Negation and Infinitives:  
*att inte vara* or *að vera ekki*

1 Preliminaries
Within the VP-domain, Vº-to-vº movement is obligatory, at least with ditransitive verbs in order to precede the indirect object. Even though this movement is string-vacuous, I will assume that the verb always raises to vº with mono- and intransitive verbs as well.

(1) Da:  
a. *at nogen give noget*  
b. at give, nogen t v noget

(2) En:  
a. *to someone give something*  
b. to give, someone t v something

(3) Obligatory Vº-to-vº movement:

```
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The question is then where the infinitive marker is base-generated. There are (at least) four logically possible answers:
I. It is inserted/base-generated in $V^o$ together with the verb as $[to+V]$. However, **excorporation** would subsequently be necessary. After the obligatory movement in (3), e.g. English *to* would have to excorporate from the verb and move to $T^o$ to precede adverbials like for example *boldly* in the famous phrase from Star Trek: *to boldly go where no man has gone before*.

II. It is base-generated in $v^o$. This analysis would also have to admit the unwanted process of **excorporation** as the complex head $[to+V]$ that results from the obligatory $V^o$-to-$v^o$ movement would have to be split up again in order to get the split infinitive.

III. It is base-generated in $T^o$. This is problematic as examples where *to* follows VP-adverbials, as in e.g. *the snails were beginning slowly to move in all directions*, would have to involve **rightward movement** or **lowering** of *to* from $T^o$ to $v^o$ across the VP-adverbial adjoined to $vP$.

IV. In the analysis adopted here, the infinitival marker is base-generated in a functional projection $FP$ above $vP$ (and auxiliary $VP$-shells) but below $TP$ as it may follow VP-adverbials, which are then adjoined to $FP$. This analysis raises none of the problems associated with excorporation and lowering. Optional movement from the base-position in $F^o$ to $T^o$ to precede VP-adverbials is illustrated in (4):

(4) **Base-position of the infinitive marker:**

[Diagram showing the structure of a sentence with infinitive marker in a functional projection FP above vP and below TP, illustrating optional movement from $F^o$ to $T^o$ to precede VP-adverbials.]
2 Movement of the Infinitival Marker

2.1 Danish

In Danish, the infinitive marker at optionally moves to Tº where it precedes left-adjoined VP-adverbials like bare 'just', as in (5)b. It can’t move to Iº as it can’t precede negation, cf. (5)c (at least this is very marked and significantly worse than (5)b):1

(5) Da. Vi overtalte dem til ...
We persuaded them to

a. ikke bare at prøve igen
to not just try again
b. % ikke at bare prøve igen

c. ??at ikke bare prøve igen

(6) Da: Vi er for glade for klubben til bare at give slip.
We are too happy for club.the to just to give slip
“We are too fond of the club to just let it go.” (Korpus 2000)

(7) Da: Mest for at bare holde folket underrettet ...
Mostly for to just hold people.the informed

(8) Danish:
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1 Examples (6) and (7) are taken from Korpus 2000, Det Danske Sprog- og Litteratselskab, DSL, http://korpus.dsl.dk/
2.2 **English**

English *to* may optionally move to Tº to precede VP-adverbials, as the examples in (9) and (9) show. Examples (11) and (12) shows that it may also optionally move to Iº to precede negation (see also Greenbaum & Quirk 1990:162, Radford 1997: 29):

(9) En: If we are ever **fully** to understand consciousness...


(10) En: I want you to **fully** understand the gravity of the situation.

(Radford 1997: 29)

(11) En: I want you **not** to see anyone.

(Bolinger 1977: 38)

(12) En: "Neither a borrower, nor a lender be" says that it is best to **not** lend [money] to other people and to **not** borrow from other people.

(http://www.goenglish.com/NeitherABorrowerNorALenderBe.asp)

(13) English:
2.3 **Swedish**

In Swedish, the infinitive marker *att* obligatorily precedes negation (Holmes & Hinchcliffe 2003: 476) and therefore it must move to I°. That split infinites are not limited to negative adverbials is shown in the example (16) (cf. Holmes & Hinchcliffe 2003: 508).

