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Infinitives in Icelandic: a description

Icelandic infinitival constructions are usually assumed to be either clausal or non-clausal, and both types may either be BARE INFINITIVES or AÐ-INFINITIVES, introduced by the infinitive marker að ‘to’. Thus, four major types can be discerned, two clausal and two non-clausal:

(1) a Clausal infinitives
   a1 Clausal að-infinitives
   a2 Clausal bare infinitives
   b Non-clausal infinitives (or Small Infinitives)
   b1 Non-clausal að-infinitives
   b2 Non-clausal bare infinitives

All að-infinitives are subjectless, whereas most clausal bare infinitives have an overt subject.

1. Clausal að-infinitives

Clausal að-infinitives are subjectless in the sense that they do not have an overt or a lexical subject. However, they are interpreted as if they had a subject, that is, they have an understood silent subject, often denoted as PRO (from ‘pronominal’). The silent subject is indicated by a dash in the following examples:

(1) a Ólafur reyndi [að ___ lesa bókina]. PRO = Ólafur
    Olaf tried to read book.the
 b Ólafur bað Rut [að ___ lesa bókina]. PRO = Rut
    Olaf asked Ruth to read book.the
 c Það er skemmtilegt [að ___ lesa bókina]. PRO = arbitrary
    it is interesting to read the book

As indicated, PRO has variable interpretations, depending on its syntactic environment. In (1a), it is understood as being coreferential with the subject of the matrix clause (Ólafur) and in (1b), it is coreferential with the object of the matrix clause (Rut). In (1c), on the other hand, it does not have a bound or restrictive reference of this sort, having, instead, an arbitrary reference (denoting somebody unspecified).

When PRO is coreferential with a constituent in its matrix clause it is said to be controlled by that constituent, whereas arbitrary PRO, as in (1c), is not controlled. That is, the matrix subject in e.g. (1a) controls the reading or understanding of the silent infinitival subject, whereas there is no such reading control of the arbitrary PRO in (1c). – Although arbitrary PRO is not controlled, its interpretation is restricted in one sense: it preferably or exclusively denotes human beings. Thus, even in a clause like It is natural to roll down hills, the silent infinitival subject cannot possibly refer to stones, but must, instead, be understood as referring to a human being, strange as that reading may be. Accordingly, clauses like It is necessary to rain in the spring are bizarre, as it is difficult to interpret their arbitrary silent subject as denoting a human being.

Arbitrary PRO-infinitives often function as a subject or even as an adverbial adjunct; the latter type is somewhat marginal though:
Controlled PRO-infinitives, on the other hand, are either complements (of verbs, prepositions, nouns and so on) or adverbial adjuncts:

(3) a Hún þráði [að ___ geta skrifað bókina].
   she desired to can write book.the
   ‘She desired to be able to write the book.’

b Hún vonaðist til [að ___ geta skrifað bókina].
   she hoped for to can write book.the

c Hún talaði um þann draum [að ___ geta skrifað bókina].
   she spoke about the dream to can write book.the

(4) Ólaf/*Ólafur langaði til [að ___ tala sjálfur á fundinum].
   Olaf(Acc/*Nom) longed for to talk self(Nom) at meeting.the
   Olaf wanted to talk at the meeting himself.’

Semi-predicates like sjálfur ‘self’ always agree with some antecedent, most commonly their subject. In (4), however, there is no overt potential nominative antecedent for the nominative form sjálfur to agree with; rather, it must be taken to agree with its local subject, namely PRO. If so, the agreement in (4) is of the same, usual sort as the simple agreement in (5):

(5) Ólafur/*Ólaf talaði sjálfur á fundinum.
    Olaf(Nom/*Acc) talked self(Nom) at meeting.the

Clausal að-infinitives seem to be able to contain much of the structure that can be found in finite að-clauses. However, there are some striking differences:

- Infinitives never allow any kind of preposing, for instance neither Topicalization nor Stylistic Fronting.
- Infinitives do not usually tolerate certain modal auxiliaries
- Infinitives do not tolerate certain modal adverbials

