

# Split and double infinitives in Icelandic

Jóhannes Gísli Jónsson

*University of Iceland*

**Abstract** A corpus study of *að*-infinitives in Icelandic reveals important data that have so far gone unnoticed in the theoretical literature. The study shows that Icelandic allows *split infinitives*, as some adverbs may occupy a position between the infinitival marker *að* and the infinitive verb in T. Roughly the same set of adverbs can also occur between two copies of the infinitive marker. This construction, which I will refer to as *double infinitives*, seems to be incredibly rare cross-linguistically although it has been reported for Norwegian (Faarlund 2015) and English (van Gelderen 2004). These data call for an analysis where the infinitive marker in Icelandic is first-merged in a low complementizer position (FinP) and moves to a higher complementizer position (ForceP), across an adverb left-adjoined to FinP. This yields the order *að* + adverb + *að* (double infinitives) if the lower copy of the infinitive marker is spelled out; however, if the lower copy is deleted, the resulting order is *að* + adverb + infinitive verb (split infinitives). This suggests that infinitival clauses can project a ForceP just like finite clauses, despite recent claims to the contrary (Satik 2022). Still, *að*-infinitives in Icelandic are structurally deficient compared to finite clauses as they show no evidence of any information-structural heads (such as Topic and WhP) in the left periphery.

## 1 Introduction

Infinitive markers show remarkable variation across the Scandinavian languages and this has been discussed in the generative literature since the early eighties (see Platzack 1983, Thráinsson 1993 and Christensen 2007 among others). Thus, the infinitive marker precedes negation in Icelandic and Swedish but follows negation in Danish and Faroese (Thráinsson et al. 2012:310-312). Norwegian (bookmål) is unique here in allowing both options (Faarlund 2019:248-249). In addition, the infinitive verb precedes the negation in Icelandic but follows the negation in Swedish and Norwegian.

Given the variation described above, each Scandinavian language must be carefully examined to determine the status of the infinitive marker in that language. In this paper, I will contribute to this goal by reviewing new data on the structural position of the infinitival marker *að* in Icelandic and the placement of what I will call high adverbs, i.e. adverbs that may precede the infinitival verb in *að*-infinitives as well as the inflected verb in finite clauses. I will argue below that the infinitive marker undergoes movement from Fin-to-Force, leaving a copy that is phonetically realized in double infinitives, whereas high adverbs left-adjoin to FinP. I will also discuss related phenomena in finite embedded clauses to see to what extent this analysis is applicable beyond infinitive clauses.

## 2 The status of the infinitive marker

As shown in (1) and (2) below, the infinitival marker *að* in Icelandic is homophonous with the complementizer *að* used in *that*-clauses:

- (1) Sigga reyndi að laga sjónvarpið  
Sigga tried to fix television.the  
'Sigga tried to fix the television.'
- (2) Einhver heldur að sjónvarpið sé bilað  
somebody thinks that television.the is broken  
'Somebody thinks that the television is broken.'

In view of this, it is not surprising that a popular analysis of the infinitival marker *að* in Icelandic holds that *að* is a complementizer in C (Platzack 1986, Sigurðsson 1989:52-56 and Johnson and Vikner 1994<sup>1</sup>). The C-analysis of the infinitive marker *að* is not uncontroversial (Thráinsson 1993), but data from splitting and doubling in *að*-infinitives discussed in sections 3 and 4 strongly suggest that the C-analysis is basically correct, but with the important modification that the infinitive marker moves within the left periphery.

Another argument for the C-analysis is that the infinitive verb clearly undergoes verb raising to T (Thráinsson 1984, 1986), even if non-finite T is not associated with any inflectional features. This is shown by the fact that the infinitive precedes medial adverbs, including the negation:<sup>2</sup>

- (3a) Ég reyndi að ónáða ekki nágrannana  
I tried to disturb not neighbours.the  
'I tried not to disturb the neighbours.'
- (3b) \*Ég reyndi að ekki ónáða nágrannana  
I tried to not disturb neighbours.the

Since the infinitive marker *að* precedes the infinitive verb in T, it is natural to assume that *að* is in C. Importantly, the claim that *að* and the infinitive verb occupy two different positions makes it possible to account for cases where high adverbs intervene between the two elements (but see section 3 for further discussion).

As a consequence of V-to-T in *að*-infinitives, they behave like finite clauses in Icelandic with respect to Object Shift (Thráinsson 1993). Thus, Object Shift is possible with full DP objects but obligatory with unstressed pronouns if there is no auxiliary in the infinitival clause:

- (4a) Ég reyndi að gleyma ekki fundinum/\*því  
I tried to forget not meeting.the.DAT/it.DAT  
'I tried not to forget the meeting/it.'
- (4b) Ég reyndi að gleyma **fundinum/því** ekki  
I tried to forget meeting.the.DAT/it.DAT not

<sup>1</sup> Strictly speaking, Johnson and Vikner (1994) assume that *að* is in a higher C in a CP-recursion structure where the lower C is the landing site for the infinitive verb.