(14) **Sw**: vi uppmanade dem att *aldrig* göra om det  
*We encouraged them to never do again it*  
(Holmes & Hinchcliffe 2003: 476)

(15) **Sw**: For att *inte* tala om alla dessa kvinnor  
*For to not talk about all these women*  
(Title of a 1964 screenplay by Ingmar Bergman)

(16) **Sw**: Att *verkligen* kunna läsa innebär att man kan följa ett  
intellektuellt resonemang och uppleva en seriös skönlitterär text  
*To really be able to read entails that one can follow an  
intellectual reasoning and experience a serious literary text*  
(Göteborgs-Posten 97)

This is also found in **Early Modern Danish** (EMD) where, according to Falk & Torp (1900: 300), the infinitive marker “often” precedes negation and other adverbials:

(17) **EMD**: at *iljde* brwge rigdom [VP-adv]  
to badly use riches  
(1526, Poul Eliesen, Falk & Torp 1900: 300)

(18) **EMD**: at *lettelige* foracte  
to easily despise  
(1575, Anders Sørensen Vedel, Falk & Torp 1900: 300)

---

2 From the Språkbanken corpus, University of Gothenburg, [http://spraakbanken.gu.se/](http://spraakbanken.gu.se/).
(19) Swedish and Early Modern Danish:

Interestingly, in Swedish, a negative object that has undergone NEG-shift (Christensen 2003) may also split the infinitive:³

(20) Sw: Den utbredda vanmakten, känslan av att inget begripa
The widespread powerlessness, feeling the of to nothing comprehend

(Svenska Dagbladet)

(21) Sw: att känna hur skönt det kan vara att inget ha
To feel how wonderful it can be to none have

(Svenska Dagbladet)

This is illustrated in (22) below:

³ Examples from the Språkbanken corpus, University of Gothenburg, http://språkbanken.gu.se/.
2.4 Norwegian

Like Swedish, Norwegian also allows sentential adverbials, as in (23), and negation, cf. (24), to intervene between the infinitival marker and the verb. Note that in (25) the adverb that splits the infinitive is the VP-adverbial *berre* ‘just’.\(^4\)

(23) No: Så må du passa på å alltid avbestilla bøkene
Then must you mind on to always cancel books.the

(Bergens Tidende)

(24) No: Det var meninga å ikkje lyse ut nokon ny anbods-konkurranse
It was intention.the to not announce PRT any new tender-competition

(Bergens Tidende)

(25) No: Annleis vil det vere om dei har halde på med å berre slå
Different will it be of they have held on with to just hit
“It would have been different if they had just kept hitting.”

(Lokalaviser)

\(^4\) All Norwegian examples are from the Nynorsk part of the Oslo Corpus of Tagged Norwegian Texts, University of Oslo, [http://www.hf.uio.no/tekstlab/](http://www.hf.uio.no/tekstlab/).
Unlike Swedish, in Norwegian the negation can either precede or follow the infinitive marker and or the VP-adverbial. Thus, there is optional Fº-to-Iº movement as well as optional Fº-to-Tº movement:

(26) No: Bjørn Eidsvåg hadde bestemt seg for ikkje å gje konsertar i sommar
Bjørn Eidsvåg had decided SELF for not to give concerts in summer
(Bergens Tidende)

(27) No: Eg vil råde dei unge til ikkje å bli gamle.
I will advice the young to not to become old
(Bergens Tidende)

(28) No: Dette er eit betre utgangspunkt enn berre å seia at …
This is a better starting-point than just to say that
(Bergens Tidende)

The Norwegian optional movement is illustrated in (29) below. Note that the pattern is the same as the English one in (13).

(29) Norwegian:

As Norwegian allows negation to intervene between the infinitive marker and the verb, as Swedish does, it would be expected that NEG-shift should also be able to split the infinitive. This is not
borne out. For some reason, NEG-shift is not possible in infinitival clauses (in Danish, (30)c is grammatical. (30)a is grammatical in both Danish and Norwegian with *ingen as constituent negation):

(30) No: a. * å ingen venner ha ingen venner er trist
    b. * å ingen venner ha er trist
    c. ingen venner å ha er trist
    no friends to have is sad

(Janne Bond Johannesssen, p.c.)

