



(Hornstein and Polinsky analyze *John to invite Mary to the prom* as a TP, but nothing hinges on that here.)

Meaning - the additional/outer **Spec-vP** that provided an escape hatch is also available in ECM constructions. It can't, however, be available in object-less subject control:

*John_i was proj hoped PRO_i to win.

Presumably ECM verbs and ditransitive subject control verbs can be made to form a (natural) class, and the above example ruled out by the fact that *hope* isn't a member. Hornstein and Polinsky never say what generalization accounts for this, but it seems natural to assume that they have in mind that the extra **Spec** is there as a side-effect of the absorption of **ACC** case. In a purely lexicalist system, then, passive-*v* comes in two forms, one that selects transitive V and one intransitive, and the one that selects transitive happens to have an outer **Spec**.

If that is the generalization, though, lack of an extra **Spec-vP** (obviating intervention by the null subject) cannot be the explanation for the ungrammaticality of **Mary_i was promised (by*