<sup>2</sup> Christensen (2007) gives an example similar to (2b) which he does not mark in any way but there is no doubt in my mind that examples where the negation precedes the infinite verb are ungrammatical. The corpus data reported here also show that examples of this kind are highly infrequent (see section 3).

A third argument for the C-analysis is that *að* is excluded from infinitives that are standardly assumed to be TPs rather than CPs, i.e. raising infinitives and ECM-infinitives:

- (5a) Tveir umsækjendur virtust (\*að) vera óhæfir  
two.NOM applicants.NOM seemed to be unqualified  
'Two applicants seemed to be unqualified.'
- (5b) Nefndin taldi tvo umsækjendur (\*að) vera óhæfa  
committee.the believed two.ACC applicants.ACC to be unqualified  
'The committee believed two applicants to be unqualified.'

Note that *að*-infinitives include not only control complements, as in (1), (3) and (4), since they can also be complements of modal and aspectual predicates. As discussed by Sigurðsson (1989:71-76), aspectual complements in Icelandic behave syntactically like CPs and thus pattern with control complements whereas modal complements with the infinitive marker *að* seem to be IPs. This means that the C-analysis may not be applicable to modal complements in Icelandic and the same applies to the analysis of split and double infinitives outlined in section 5 below.

### 3 Split infinitives

The term *split infinitive* is familiar from Modern English where it refers to the word order infinitive marker (*to*) - adverb - infinitive verb, which is possible with a wide array of adverbs. This is exemplified in (6) where the adverbs *seriously*, *suddenly* and *even* intervene between the infinitive marker and the infinitive verb.

- (6a) She ought to **seriously** consider her position  
(6b) For me to **suddenly** resign my job is unthinkable  
(6c) He wasn't able to **even** move his fingers  
(Quirk et al. 1985:496)

In view of the obligatory verb raising in *að*-infinitives shown in (3), one might expect split infinitives to be excluded in Icelandic. However, searches in the Risamálheild Corpus (Barkarson et al. 2022) show that this is not quite correct. As discussed in more detail in section 3, split infinitives are possible in Icelandic with a small set of adverbs. Importantly, this class is largely equivalent to the class of adverbs that may intervene between two copies of the infinitive marker (see section 4) and precede the inflected verb in finite clauses (see 5.3 below). Adverbs in the last class are sometimes referred to as *V3 adverbs* (Thráinsson 2010, Angantýsson et al. 2023) but I will refer to the first class as *splitting adverbs*. As already stated, adverbs that belong to all three classes will be referred to as *high adverbs*.

Some representative examples of split infinitives from the Risamálheild Corpus (henceforth, RC) are shown in (7) below. It should be noted that all examples from RC in this paper are fully grammatical in my judgment unless otherwise noted.

- (7a) þegar hann er búinn að **nánast** útiloka annað  
 when he is finished to almost exclude other...  
 ‘when he has almost excluded other options...’ (Það skelfur - Endurminningar)
- (7b) Er hægt að **bara** brjótast inn í tölvupóst hjá fólki?  
 is possible to just break into e-mail by people  
 ‘Is it possible to just break into people’s e-mail?’ (Glæraugun hans Góa)
- (7c) Það er ekkert rangt við það að **hérna** teikna skopmyndir...  
 there is nothing wrong with it to here draw caricatures  
 ‘There is nothing wrong with drawing caricatures...’ (Bylgjan)
- (7d) Lögreglan hefur beðið fólk um að **vinsamlegast** leggja bílum...  
 police.the has asked people about to kindly park cars  
 ‘The police has asked people to kindly park (their) cars...’ (Fréttablaðið.is)
- (7e) við erum öll mikilvægir hlekkir í því að **virðilega** bæta lífsgæði  
 we are all important links in it to really improve life.quality  
 ‘We are all important links in really improving the quality of life.’ (Bylgjan)
- (7f) Þú ert búinn að **fokking** skemma lífið mitt  
 you are finished to fucking destroy life.the my  
 ‘You have fucking destroyed my life’ (Héraðsdómstólar)

A majority of the examples of split infinitives that I have found in the RC come from media interviews. These include examples from radio stations (*Bylgjan* and *Rás 1 og 2*) as well as TV news (*Sjónvarpsfréttir RÚV*). Still, split infinitives are by no means limited to informal spoken language, especially if the splitting adverb is frequently used in more formal registers.

