, they can be considered a consequence of the first and second South Slavic influences as a result of literal translation of Greek sources.

The question arises, why in these and some other languages the infinitive is frozen not in the form of the nominative-accusative case, but in the local and dative? It can be assumed that this is a feature of the languages of the Eastern type, with a more ancient primordial stem dating back to the ergative system. This circumstance, most likely, limited the formation and dissemination of a large number of infinitive phrases in the nominative and accusative form in the Indo-European languages of the "eastern" type.

Another limiting condition for the formation and consolidation in the language of phrases with the meaning of a complex object can be considered the choice of the case of the "logical subject" of a semi-predicative construction. It is this condition that determines the low probability of the appearance of phrases with the meaning of a complex addition in languages of the ergative system (for example, in Sumerian), since the grammatical system of these languages does not imply the presence of constructions with Nominative and Accusative cases. In languages of the ergative
system, the concept of an "object" of action does not exist at all in the sense in which names in the Accusative case function in languages of the nominative system. In ergative languages, the equally dominant subject (subject in an absolute, intransitive active construction) and patient (subject in an ergative construction, similar in meaning to the passive construction of languages of the nominative system) are used. The patient, unlike the object in nominative languages, is not dependent on the subject, but is equivalent to it. Therefore, in the languages of the nominative structure, the passive construction «The temple was built by the king» can easily be transformed into an active one by changing the case forms of the subject and object of the action «The king built the temple». In languages of the ergative structure, such a replacement is impossible, since this sentence can have only one form of the ergative construction “lugal-e é mun-un-dû «The king built the temple», where “é” – is the name in the Absolute case «temple», and “lugal-e” – is a name in the Ergative case «by king». [6, p. 28]. Given this circumstance, by the nature of the distribution in the language of phrases with the meaning of a complex object and a complex subject, as well as by the peculiarities of the structure of these phrases, it can be assumed to which type of structure each language historically ascends.

**Result Analysis:**
In this study, the functional and grammatical features of infinitive turns and their transformations were considered on the example of the history of the Russian language in comparison with some ancient Indo-European languages (Sanskrit, Ancient Greek, Latin) in order to identify traces of the ergative structure in modern Russian. In the course of the study, it was possible to determine the structural features of semi-predicative infinitive turns, to characterize the infinitive as the grammatical core of semi-predicative turns in the diachronic aspect, and also to find the relationship between the forms of the infinitive historically fixed in the studied languages and the peculiarities of the syntactic organization of semi-predicative structures in ergative and nominative languages.

**Conclusion**
1. In languages of the nominative system, semi-predicative constructions with the meaning of a complex object, Accusativus cum infinitivo, are more widespread. 2.
2. Since this whole construction has the meaning of a complex object and depends on transitive verbs, it is most likely in most languages to attach the direct object to the components of such turns of the case, that is, the Accusative.
3. Accusative case of a turnover with the meaning of a complex object is not the norm for all languages.
4. The choice of the case of such a semi-predicative construction is also determined by the condition of the agreement between the «logical subject» and the «logical predicate». Therefore, in languages dating back to the more ancient, ergative proto-basis, phrases such as Accusativus cum infinitivo are not formed, and even if they appear as a result of linguistic influences in the process of translation, they are not fixed in the language system.
5. In languages that go back to the ergative primordial basis, ergative analogs of these phrases function, the predicative nucleus of which is infinitives and names in the Dative, Local, Instrumental and other ergative cases. It is to this type that both Old Russian and modern Russian can be attributed.
There are other elements of the language system, which are an indicator of the ergative structure of the primordial basis of the language. They will be considered in our further research.

**Recommendations:**

As recommendations and prospects for this study, we can offer the study of other elements of the language system, which are an indicator of the ergative structure of the language-primordial basis. It is necessary to consider the options for using the case forms of the nominal part of the compound nominal predicate in languages of different types, as well as the possibility of the formation and functioning of impersonal sentences, especially in the use of impersonal passives.
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