both Case -features thereby erased (since Case -features and complement-features are uninterpretable)." (A.Radford,1997: 102)

The specifier-features of *hate* indicate that it requires a specifier whose head is nominative and either first /second person or plural; but as there is no specifier within the VP headed by *hate* ,the only way in which *hate* can check its specifier-features is if the relevant features percolate up to INFL (in the same way as the head-features of *hate* do). The specifier of INFL is the DP ∅ *students*. The head-features of ∅ satisfy the requirements imposed by specifier-features of INFL(which in turn are inherited from *hate*) , so the specifier-features of *hate* can be checked and erased (along with the nominative Case-feature carried by ∅).

2. Account for the ungrammaticality of the following sentences:

(i) (a) *They had planned to escape.*

(b) **They had planned him to escape* (intended as synonymous with '*They had planned that he should escape*')

(ii) (a) *We consider him to be right.*

(b)* *We consider to be right* (intended as synonymous with '*We consider ourselves to be right*)

(iii) (a) *He would like me to retire.*

(b)* *He would like to retire.*

(iv) (a) **He said her to like apples* (intended as synonymous with '*He said she liked apples*)

(b)* *He said to like apples* (intended as synonymous with '*He said he liked apples*).

(v) (a) *She seems keen for them to participate.*

(b)* *She seems keen for to participate.*

(vi) (a) *He received a request to help the refugees.*

(b)* *He received a request they/them to help the refugees.*

(vii) (a) *He felt himself to be ageing.*

(b)* *He felt himself was ageing.*