Table 1 lists the 29 most common adverbs found in splitting position in the RC.<sup>3</sup> As this table shows, the discourse particle *bara* ‘just’ is by far the most frequently used splitting adverb in Icelandic, followed by *fokking* ‘fucking’, *svona* ‘so’, *hérna* ‘here’ and *hreinlega* ‘simply’. It is very hard to find a common semantic denominator for all these adverbs but most of them are probably best classified as focusing or intensifying adverbs. It is probably also quite telling that a clear majority of these adverbs resist topicalization; the ones that can be topicalized include *kannski* ‘maybe’, *mögulega* ‘possibly’ and *jafnvel* ‘even’. This is clearly reminiscent of V3 adverbs in Swedish (see Brandtler 2020 and references cited there) but this connection will not be explored here.

<sup>3</sup> One of the 30 most frequent adverbs is the negation *ekki* (with 935 examples). It is left out here because the cases with negation in splitting position are less than 1% of all cases where negation is on either side of the infinitive verb. Note also that the numbers in Table 1 take into account various misspellings of individual adverbs.

Table 1	Splitting adverb	Number of examples
	bara ‘just’	3766
	fokking ‘fucking’	1685
	svona ‘so’	1288
	hérna ‘here’	1132
	hreinlega ‘simply’	985
	einfaldlega ‘simply’	610
	virðilega ‘really’	605
	kannski ‘maybe’	474
	nánast ‘almost’	438
	gjörðsamlega ‘completely’	348
	vinsamlegast ‘kindly’	318
	einmitt ‘exactly’	267
	mögulega ‘possibly’	246
	bókstaflega ‘literally’	239
	beinlínis ‘directly’	228
	allavega ‘at least’	228
	jafnvel ‘even’	236
	endilega ‘by all means’	189
	raunverulega ‘truly’	188
	hugsanlega ‘possibly’	175
	aðeins ‘only’	127
	sko ‘look, you know’	123
	líka ‘also’	95
	algjörlega ‘totally’	75
	loksins ‘finally’	75
	fyrirfram ‘in advance’	72
	endanlega ‘finally’	70
	næstum ‘almost’	68
	vísvitandi ‘deliberately’	66

The translations provided here should not be taken too literally because some of the adverbs are very difficult to translate, especially the discourse particles *hérna*, *svona*, *bara* and *sko*. To take *hérna* as an example, it appears that this word is mainly used to indicate hesitation or uncertainty when used as a splitting adverb. This is shown by the fact that there are 220 examples in the RC where *hérna* is followed by a comma in splitting position. Examples of this kind are found when the search string targets two words between the infinitive marker and the infinitive verb but these examples are not included in the number for *hérna* in Table 1.

Note that Table 1 only shows the total number of splitting orders for each adverb in the RC. In most cases, these orders are a small percentage of all relevant cases, i.e. splitting orders and orders where the adverb immediately follows the infinitive verb, but this requires further investigation.

For convenience, I will use the term *adverb* here not only to include single words but also PPs that have a similar function as adverbs as well as stacked adverbs. Examples of this kind are easy to find in splitting position in the RC:

- (8a) að hlaupa svona hratt án þess að í **rauninni** klára hlaupið  
to run so fast without to in reality finish run.the  
'to run so fast without really finishing the run' (ruv.is)
- (8b) að May hefði gert mistök með því að **til dæmis** sniðganga kappræður  
that May had made mistake by it to for example avoid debates  
'that May had made a mistake by avoiding debates' (Fréttablaðið.is)
- (8c) Er raunhæft... að **bara hreinlega** lifa bíllausum lífstíl?  
is realistic to just simply live carless lifestyle  
'Is it realistic...to just simply live a carless lifestyle?' (Sjónvarpsfréttir RÚV)
- (8d) Þá fórum við að **hérna svona** sjá fyrstu merki um þetta  
then began we to here so see first signs of this  
'then we started to see the first signs of this' (Rás 1 og 2)

It is also possible to place high adverbs right after the infinitive verb in *að*-infinitives. This is illustrated in (9):

- (9a) Er hægt að brjótast **bara** inn í tölvupóst hjá fólki?  
is possible to break just into e-mail by people  
'Is it possible to just break into people's e-mail?'
- (9b) við erum öll mikilvægir hlekkir í því að bæta **virðilega** lífsgæði  
we are all important links in it to improve really life.quality  
'We are all important links in really improving the quality of life.'
- (9c) ...að hlaupa svona hratt án þess að klára í **rauninni** hlaupið  
...to run so fast without to finish in reality the.run  
'...to run so fast without really finishing the run'
- (9d) Er raunhæft... að lifa **bara hreinlega** bíllausum lífstíl?  
is realistic... to live just simply carless lifestyle  
'Is it realistic...to simply live a carless lifestyle?'