The clauses in (6) demonstrate Stylistic Fronting, SF, in a finite clause and the structures in (7) show that the same kind of preposing is impossible in an að-infinitive:
It thus seems that the ‘left edge’ of infinitival *að*-clauses is ‘smaller’ or contains fewer structural positions than the left edge of finite clauses. This is also suggested by the fact that certain modal auxiliaries are awkward or impossible in infinitives (the intended reading of *kunna* in (8b) is epistemic ‘may’, not the root meaning ‘know how to’, which would be somewhat better):

Similarly, certain modal sentence adverbs are ungrammatical in infinitives:

In contrast, the negation and some other sentence adverbs may occur in *að*-infinitives, and when this is the case the first verb of the infinitival clause is to the left of the adverb:

In this respect, Icelandic differs from e.g. English and the Mainland Scandinavian languages, where all verbs are to the right of sentence adverbials in clausal infinitives. As we have also seen, Icelandic furthermore differs from these languages in having the tensed verb to the left of sentence adverbials in most finite subordinate clauses – in the Tense position. It seems that...
the first verb in clausal að-infinitives is in this same position, which is conceivable if the position in question is not really a position of morphological tense but rather a position of tense interpretation, in finite as well as in nonfinite clauses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Matrix)</th>
<th>M i d d l e p a r t</th>
<th>F i n a l p a r t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inf. marker</td>
<td>'Tense'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Hann bað mig) (he asked me)</td>
<td>að</td>
<td>lesa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Hann vonaðist til) (he hoped for)</td>
<td>að</td>
<td>hafa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Það er gott) it is good</td>
<td>að</td>
<td>þurfa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What might be referred to as Purpose Infinitives is a somewhat peculiar subtype of clausal að-infinitives; infinitives of this type do not only have a silent (arbitrary) subject but also a zero complement:

(11) a Þetta er penni til [að skrifa með ___].
this is a-pen for to write with
‘This is a pen to write with.’

b Þetta er ekki bók til [að lesa ___].
this is not a-book for to read
‘This is not a book to read.’

On the other hand, Icelandic does not have any wh-infinitives of the English type: *I don’t know how to do this, I don’t know where to go* and so on:

(12) a Ég veit ekki hvernig á að gera þetta.
I know not how (one) is(3sg) to do this

b Ég veit ekki hvert á að fara.
I know not where (one) is(3sg) to go

The infinitive marker of clausal að-infinitives connot usually be dropped:

(13) a Það sem hún reyndi var að selja fisk. / ??Það sem hún reyndi var selja fisk it that she tried was to sell fish
‘What she tried was to sell fish.’

b Að selja fisk dreymdi hana ekki um. / ??Selja fisk dreymdi hana ekki um. to sell fish dreamed her(Acc) not about
‘Selling fish, she did not dream about.’

An important subclass of predicates that take clausal að-infinitives consists of aspectual auxiliaries:

progressive: vera ‘be’
inchoative: fara ‘go, begin’, byrja ‘begin, start’ (and, literary: taka ‘begin’)
terminative: hætta ‘quit, cease, stop’

Some simple examples:
These aspectual constructions may have various less central readings/modalities. Thus, the progressive often translates as the simple present in other Germanic languages, whereas the Icelandic simple present strongly tends to have either a futuritive or a generic/habituative/repetitive reading. German *Ich lese dieses Buch* cannot be translated by Icelandic *Ég les þessa bók* (‘I read this book’) but must instead be translated as *Ég er að lesa þessa bók* (‘I am to read this book’ = ‘I’m reading this book’). On the other hand, repetitive *Ich lese manchmal dieses Buch* or English *I sometimes read this book* translates as *Ég les þessa bók stundum* (lit. I read this book sometimes), not as *Ég er stundum að lesa þessa bók* (lit. I am sometimes to read this book, i.e. ‘I’m sometimes reading this book.

The progressive *vera* may combine with the inchoative or the terminative, so as to form the **immediate inchoative** or the **immediate terminative**:

(15)  
(a) *Ég er að fara að lesa.*  
I am to go to read  
‘I’m on the brink of starting reading.’

(b) *Ég er að hætta að lesa.*  
I am to quit to read  
‘I’m on the brink of quitting reading.’