2.5 Icelandic

In Icelandic, there are two possible movements of the infinitive marker *að. As (31)a and b show, *að may optionally move to Iº where it precedes negation, contrary to what is claimed by Holmberg (2000: 456, footnote 12). The second movement is the one in (31)c where the infinitive verb has moved to adjoin to *að with subsequent movement to Iº of this complex head [*að+V]:

(31) Ic: a. ? ekki að eiga neina vini er ákaflega leiðinlegt
    b. ?að ekki eiga neina vini er ákaflega leiðinlegt
    c. að eiga ekki neina vini er ákaflega leiðinlegt
    to have not any friends is awfully boring

Fº-to-Tº movement is also optional as *að may either precede or follow left-adjoined VP-adverbials such as *bara ‘only’. Again, in the unmarked case [*að+V] is moved:

(32) Ic: a. ? Alltaf bara að drekka kók er mjög óhollt
    b. ?að Alltaf bara drekka kók er mjög óhollt
    c. *Að alltaf bara drekka kók er mjög óhollt
    d. *Að drekka alltaf bara kók er mjög óhollt
    to drink always only Coke is very unhealthy

It appears that moving the [*að+V] (see the tree in (34) below) complex is the unmarked strategy. (31)c is slightly more ‘natural’ than (31)a and b. This can also be seen in example (33)c which involves movement to Iº of the [*að+V] complex and OBJ-shift:

(33) Ic: a. ?Hún hefur reynt ekki að lesa bókina
    b. ?Hún hefur reynt að ekki lesa bókina
    c. Hún hefur reynt að lesa [bókina] ekki
    She has tried to read book the not

5 Thanks to Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson for judgements on the Icelandic examples.

6 *Að drekka alltaf bara kók er mjög óhollt is interpreted as ‘to always drink nothing else but Coke’ – i.e. bara has only scope over kók. That is not the case in the other three examples where bara scopes over the entire VP.
Thus, the movement pattern of að is the same as that for English to and Norwegian å (see (13) and (29) above). The [að+V] complex obligatorily moves to I".

(34) Icelandic Vº-to-Fº incorporation:

When the object is negative it has to move to spec-NEGP to license sentential negation. Unlike Swedish, this operation is not allowed to split the infinitive. Instead, the [að+V] complex moves to Iº and the object undergoes NEG-shift:

(35) Ic: a. * [enga vini] að eiga (er ákaflega leiðinlegt)
    b. *að [enga vini] eiga (er ákaflega leiðinlegt)
    c. að eiga [enga vini] (er ákaflega leiðinlegt)
    to have no friends (is awfully boring)

That the negative object enga vini ‘no friends’ in (35)c is not to be interpreted as a instance of “trifling” negation is clear in examples with auxiliary verbs. The infinitival [að+V] complex has moved to Iº and the object has undergone NEG-shift as it precedes the main verb participle:

(36) Ic: [að hafa [enga vini] átt] hefur verið ákaflega leiðinlegt
    to have no friends had has been awfully boring

(37) Ic: [að hafa [engar bækur] lesið] var ákaflega vitlaust
    to have no books read was awfully stupid

This is illustrated in (38) below:
(38) Icelandic \([a\delta+V]\) movement and NEG-shift:

Interestingly, these examples show:

a) that Icelandic allows the split infinitive with both VP-adverbials and negation,\(^7\)

b) that \(V^0\)-to-\(I^0\) is not restricted to finite verbs, but

c) that the infinitive verb may move with the infinitive marker to \(I^0\) as a complex head.

However, the movement of the infinitive verb is only licensed in the company of the infinitive marker \(a\delta\) (regardless of subsequent OBJ-shift), as the following ECM examples show:

(39) Ic: a. Hann sá [mig ekki lesa bókina]
    b. *Hann sá [mig lesa ekki bókina]
    c. *Hann sá [mig lesa bókina ekki]

"He saw me not reading the book."

