In ‘On phases’, Chomsky (2008) proposes that only phase heads can be specified for probing features and EPP, and at the same time assumes that T is not itself a phase head. To allow T to probe the subject, Chomsky suggests that T inherits its probing features and EPP specification from C — the Feature Inheritance Hypothesis. My goal in this talk is to show that Feature Inheritance (FI), deployed in a way that is different from Chomsky’s own exploitation of FI, explains the interplay between verb raising to T, preverbal subject placement, and pro-drop in a way similar to Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou’s (1998) seminal account — but without overgenerating and without assuming that verb movement to T itself satisfies the EPP. I will do this on the basis of a specific proposal for regarding the feature content of the T–head: either (a) T is endowed with a non-probing [tense] feature, or (b) T is radically featureless. When (a) is in effect, movement of the v+V complex up to T involves adjunction, in the familiar way; but when (b) is in effect, the v+V complex raises up to T via substitution, extending the vP phase up to TP and precluding FI from C to T, thereby causing the EPP not to be activated on T and preventing the subject from raising to SpecTP. The consequences of substituting verb movement to T for the φ-features of the finite verb and the case-features of the subject will be reviewed in detail. At the end of the talk, I will make some exploratory remarks about the implications of the proposed distinction between substituting and adjoining verb movement to T in the realm of temporal interpretation and sequence-of-tenses (SoT) phenomena.

(This paper is part of a larger project that also discusses FI in the vP phase. In Den Dikken & Shim 2011, support is provided for FI in the vP phase from the domain of object placement in Japanese/English and Korean/English code-switching constructions.)