In some cases, the relative order of adverb and the infinitive verb affects scope. For instance, the PP *til dæmis* in (8b) has scope over the whole VP *sniðganga kappræður*. By contrast, placing *til dæmis* after the verb yields the interpretation where *til dæmis* only scopes over the object *kappræður*. Thus, the splitting order in (8b) is not really an alternative to the order where the PP follows the infinitive.

## 4 Double infinitives

In the RC, there are various examples of doubling of the infinitive marker *að* although this is at least 20 times less common than splitting in *að*-infinitives. There is also a difference in the status of these two constructions as doubling is clearly more colloquial than splitting. The reason for this may be linked to the fact that doubling involves the phonetic realization of a

lower copy of the infinitive marker and this is clearly exceptional since lower copies are generally not spelled out. Some examples of doubling from the RC are shown in (10):

- (10a) mæli með **að** einmitt (**að**) flytja eitthvert annað en til London  
 recommend to exactly to move somewhere else than to London  
 ‘[I] recommend moving somewhere else than to London’ (Bland.is)
- (10b) sá fyrri er... **að** einfaldlega (**að**) hækka launin  
 the former is to simply to raise salaries.the  
 ‘the former [option] is to simply raise the salaries’ (Morgunblaðið)
- (10c) mig langar **að** bara (**að**) deila með ykkur gleði minni  
 me wants to just to share with you joy my  
 ‘I want to just share my joy with you’ (Bland.is)
- (10d) að sumir bara þurfi **að** hreinlega (**að**) læra að fyrirgefa  
 that some just need to simply to learn to forgive  
 ‘...that some people just need to simply learn to forgive’ (Málefni.com)
- (10e) Ég bað eiganda **að** vinsamlegast (**að**) fara með hundinn út  
 I asked owner to kindly to go with dog.the out  
 ‘I asked the owner to kindly take the dog out’ (Bland.is)
- (10f) Ég var **að** svona (**að**) kíkja á dómana sem lögin hans fá  
 I was to so to look at reviews.the which songs.the his receive  
 ‘I was sort of looking at the reviews that his songs have received’ (Hugi.is)

As shown by the brackets, the second copy of the infinitive marker can be deleted in all these examples, thereby creating a split infinitive.<sup>4</sup> Conversely, in all the examples of split infinitives in (7) and (8) above, a second copy of the infinitive marker can be added. The following examples should be contrasted with (7a), (7f) and (8c):

- (11a) þegar hann er búinn **að** nánast **að** útiloka annað  
 when he is finished to almost to exclude other...
- (11b) að þetta komi til með **að** jafnvel **að** lengja kreppuna  
 that this leads to even to extend crisis.the
- (11c) Er raunhæft... **að** bara hreinlega **að** lifa bíllausum lífstíl?  
 is realistic to just simply to live carless lifestyle

It seems that both split and double infinitives involve the same class of adverbs. With adverbs outside of this class, both splitting and doubling are excluded, or at least highly marginal:

<sup>4</sup> The first copy of the infinitive marker in (11) can also be left out but this would unambiguously indicate that the relevant adverb has a matrix reading as part of the matrix clause. Since this possibility is irrelevant for our purposes, it will be ignored in examples (12) and (13) as well.

- (12a) \*Sumir eru þekktir fyrir **að** yfirleitt (**að**) mæta á réttum tíma  
 some are known for to usually to show.up on right time  
 ‘Some people are know for usually show up on time’
- (12b) \*Ég reyni **að** aldrei (**að**) horfa á sjónvarpið  
 I try to never to look on television.the  
 ‘I try to never watch TV’
- (12c) \*Henni tókst **að** auðveldlega (**að**) skora mark  
 her managed to easily to score goal  
 ‘She managed to easily score a goal’

As expected, doubling is like splitting in allowing more than one word to follow the first infinitive marker:

- (13a) svo ég ætla **að** bara samt (**að**) svara  
 so I intend to just still to reply  
 ‘so I am still just going to reply’ (Bland.is)
- (13b) svona senda... sem **að** við þurfum **að** í rauninni (**að**) úrelða  
 such transmitters which that we need to in reality to phase.out  
 ‘such transmitters...which we need in fact to phase out’ (Sjónvarpsfréttir RÚV)
- (13c) Hér ætlum við **að** sem sagt (**að**) ræsa vélina  
 here intend we to as said to start machine.the  
 ‘Here we will start the machine as we already said’ (Rás 1 og 2)

Despite the strong similarities between split and double infinitives, there are some differences with respect to the frequency of individual adverbs following the first infinitive marker. Thus, the most common adverb in double infinitives is *bara* ‘just’ (148 examples), followed by *líka* ‘also’ (42), *helst* ‘preferably’ (38), *endilega* ‘by all means’ (29), *hreinlega* ‘simply’ (29), *kannski* ‘maybe’ (26) and *virðilega* ‘really’ (24). However, since all these numbers are very low it is difficult to make any sense of this contrast. Moreover, the two constructions may have slightly different pragmatics but I will leave this as a matter for future investigation.