\(^7\) For reasons yet unknown, sentential adverbials other than negation are not allowed to split the infinitive, as the difference in grammaticality between examples (31)b and (32)c shows.
Johnson & Vikner (1998), following Sigurðsson (1989), claim that ECM constructions can’t have a NEGP:

(44) For some unknown reason, non-control infinitives in Icelandic are so anemic, that they do not allow for the kinds of adverbs usually used to determine whether verbs have moved or not. (Johnson & Vikner 1998: 15-16)

However, the data presented above are counterexamples to such a claim. The problem appears to be the auxiliary verb in the matrix clause, not the negation in the embedded clause, compare (45) and (46):

(45) Ic: a.*Pétur hafði talið [Mariu ekki hafa vaskað upp diskana] 
b.*Pétur hafði talið [Mariu hafa ekki vaskað upp diskana] 
c. Pétur hafði talið [Mariu hafa vaskað upp diskana] 
(Peter had believed Mary (not) have washed up dishes.the) 
(Johnson & Vikner 1998: 14, (41))
The analysis of Johnson & Vikner (1998) also admittedly wrongly predicts control infinitives to be extraction islands. They argue that ad is base-generated in the higher Cº in a recursive CP-domain and that PRO is topicalized to avoid government by the infinitive verb which they argue is moved to the lower Cº, cf. the example in (47). They thus have to make additional stipulations. The present analysis does not make such a prediction, cf. the analysis in (48):

(47) Ic: Hvernig1 lofaði Pétur Jóni … How promised Peter.NOM Jón.DAT

\[ [CP að [CP PRO fara [IP til London á morgun t₁]]]? \to go \to London tomorrow \]

(Johnson & Vikner 1998: 31, (78b))

There are thus two versions of Icelandic ad. One that may move alone which is slightly marked, and another one which may be analyzed as an incorporating head which is the unmarked version.

As in Icelandic, in Early Modern Danish the infinitive marker and the infinitive (auxiliary) verb may move together as they may both precede sentential adverbs and negation:

(49) EMD: sinntes at haffue aldelis forført seems to have completely seduced

(1575, Anders Sørensen Vedel, Falk & Torp 1900: 299)

(50) EMD: sagde sig nu at skulle icke lade hannem vere der lenger said SELF now to should not let him be there longer

(1574-1597, Bishop Jens Nielsen, Visitatsbog, Falk & Torp 1900: 299)

The possibility of moving [at+V] in Early Modern Danish and [ad+V] in Icelandic seems to correlate with / be licensed by Vº-to-Iº movement. Among the modern Scandinavian languages, only Icelandic has Vº-to-Iº movement while Danish lost it sometime between 1300 and 1700. The movement of the infinitive marker alone is not subject to such a licensing condition.
3 Summary

The distribution of the infinitive marker can be summed as follows:

a. Danish *at* optionally moves to Tº to precede VP-adverbials. Movement to Iº is impossible as it obligatorily follows NEGP.

b. English *to* optionally moves to Tº where it precedes VP-adverbials and optionally to Iº to precede NEGP.

c. Swedish *att* always moves to Iº as it obligatorily precedes NEGP which may also be targeted by NEG-shift.

d. Norwegian *å* optionally moves Tº to precede VP-adverbials and optionally to Iº where it precedes NEGP. Unexpectedly, spec-NEGP may not be filled by NEG-shift in infinitival clauses.

e. Icelandic *að* (and Early Modern Danish *at*) may optionally move to Tº to precede VP-adverbials and further to Iº where it precedes NEGP. The unmarked derivation, however, is the one where the verb is incorporated by *að* and this complex head moves to Iº. This appears to be licensed by the ‘Vº-to-Iº parameter’.