Both these ‘immediateness aspects’ usually require heavy stress on the verb *vera* ‘be’. Similarly, *fara* ‘go’ can combine with both the inchoative and the terminative, so as to render a **proximate** rather than an immediate reading; the resulting **proximate inchoative** and **proximate terminative** are exemplified in (16):

(16)  
(a) *Ég fer að fara að lesa.*  
I go to go to read  
‘I’ll start reading soon.’

(b) *Ég fer að hætta að lesa.*  
‘I’ll stop reading soon.’

Another subclass of predicates that take clausal *að*-infinitives consists of combinations of *vera* plus **aspectual participles**:

**perfect/termiantive:** *vera búinn*, ‘have already’ (lit. be finished/ready)

**inchoative:** *vera farinn*, *vera byrjaður* ‘have gone, have begun’ (lit. be gone, be begun)

**terminative:** *vera hættur* ‘have quit’ (lit. be quit)
Some simple examples:

(6) a Hann er búinn að lesa bókina.
   he is finished to read book.the
   ‘He has (already) read the book. / He has finished reading the book.’

  b Hann er farinn að lesa bókina.
   he is gone to read book.the
   ‘He has (already) begun reading the book.’

  c Hann er hættur að lesa bókina.
   he is quit to read book.the
   ‘He has (already) quit reading the book.’

2. Clausal bare infinitives

Icelandic has several types of clausal bare infinitives, most importantly the following ones:

1. The **Accusative-with-Infinitive** construction (Aci, accusativus cum infinitivo)
2. The **Nominative-with-Infinitive** construction (Nci)
3. The **Dative-and-Nominative-with-Infinitive** construction (D/Nci)

Verbs that take AcI in English include:

A. Verbs of believe: **Believe, consider**
B. **Expect, want**
C. Perception verbs: **See, hear, feel, smell, sense**
D. Causative verbs: **Let, have, make, force**

Icelandic also has many AcI verbs, the main difference being that it has no AcI verbs that correspond to **expect** and **want**, whereas it has AcI verbs of saying. The following list contains most or all AcI taking verbs that can be said to be a part of every day language (as well as some more literary ones):

A. Verbs of believe:

   telja             ‘believe, consider’
   álíta             ‘consider’
   haldpa            ‘believe’

B. - -

C. Perception verbs:

   sjá               ‘see’
   koma auga á       ‘set eye on’
   horfa á           ‘look at, watch’
   heyra             ‘hear’, hlusta á ‘listen to’
   finna             ‘feel, experience’
   skynja            ‘sense’

D. Causative verb:

   láta             ‘let, have’
E. Verbs of saying:

**segja**  
‘say’

**kveða**  
‘say’ (literary)

Some examples:

(1) a Við teljum [hana hafa verið gáfaða].  
we consider her(Acc) have been intelligent  
‘We consider her to have been intelligent.’

b Við sáum [hana taka hjólið].  
we saw her(Acc) take byke.the  
‘We saw her take the byke.’

c Við hlustuðum á [hana syngja lagið].  
we listened to her(Acc) sing song.the  
‘We let/had her sing the song.’

d Ég fann [kuldann bíta mig].  
I felt cold.the(Acc) bite me  
‘We said that she had sung well.’

e Við létum [hana syngja lagið].  
we let her(Acc) sing song.the  
‘We let/had her sing the song.’

f Við sögðum [hana hafa sungið vel].  
we said her have(Acc) sung well  
‘We said that she had sung well.’

As seen, all these verbs take a bare infinitive with an accusative subject: [Acc – Infinitive – Final part]. In addition, some verbs that are reminiscent of English Acl-taking verbs can take an accusative object plus a *til að* ‘for to’ infinitive, as in the following examples:

(2) a Við þvinguðum hana til að syngja lagið.  
we forced her(Acc) for to sing song.the  
‘We forced her to sing the song.’

b Við fengum hana til að syngja lagið.  
we got her(Acc) for to sing song.the  
‘We got her to sing the song.’