As a final note in this section, there are some examples of doubling in the RC where the adverb between the two infinitive markers belongs semantically to the matrix clauses. This is shown in (14):

- (14a) Ég er **að** fara (**að**) út **að** skokka  
 I am to go to out to jog  
 ‘I am going out to jog’ (Twitter)
- (14b) mig langar (**að**) rosalega **að** sjá einhverjar myndir  
 me wants to extremely to see some pictures  
 ‘I really want to see some pictures’ (Bland.is)

- (14c) þetta hlýtur (að) auðvitað að þekkjast hér eins og annars staðar  
 this must to certainly to be.known here as other places  
 ‘This must be known here as elsewhere’ (Bland.is)

I find all of these examples ungrammatical. Thus, it is not surprising that in these examples, it would be impossible to create a split infinitive by deleting the second infinitive marker. By contrast, the first infinitive marker can be deleted, signalling that the relevant adverb must be part of the matrix clause.

## 5 Theoretical implications

This section divides into three parts. First, a structural analysis unifying split and double infinitives in Icelandic is presented in 5.1. This is followed in 5.2 by a discussion of complementizer doubling (recomplementation) in finite clauses in Icelandic and how this phenomenon compares to the analysis of double infinitives outlined in 5.1. Finally, V3 adverbs in subject-initial finite clauses are briefly discussed in 5.3 and what they may tell us about the placement of high adverbs.

### 5.1 Structural analysis

The data discussed in sections 3 and 4 give us good reasons to assume that split and double infinitives should be given essentially the same syntactic analysis as informally shown in (15):

- (15a) *að* - adverb - infinitive (split infinitives)  
 (15b) *að* - adverb - *að* - infinitive (double infinitives)

On this view, the only syntactic difference between the two constructions is that the lower copy of the infinitive marker *að* is visible in double infinitives but not in split infinitives. The detailed syntactic structure that I would like to propose for split and double infinitives in Icelandic is shown in (16):

- (16) [ForceP [Force' *að* [FinP ADV [FinP [Fin' <*að*> [TP PRO [T' infinitive...]]]]]]]]

This analysis entails that the infinitive marker *að* is first-merged in Fin and then moved to Force. This movement reflects the standard view within cartography that FinP and ForceP are the main components of the complementizer system. Apparently, ForceP is not associated with any illocutionary act in this case. Instead, it has a purely syntactic function as the connecting point with the matrix clause as it is accessible to selection by the matrix predicate.

The Fin-to-Force movement takes place in both split and double infinitives but the lower copy of the infinitive marker, marked by angle brackets in (15), is only phonetically realized in the latter construction. This is very similar to Faarlund's (2015) analysis of double infinitives in Norwegian except that he assumes movement of the infinitive marker from T to C. This would not be possible in Icelandic where the infinitive verb moves to T as we have already noted. Double infinitives have also been reported for English by van Gelderen (2004:244), who

also takes them to indicate movement of the infinitive marker without deletion of the lower copy.

Apart from the lower copy of the infinitive marker, everything else is the same in split and double infinitives in Icelandic as the adjuncts following the highest copy of the infinitive marker are left-adjoined to FinP, and the infinitive verb moves to T. Evidence for verb movement in split and double infinitives comes from examples where the verb preceded clause-medial adverbs like negation:

- (17) Er raunhæft **að** hreinlega (**að**) borða ekki sykur?  
 is realistic to simply to eat not sugar  
 ‘Is it realistic to simply not eat sugar?’

The analysis I have proposed in (16) is naturally extended to infinitives where no adverbial follows the highest infinitive marker, i.e. simple cases like (18):

- (18) Er raunhæft að borða ekki sykur?  
 is realistic to eat not sugar  
 ‘Is it realistic to not eat sugar?’

According to my analysis, *að*-infinitives in Icelandic have a more articulated structure in the left periphery than in previous analyses. The crucial claim is that *að*-infinitives can project a ForceP just like finite clauses, despite recent claims to the contrary (Satk 2022).