(51) The variation in the position of the infinitive marker:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement Type</th>
<th>Languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Optional Fº-to-Tº movement</td>
<td>En (<em>to</em>), No (<em>å</em>), Da (<em>at</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional Tº-to-Iº movement</td>
<td>En (<em>to</em>), No (<em>å</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obligatory Fº-to-Iº movement</td>
<td>Sw (<em>att</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Fº+[vº+Vº]] movement to Iº</td>
<td>Ic (<em>að+V</em>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(52) NEG-shift and infinitives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>NEG-shift</th>
<th>Infinitives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Split infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ic</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>[að+V] move</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Da</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td><em>Ingen</em> at V t1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No [Ic]</td>
<td>×</td>
<td><em>Ingen</em> → <em>ikke nogen</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>VP-internal negation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 Conclusions

a) The base-position of the infinitive marker is the same cross-linguistically, namely in a functional projection FP at the top of the VP-domain. This is different from what is assumed elsewhere. The table below shows some examples of the various positions argued for the infinitive marker (*mutatis mutandis* as some of the authors use non-split IPs). Interestingly, Beukema & den Dikken (1989) also argues for optional movement, but only for English and Norwegian:

(53) Base-positions of the infinitive marker:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cº</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ic: að</td>
<td>Ic: að</td>
<td>Ic: að</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sw: att</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tº</td>
<td>En: to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sw: att</td>
<td>En: to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tº</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Da: at</td>
<td>Da: at</td>
<td>Da: at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>En: to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No: â</td>
<td></td>
<td>En: to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No: â</td>
<td></td>
<td>No: â</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Bobaljik & Thráinsson (1998) argue that only Icelandic has a split IP while the other Scandinavian languages and English have a simple un-split IP. The data presented here show that it cannot be correct (or at the very least, it doesn’t have to be). All the languages must have more than one functional head in the IP-domain that can be targeted by movement of the infinitival marker: one preceding NEGP, i.e. Tº, and one following NEGP but preceding VP-adverbials, i.e. Tº. (This presumably also holds for Swedish, even though the data presented here do not show it.)

c) The distribution of the infinitival marker and negation and sentential and VP-adverbs shows that NEGP can have the same structural position in all the languages, i.e. between IP (or AGRSP) and TP. Ouhalla (1990: 199) argues that English (and implies that Swedish (1990: 210)) NEG selects VP, while French NEGP selects TP. The present analysis shows that all of these languages (again except perhaps Swedish) may have the same “NEG-parameter” setting: NEG selects TP.

d) Contrary to what is argued by Johnson & Vikner (1998), Icelandic infinitive verbs do not move (they argue that the verb moves through Tº to Cº). The infinitival marker *að* attracts and incorporates the infinitive verbs prior to movement to Tº. This complex head, not the infinitive verb, is able to check [φ] features.
e) In Icelandic ECM constructions (non-control infinitives), there is no infinitival *að* and therefore no movement to Iº as the infinitival verb itself cannot check the features on Iº. I have presented data that show, contrary to what is claimed by Johnson & Vikner (1998) and others, that ECM constructions may have a NEGP which makes it possible to positively identify the structural position of the verb.

f) The analysis presented here correctly predicts that control infinitives are not extraction islands, which the analysis in Johnson & Vikner (1998) predicts them to be.
5 Appendix: A note on non-control infinitives

In control infinitives, PRO in spec-IP checks [EPP] on Iº, að/att checks [φ].

(54) Features checked by PRO and the infinitival marker (version 1):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>Icelandic að / Swedish att</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[EPP] [INF, φ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I assume that iff Iº assigns Case, Iº has [φ] features. In other words, Iº has no [φ] features in:

(55) a. ECM constructions
    b. Icelandic clauses with DAT/ACC subjects

In ECM constructions, the subject DP moves to get Case. There are no [φ] features, and Icelandic að like Swedish att are not licensed as their uninterpretable [φ] features cannot be checked.

     b. *Pétur taldi [ Maríu að ekki hafa vaskað upp diskana]
     c. *Pétur taldi [ Maríu ekki að hafa vaskað upp diskana]
     Peter believed Mary not to have washed up dishes.

In Raising constructions, the raising subject DP checks [φ, EPP] on the embedded Iº and [EPP] on the matrix Iº. Again, að/att would not be able to check [φ] and is therefore not licensed.