It seems, however, that these *til að* infinitives are PRO infinitives, much as the *um að* ‘for to, about to’ infinitives in the following examples; for clarity, the silent subject position is indicated by a slot:

(3) a Við báðum hana um [að ___ syngja lagið].  
we asked her(Acc) for to sing song.the  
‘We talked to her about (us/her) singing the song.’

b Við töluðum við hana um [að ___ syngja lagið].  
we talked with her(Acc) about to sing song.the  
‘We talked to her about (us/her) singing the song.’

In the Accusative-with-Infinitive or Acl construction the accusative argument is the subject of the infinitival clause. In the **Nominative-with-Infinitive** construction, on the other hand, the nominative argument is the subject of the main clause, as in:

(4) **Hún** virðist [ ___ vera gáfuð].  
she(Nom) seems be intelligent
As indicated by the slot, however, the nominative argument has its source, so to speak, as a subject of the infinitive, from where it is moved to the subject position, by **Subject Raising**. In other words, the semantic function or the so-called **thematic role** of the subject is not ‘to seem’, but rather ‘to be intelligent’. That is, the clause in (4) does not mean that ‘it seemed to her to be intelligent’, but rather that ‘it seemed to someone else that *she was intelligent*’ (where ‘she’ is a subject of the predicate ‘was intelligent’). Thus, nominative main clause subjects of NcI constructions have the same thematic role as accusative infinitival subjects of corresponding AcI constructions, as illustrated in (5):

(5)  

a  
Við töldum hana vera gáfaða.  
we believed her(Acc) bee intelligent(Acc)

b  
Hún var talin vera gáfuð.  
she(Nom) was believed bee intelligent(Nom)

In both sentences, it is obviously the case that someone believes that ‘*she is intelligent*’, the difference being that ‘she’ moves to the matrix clause subject position in the NcI construction, as opposed to the AcI construction (where the matrix clause subject position is occupied by another subject, in (5a) *við* ‘we’).

There are three major types of NcI verbs in Icelandic: A) ‘Independent’ NcI verbs, i.e., NcI verbs that are not related to AcI verbs. B) Passives of some AcI verbs. C) “Mediopassives” of many AcI verbs (formed by adding the “mediopassive” suffix –*st* to the AcI verb). Most ‘independent’ NcI verbs also take a mediopassive form, in –*st*.

A. ‘Independent’ NcI verbs:
- reynast ‘prove (to be/do), turn out’
- sýnast ‘appear, look (as if)’
- virðast ‘seem’
- þykja ‘be held, considered, felt/found’
- þykjast ‘pretend, make believe’

B. Passives of some AcI verbs:
- vėra talinn ‘be believed, considered’
- vėra álitinn ‘be considered’
- vėra halðinn ‘be held, believed’ (old fashioned)
- vėra látninn ‘be let, made’
- vėra sagður ‘be said’
- vėra kveðinn ‘be said’ (old fashioned)

C. Mediopassives of some AcI verbs:
- heyrast ‘be, get heard’
- kveðast ‘say (onself to . . . )’ (old fashioned)
- sjást ‘be, get seen’
- láťast ‘pretend’
- segjast ‘say (oneself to . . . )’
- teljast ‘be considered’

Some examples; the slots shown the infinitival subject position (from where the nominative argument raises to the matrix subjec position):
In addition, some other verbs in –st take non-infinitival predicates, for instance patricipial predicates, as in the following examples:

(7) a  
Hann fannst [ __ liggiandi á götunni].
he(Nom) was-found lying on street.the

b  
Þjófurinn náðist [ __ stelandi bókum].
thief.the(Nom) got-cought stealing books

The structure of AcI and NcI constructions may be sketched as follows:

(8) a  
AcI: Subject – AcI verb – Acc – Infinitive

b  
NcI: Nom – NcI verb – Ø – Infinitive

As mentioned above, Icelandic also has the so-called Dative-and-Nominative-with-Infinitive construction D/NcI, where the dative is a matrix clause experiencer whereas the nominative is the subject of the infinitive. Thus, the structure of this unusual construction may be sketched as follows:

(9) D/NcI: Dat – D/NcI verb – Nom – Infinitive

For clarity, the three infinitival constructions are compared in (10):