Still, *að*-infinitives are structurally deficient compared to embedded finite clause in that there are only two projections in the left periphery, FinP and Force. As shown by Thráinsson (1993), topicalization is excluded in *að*-infinitives, whether the topicalized precedes or follows the infinitive marker. This is in clear contrast to *that*-clauses, which allow topicalization to a position following the complementizer *að*:

- (19a) Jón lofaði { \*þetta } að { þetta } myndi hann aldrei gera  
 John promised this that this would he never do  
 ‘John promised that he would never do this’

- (19a) Jón lofaði { \*þetta } að { \*þetta } gera aldrei  
 John promised this that this do never

This suggests that *að*-infinitives, unlike *that*-clauses in Icelandic, do not have any Spec,Topic as a landing site for topicalized phrases. Moreover, since Icelandic does not have *wh*-infinitives, as shown in (20) below, *að*-infinitives also lack projections hosting *wh*-phrases (e.g. WhP or IntP).

- (20) \*Þú veist hvað að gera  
 you know what to do  
 ‘You know what to do’

Satk (2022) takes the contrast in (19a) and (19b) to show that infinitival *að* is a low complementizer in Fin whereas finite *að* is a high complementizer in Force. The underlying

assumption here seems to be that the presence of Force entails the possibility of a lower projection in the left periphery, such as TopicP. By contrast, my analysis postulates that ForceP and FinP are the only available projections in the left periphery of Icelandic *að*-infinitives. I do not see this as a theoretical problem because one can e.g. think of this as a result of a restriction where non-finite Force is only able to select FinP as a complement. Moreover, very similar ideas about reduced clauses have been discussed in the literature; see e.g. Heageman's (2006) proposal about the left periphery of central adverbial clauses.

## 5.2 Recomplementation in finite clauses

In contrast to infinitival markers, it is fairly standard to assume that finite complementizers undergo Fin-to-Force movement (Rizzi 1997, Ledgeway 2005 and Demonte and Fernández-Soriano 2009 and much subsequent work). Perhaps the clearest evidence for complementizer movement within the left periphery comes from complementizer doubling in finite clauses, a phenomenon also known as recomplementation. In this construction, which is common in the Romance languages, a left-dislocated element is sandwiched between two copies of the complementizer in *that*-clauses, as in the following example from the RC:<sup>5</sup>

- (21) Við teljum **að** þessi skýrsla **að** hún verði mjög gagnleg  
 we believe that this report that it will.be very useful  
 'We believe that this report, it will be very useful' (Rás 1 og 2)

As far as I know, recomplementation has not been reported for Icelandic in previous literature. The reason may be that this is a colloquial construction that is easy to miss, just like split and double infinitives.

Interestingly, Icelandic also has recomplementation with high adverbs in the left periphery. This is shown in (22):

- (22a) Ég vona **að** bara (**að**) ég fái einhverja aðstoð  
 I hope that just that I get some assistance  
 'I hope that I just get some assistance' (Bland.is)
- (22b) Ég held **að** kannski (**að**) brotunum sem slíkum hafi ekki fjölgað  
 I think that maybe that offences.the as such have not increased  
 'I think that the the number of the offences per se has not increased' (Rás 1 og 2)
- (22c) Það var samdóma álit fólks **að** hérna (**að**) þetta væru vonbrigði  
 it was unified view of.people that here that this was disappointment  
 'Everyone agreed that this was disappointing' (Sjónvarpsfréttir RÚV)
- (22d) Mér finnst mikilvægt **að** einmitt **að** við skoðum málið heildstætt  
 me finds important that precisely that we review case.the holistically  
 'I think it is important that we review the case comprehensively' (Rás 1 og 2)

---

<sup>5</sup> Note that there are no brackets arounds the lower copy of the complementizer because its presence is strongly preferred in this case. The same applies to examples (23) and (24) below.

Interestingly, searches in the RC indicate that this type of doubling is much less common than doubling in *að*-infinitives even though both constructions seem to call for the same structural analysis.

For examples like (21) and (22), it seems fairly straightforward to assume that the finite complementizer *að* undergoes Fin-to-Force movement just like the infinitive marker in *að*-infinitives. By moving to Force, the higher copy of the complementizer will inevitably precede left-dislocated elements (in Spec,Topic) and adverbs left-adjoined to FinP. However, it is possible to construct examples of left-dislocated objects where the lower copy of the complementizer is clearly in a head position above FinP:

- (23) ?Við teljum **að** þessa skýrslu **að** hana muni forstjórinn lesa  
 we believe that this.ACC report.ACC that it.ACC will director.the read  
 ‘We believe that the director will read this report’