(57) Ic: a. *Hann virtist [að ekki tala fullkomna íslensku] (Raising)
     b. Hann virtist [ ekki tala fullkomna íslensku]
     c. *Hann virtist [að tala ekki fullkomna íslensku]
     He seemed to speak not perfect Icelandic

Danish at, English to, and Norwegian å are obligatory in both ECM and Raising constructions: 8

8 Except ECM constructions under perception verbs, which for some reason do not license the infinitive marker in any of the languages in question:

(i) Da: Jeg hørte [hende (*at) spille klaver]
(ii) En: I heard [her (*to) play the piano]
(iii) Ic: Ég heyrði [hana (*að) leikja á pianó]
b. *Jeg anser [hende for være kompetent]
   I consider her for to be competent

(59) Da: a. Han synes [att tale flydende dansk] (Raising)
b. *Han synes [tale flydende dansk]  
   He seems to speak fluent Danish

This is summarized in the table in (60) below (see also Beukema & den Dikken 1989: 66-67):

(60) Distribution of the infinitival marker:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infinitival marker</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>ECM</th>
<th>Raising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Danish at</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English to</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian å</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Icelandic að</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish att</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But why, then, are Da. at, En. to, and No. å obligatory in ECM and Raising? If it is assumed that there is a difference in the properties of PRO and the infinitive marker the observed variation follows. In Icelandic and Swedish, the infinitive marker checks the [φ] features (obligatory movement to Fº-to-Iº), while in Danish, English, and Norwegian, this is done by PRO (optional Fº-to-Iº). (Future research may answer the question why Icelandic and Swedish PRO can’t check [φ] features.)

(61) Features checked by PRO and the infinitive marker (version 2):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>Infinitive marker Fº</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ic, Sw</td>
<td>[EPP]</td>
<td>[INF, φ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Da, En, No</td>
<td>[EPP, φ]</td>
<td>[INF]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(62) The variation in the position of the infinitive marker (repeated from (51) above):

| Optional Fº-to-Tº movement | En (to), No (å), Da (at) | [, ?Ic (að)] |
| Optional Tº-to-Iº movement | En (to), No (å)          | [, ?Ic (að)] |
| Obligatory Fº-to-Iº movement | Sw (att)                |
| [Fº+[vº+Vº]] movement to Iº | Ic (að+V)               |
As mentioned in section 2.5 above, the movement of the Icelandic að without the infinitival verb is marked. Assuming the feature distribution in (61) provides us with a possible explanation of this markedness. Consider the data in (63) (repeated from (31) above):

\[(63)\]

Ic:

a. ? ekki að eiga neina vini er ákaflega leiðinlegt

b. ?að ekki eiga neina vini er ákaflega leiðinlegt

c. að eiga ekki neina vini er ákaflega leiðinlegt

to have not any friends is awfully boring

Not moving að, as in (63)a, is marked because the \([\varphi]\) features on Iº remain unchecked (or is perhaps postponed to LF). Moving að alone to check \([\varphi]\) features on Iº, as in (63)b, is marked because the infinitival verb is ‘stranded’, or rather að has failed to incorporate it.

The optional movement of Da. at / En. to / No. å probably has to do with scope relations (e.g. whether the infinitive scopes over e.g. negation or vice versa) and/or information structure (focus and presupposition), not feature checking.

\[(64)\]

En:

a. Not to win the Olympics is okay. [We are not all champions.]

(b. #To not win the Olympics is okay. [Winning is not okay.]

(presupposes that the Olympics actually takes place)

Swedish att has lost its ability to incorporate – an ability found in Icelandic að and Early Modern Danish at which indicates that it might be licensed by Vº-to-Iº movement (the exact connection / licensing condition between the two remains to be explained). I propose that incorporation is motivated by an uninterpretable feature, say, \([+\text{INCORP}]\) on the infinitive marker. This explains why ‘verb stranding’ in (63)b leads to markedness (or ungrammaticality).

\[(65)\]

Features checked by (or on) PRO and the infinitive marker (version 3):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>Infinitive marker Fº</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ic</td>
<td>[EPP]</td>
<td>[INF, +INCORP, (\varphi)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>[EPP]</td>
<td>[INF, –INCORP, (\varphi)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Da, En, No</td>
<td>[EPP, (\varphi)]</td>
<td>[INF, –INCORP]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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