(10) a  
Ég taldi [hana hafa tekið bókina]. AcI
I believed her(Acc) have taken book.the

b  
Hún virtist [ __ hafa tekið bókina]. NcI
she(Nom) seemed have taken book.the

c  
Mér sýndist [hún hafa tekið bókina]. D/NcI
me(Dat) appeared she(Nom) have taken book.the

‘It appeared me that she had taken the book.’
D/NcI verbs include at least the following (many of them also being ‘independent’ NcI verbs):

- finnast  ‘find, consider’
- heyrast  ‘hear, sound (as if)’
- reynast  ‘prove, turn out’
- sýnast  ‘appear’
- virðast  ‘seem’
- þykja  ‘find, consider’

Some examples:

(11) a  Mér fannst [hún syngja vel].
   me(Dat) found she(Nom) sing well
   ‘In my opinion she sang well.’

b  Mér heyrðist [hún syngja vel].
   me(Dat) heard she(Nom) sing well
   ‘I thought she sang well.’

c  Þér mun líklega reynast [hún (verða) góður samstarfsmaður].
   you(Dat) will probably prove she(Nom) (be) good colleague
   ‘She will probably turn out to be a good colleague to you.’

d  Honum hafði oft virst [hún vinna of mikið].
   him(Dat) had often seemed she(Nom) work too much

Clausal bare infinitives are ‘incomplete’ or ‘defect’ in the sense that they only tolerate sentence adverbials very reluctantly:

(12) a  Við höfum ekki talið [hana (??sennilega) hafa tekið bókina].
   we have not believed her(Acc) (probably) have taken book.the
   you would then seem (not) have done duty your

b  Honum virtist [hún vinna (*hreinskilnislega) of mikið].
   him(Dat) seemed she(Nom) not work too much

Notice that the infinitival subjects in Ael and D/NcI stay in the subject position of the infinitival in (12a) and (12c); hence, of course, they show up behind both the main verb and the sentence adverbial of the main clause: … ekki talið hana … and … ekki virst hún, respectively. However, if the main clause contains no auxiliary, the infinitival subjects show up in front of the matrix sentence adverbial:

(13) a  Við töldum hana ekki [__ hafa tekið bókina].
   we believed her(Acc) not have taken book.the

b  Honum virtist hún ekki [__ vinna of mikið].
   him(Dat) seemed she(Nom) not work too much

In examples of this sort, the infinitival subject moves into the matrix clause, across the matrix negation, by so-called OBJECT-SHIFT (a slight misnomer as it applies to subjects of bare infinitives as well as to usual objects; see further section …). As mentioned, so-called Subject Raising raises the infinitival subject in the NeI construction out of the infinitive into the subject position of the matrix clause. So-called
TOUGH-MOVEMENT in English clauses of the following type is in many respects similar to Subject Raising; the slot indicates the position from where the matrix subject has moved:

(14)  a  He is tough [to get on with __].
       b  She is easy [to please __].
       c  They are likely [to win __].

Tough-Movement seems to be gaining ground in Icelandic as well. Thus, in addition to the more traditional expressions in (15), the Tough-Movement constructions in (16) are sometimes heard:

(15)  a  Það er erfitt [að umgangast hana].
       it is difficult to get-along-with her(Acc)
       b  Það er auðvelt [að lesa þennan kafla].
       it is easy to read this chapter(Acc)

(16)  a  %Hún er erfið [að umgangast __].
       she(Nom) is difficult to get-along-with
       b  %Þessi kafla er auðveldur [að lesa __].
       this chapter(Nom) is easy to read.

Although we have followed tradition in using the terms Accusative-with-Infinitive and Nominative-with-Infinitive, they are slightly misleading for Icelandic (whereas they are quite suitable for many other languages). The reason for this is that not all arguments that enter into these constructions in Icelandic are accusative vs. nominative. This is illustrated for the AcI construction in (17) and for the NcI construction in (18):

(17)  a  Ég taldi [henni líða vel].
       I believed her(Dat) feel well
       ‘I believed that she felt well.’
       b  Ég taldi [hennar hafa verið leitað].
       I believed her(Gen) have been looked-for
       ‘I believed that she had been kookied for.’