In this somewhat deviant example, it looks like the complementizer realizes a Topic head preceding the fronted pronoun *hana* (in Spec,Fin) as well as the finite verb *muni* (in Fin).<sup>6</sup> This contrasts with the example in (21), which has a left-dislocated subject and sounds completely natural. In fact, I have been unable to find any examples with embedded left-dislocated objects in the RC, whether the resumptive pronoun moves to the left periphery, as in (23), or stays in situ, as in (24):

- (24) ?Við teljum **að** þessa skýrslu **að** forstjórinn muni lesa hana  
 we believe that this.ACC report.ACC that director.the will read it.ACC  
 ‘We believe that the director will read this report’

Since (24) is consistent with a Fin-to-Force movement of the complementizer, unlike (23), it seems that the problem with both examples is due to left-dislocation of an embedded object rather than the placement of the lower complementizer. Thus, we can conclude that embedded finite clauses do not provide clear evidence for Fin-to-Force movement of the complementizer *að*. However, the apparent topic marking of the complementizer in finite clauses in examples of left-dislocation should not undermine my analysis of double infinitives since they cannot have any TopicP in the left periphery.

### 5.3 V3 adverbs

As discussed by many authors (see Angantýsson, Nowenstein and Thráinsson 2023 and references cited there), Icelandic allows violations of the V2 constraint if a clause-initial subject is followed by a high adverb.<sup>7</sup> Some representative examples of this are shown in (25):

<sup>6</sup> For another case where the functional element *að* is higher than FinP but lower than Force, see Jónsson’s (2019) discussion of the XP-*há* construction in Icelandic.

<sup>7</sup> As noted by Thráinsson (2010), V3 orders are also possible in Icelandic after topicalized phrases. However, since this is much less studied than V3 in subject-initial clauses, and probably much less common as well, I will focus on subject-initial clauses here.

- (25a) Það **bara** hlýtur einhver að vita þetta  
 there just must someone to know this  
 ‘Somebody must know this’
- (25b) Ég **hreinlega** man það ekki  
 I simply remember it not  
 ‘I simply don’t remember it’
- (25c) Svona hegðun **beinlínis** vinnur gegn okkar markmiðum  
 such behavior directly works against our goals  
 ‘Such behavior goes directly against our goals’
- (25d) Þú **kannski** lætur okkur vita  
 you maybe let us know

Although the class of V3 adverbs in Icelandic has never been studied extensively, it is clear that some adverbs sound quite natural in V3 clauses, e.g. the adverbs exemplified above, whereas other adverbs do not. In fact, some of the adverbs listed in Table 1 fall into this latter class, at least in my judgment, e.g. *vinsamlegast* ‘kindly’, *endanlega* ‘finally’ and *einmitt* ‘exactly’. Thus, it appears that V3 adverbs cannot be completely conflated with splitting adverbs (or doubling adverbs). Still, the similarities are so strong that it is very tempting to give V3 adverbs the same syntactic analysis as splitting and doubling adverbs by assuming that they are left-adjoined to FinP. This view calls for subject movement from Spec,T to some higher position above FinP, presumably Spec,Topic, but the finite verb would presumably stop in Fin. This is not implausible for a V2 language for Icelandic, although examples with a non-topic in first position, as in (25a), would be a problem.<sup>8</sup> An even bigger problem, though, is that V3 adverbs freely occur in all kinds of embedded clauses, including clauses where topicalization is more or less excluded.<sup>9</sup> This is exemplified in (26) below:

- (26a) ...þótt ég **hreinlega** muni það ekki  
 ...although I simply remember it not  
 ‘although I simply cannot remember it’
- (26b) ...því svona hegðun **beinlínis** vinnur gegn okkar markmiðum  
 ...because such behavior directly works against our goals  
 ‘because such behavior goes directly against our goals’
- (26c) ...spurning sem María **bara** getur ekki svarað  
 ...question which Mary just can not answer  
 ‘a question that Mary simply cannot answer’

Thus, it appears that we must adopt the structurally simplest analysis here, according to which a clause-initial subject is always in Spec,T and the finite verb in T. On this analysis, the high

<sup>8</sup> Julien (2018) also notes this as a problem for her analysis of V3 orders in finite clauses in Norwegian and Swedish, which is similar to the analysis discussed here.

<sup>9</sup> See Angantýsson (2011) for an in-depth discussion of embedded topicalization in Icelandic.

adverbs between the subject and the finite verb are presumably left-adjoined to T'. The problem with this analysis, however, is that it makes it very hard to make sense of the syntactic position of high adverbs in Icelandic since they appear to have two rather different adjunction sites. This issue will not be solved here but I would like to refer the reader to Julien (2018), Lundquist (2018) and Brandtler (2020) for a discussion of V3 adverbs in Swedish and Norwegian that is highly relevant for our concerns.

## 6 Conclusions

On the basis of novel data from split and double infinitives in Icelandic, I have argued that *að*-infinitives involve Fin-to-Force movement of the infinitive marker *að* and high adverbs following the infinitive marker in Force are left-adjoined to FinP. In this position, these adverbs will precede a phonetically realized lower copy of the infinitive marker in Fin in double infinitives. It is unclear, however, how far this approach can be pursued with respect to complementizer doubling in finite clauses as well as the placement of V3 adverbs.

## References

- Angantýsson, Ásgrímur. 2011. *The syntax of embedded clauses in Icelandic and related languages*. Hugvísindastofnun, Reykjavík.
- Angantýsson, Ásgrímur, Iris Edda Nowenstein and Höskuldur Thráinsson. 2023. V2 violations in different variants of Icelandic: A common denominator? *Nordic Journal of Linguistics*:1–29.
- Barkarson, Starkaður, Steinþór Steingrímsson and Hildur Hafsteinsdóttir. 2022. Evolving large text corpora: Four versions of the Icelandic Gigaword Corpus. *Proceedings of the Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pp. 2371–2381. Marseille, France.
- Brandtler, Johan. 2020. Vi bara testade en hypotes... Ännu mer om preverbala adverbial i svenska. *Norsk Lingvistisk Tidsskrift* 38:59–92.
- Christensen, Ken Ramshøj. 2007. The infinitive marker across Scandinavian. *Nordlyd* 34:147–165.
- Demonte, Violeta and Olga Fernández-Soriano. 2009. Force and finiteness in the Spanish complementizer system. *Probus* 21:23–49.
- Faarlund, Jan Terje. 2015. The Norwegian infinitive marker. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 95:1–10.
- Faarlund, Jan Terje. 2019. *The syntax of Mainland Scandinavian*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Haegeman, Liliane. 2006. Argument fronting in English, Romance CLLD and the left periphery. In Raffaella Zanuttini, Héctor Campos, Elena Herburger and Paul H. Portner (eds), *Cross-linguistic research in syntax and semantics: negation, tense and clausal architecture*, pp. 27–52. University Press, Georgetown.
- Johnson, Kyle and Sten Vikner. 1994. The position of the verb in Scandinavian infinitives. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 53:61–84.

- Jónsson, Jóhannes Gísli. 2019. The XP-*þá*-construction and V2. In Ken Ramshøj Christensen, Henrik Jørgensen and Johanna L. Wood (eds.), *The sign of the V: Papers in honour of Sten Vikner*, pp. 341–360. Department of English, School of Communication & Culture, Aarhus University.
- Julien, Marit. 2018. Om preverbale adverbialer. *Norsk lingvistisk tidsskrift* 36(1):161–178.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2005. Moving through the left periphery: The dual complementizer system in the dialects of Southern Italy. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 103:339–96.
- Lundquist, Björn. 2018. Mer om de preverbala adverbialens syntax, semantik och prosodi. *Norsk lingvistisk tidsskrift* 36(1):179–195
- Platzack, Christer. 1986. Comp, INFL, and Germanic word order. In Lars Hellan and Kirsti Koch Christensen (eds.), *Topics in Scandinavian syntax*, pp. 185–234. Reidel, Dordrecht.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In Liliane Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of grammar*, pp. 281–337. Kluwer, Dordrecht.
- Satik, Deniz. 2022. *The infinitive size generalization*. Lingbuzz/005910.
- Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 1989. *Verbal syntax and case in Icelandic: In a comparative GB approach*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Lund.
- Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 1984. Different types of infinitival complements in Icelandic. In Wim de Geest and Yvan Putseys (eds.): *Sentential complementation*, pp. 247–55. Foris, Dordrecht.
- Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 1986. On Auxiliaries, AUX and VP in Icelandic. In Lars Hellan and Kirsti Koch Christensen (eds.): *Topics in Scandinavian syntax*, pp. 235–65. Reidel, Dordrecht.
- Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 1993. On the structure of infinitival complements. *Harvard Working Papers in Linguistics* 3:181–213. Department of Linguistics, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 2010. Predictable and unpredictable sources of variable verb and adverb placement in Scandinavian. *Lingua* 120:1062–1088.
- Thráinsson, Höskuldur, Hjalmar P. Petersen, Jógvan í Lon Jacobsen and Zakaris Svabo Hansen. (2012). *Faroese: An overview and reference grammar*. Faroe University Press and Linguistic Institution, University of Iceland. [First published in 2004 by Føroya Fróðskaparfelag].
- van Gelderen, Elly. 2004. *Grammaticalization as economy*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.