(18)  a  Hana virðist langa heim.
       her(Acc) seems long home
       ‘She seems to want to go home.’
       b  Henni virðist líða vel.
       her(Dat) seems feel well
       ‘She seems to feel well.’
       c  Hennar virðist hafa verið leitað.
       her(Gen) seems have been looked for
       ‘She seems to have been looked for.’

Thus, in the AcI construction, the ‘accusative’ may be dative or genitive as well as accusative, and in the NcI construction, the ‘nominative’ may be accusative, dative or genitive as well as nominative.

These alternative case-markings in the AcI and NcI constructions are, however, not arbitrary. Rather, they are instantiations of so-called INHERENT CASE-MARKING. It is an inherent property of many predicates in Icelandic that they take inherently case-marked
subjects, that is, subjects in the accusative, dative or genitive, rather than in the usual nominative of subjects. Subjects of this sort are sometimes called **OBlique Subjects** or even **QuIRky SubjEcts**. Such subjects always retain their inherent case in the AcI and the NcI constructions:

**ACCUSATIVE ‘BASIC’ SUBJECT:**

(19) a Hana vantaði í vinnuna. 
her(Acc) lacked in work.the ‘She wasn’t at work.’

b Við töldum [hana vanta í vinnuna]. we believed her(Acc) lack in work.the

**AcI verb – Acc – vanta**

c Hana virtist [ __ vanta í vinnuna]. her(Acc) seemed lack in work.the

**Ac – NcI verb – vanta**

**DATIVE ‘BASIC’ SUBJECT:**

(20) a Henni leiddist um sumarið. her(Dat) bored in summer.the

‘She was bored in the summer.’

b Við töldum [henni leiðast um sumarið]. we believed her(Dat) bore in summer.the

**AcI verb – Dat – leiðast**

c Henni virtist [ __ leiðst um sumarið]. her(Dat) seemed bore in summer.the

**Dat – NcI verb – leiðast**

**GENITIVE ‘BASIC’ SUBJECT:**

(21) a Hennar gætti ekki. her(Gen) noticed not

‘She wasn’t noticeable.’

b Við töldum [hennar ekki gæta]. we believed her(Gen) not notice

‘We believed her not go be noticabale.’

c Hennar virtist [ __ ekki gæta]. her(Dat) seemed not notice

‘She didn’t seem noticeable.’

**Gen – NcI verb – gæta**

In much the same manner, the ‘nominative’ argument in the D/NcI construction may be accusative, dative or genitive as well as nominative:

(22) a Mér virtist [hana vanta í vinnuna]. me(Dat) seemed her(Acc) lack in work.the

**Dat – D/NcI verb – Acc – vanta**

b Mér virtist [henni leiðast]. me(Dat) seemed her(Dat) bore

**Dat – D/NcI verb – Dat – leiðast**

c Mér virtist [hennar ekki gæta]. me seemed her(Gen) not notice

**Dat – D/NcI verb – Gen – gæta**

Non-nominative subjects will be further discussed in section …
3. A note on Small Infinitives

It is not clear that all infinitives are best analyzed as being clausal; rather, many auxiliaries take infinitival complements that seem to be verb phrases or non-clausal constructions of some other sort. For ease of reference, let us call these infinitives SMALL INFINITIVES. Like clausal infinitives, small infinitives are either bare infinitives or að-infinitives. Four auxiliaries take bare small infinitives: mega ‘be allowed, may’, munu ‘will’, skulu ‘shall’, vilja ‘want to’; all other auxiliaries that take an infinitival complement take an að-infinitive. Using or not using að improperly in small infinitives is sharply ungrammatical:

(1) a Hann mun fara. / *Hann mun að fara.
   he will go
b þú skalt fara. / *þú skalt að fara.
you shall go
   ‘You should go.’

(2) a Hún verður að fara. / *Hún verður fara.
she must to go
b Hún þarf að fara. / *Hún þarf fara.
she needs to go
c Hún á að fara. / *Hún á fara.
she is to go
d Hún fær að fara. / *Hún fær fara.
she gets (permission) to go

----------

Some relevant studies:
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