A) **Conjecture:** Adopting the general framework and ideas on head movement in Chomsky (2013)/POP, (2015)/POP+, this paper proposes an analysis in which internal Pair Merge of \(<R, v_\circ>\) or T to C yields the amalgams \(<<R, v>, C>\) or \(<T, C>, C>_\circ or \(<T, C>_\circ or \(<T, C>_\circ\) in bracket notation. In the amalgam, it is not C but the moving (auxiliary or lexical) finite verb which becomes “the most prominent element.” For expository purposes, we henceforth illustrate head movement to C with T, not with lexical verbs (as e.g. in Germanic V1/V2). The labeling algorithm LA in POP finds this amalgam in \([_{\{T, C\}} TP]\) and determines \(<T, C>_\circ to be α’s label to yield \([_{<T, C>_\circ TP}, T + C\}] TP\) (cf. POP+: 12 on \(<R, v>_\circ>\). A consequence is that features on C are “hidden” for the purposes of agreement with XP in \([XP, {<T, C>, TP}]\). We develop various predictions of head-movement to C phenomena vis-à-vis non-hidden C and show how they are borne out in languages like English, German and French complex inversion (not shown here).

B) **The KRR-effect derived:** The Kayne/Rizzi/Roberts effect refers to the observation that in most varieties of English, Germanic V2-languages and French, T-to-C- or V-to-C-head movement are confined to root or root-like contexts and barred from lexically selected ones (Kayne 1982, 1983; Rizzi & Roberts 1989; cf. McCloskey 2006 for exceptions and an analysis that retains the KRR-effect):

1) **Illustration of the KRR-effect:** (*The police discovered) [who had, they t, beaten up]

Rizzi & Roberts (1989) suggest that such facts militate against an adjunction approach to head movement, and speak for a substitution approach, in that the former involves a complex head \([c, T+C]\), leaving the KRR effect unexplained: C projects invariably. In our analysis, T-to-C is an instance of forming \(<T, C>_\circ. As a consequence of C being hidden in the amalgam, C (i) cannot participate in agreement processes, and (ii) by virtue of (i) cannot participate in the formation of a “shared feature” label (cf. POP: 45, POP++; EKS 2016, Sugimoto 2016). Furthermore, the following interface condition is adopted (cf. Blümel 2017; Chomsky, Gallego & Ott 2017):

2) **Root Exocentricity (RE):** Root clauses are canonically associated with unlabeled structures.

The rationale behind RE: By assumption, being labeled is crucially a feature of selected syntactic objects. Since root clauses are not selected (the derivation terminates), they do not require a label. Blümel (2017) argues that V2-languages employ obligatory Merger of XP in the sister position of CP= \([C_{\{\{\text{finV/T}\}} TP]\) to yield \([XP, CP_{\{\{\text{finV/T}\}}}]\). As a consequence, the application of LA delivers no result. This unlabeled structure is then associated with the interpretation of a declarative clause. (2) extends this idea to V1/V2-structures more generally, i.e. to clause types like WH- and polar interrogatives, as well as V1 conditional clauses, as follows: Left open in Blümel’s (2017) approach is the role that V/T-in-C plays. Merge is free to apply, but only certain derivational combinations yield outcomes that meet RE. C-hiding by Internal Pair Merge of finite V/T contributes to meeting RE. More specifically, V/T-movement as C-hiding yields structures of the format \([XP, {<T, C>, TP}]\). Since the features of C are hidden by the Pair Merge T in such structures, XP and C cannot undergo agreement (understood as Minimal Search for features, cf. Kinjo 2018, EKS 2018). However, agreement obviation is a prerequisite for suppressing the application of LA (POP: 45). And failure to apply LA is a means to meet RE.

The following derivations illustrate the basic working of our proposal:

3) **Embedded WH-clause:** *(Mary wonders) who John likes.*
   a. TP=John likes who
   b. \{C, TP\}
   c. \{who, \{C, TP\}\}
   d. \{who, \{C, TP\}\}

   **⇒ RE is not met:** \(<Q, Q>\) is an object for selection by verbs. As the subordinate question is labeled, RE correctly predicts it to not be a possible root clause.

4) **Root WH-clause:** Who does John like?
   a. TP=John does like who
   b. \{C, TP\}
   c. \{\{T, C\}, TP\}
   d. \{who, \{\{T, C\}, TP\}\}

   **External Set Merge of C**

   **Internal Set Merge of who**

   **Agreement (as Minimal Search of \(XP, YP\)) obtains**

   **Labeling obtains (\(Q\) is shared)**

   **⇒ RE is not met:** \(<Q, Q>\) is an object for selection by verbs. As the subordinate question is labeled, RE correctly predicts it to not be a possible root clause.
is hidden within <$T+C_o$>

\[ \Rightarrow \text{RE is met; an exocentric structure is not an object for selection by (matrix)-verbs, deriving the KRR-effect (1): If T-to-C movement occurs as in (1), then agreement and labeling <$Q, Q$> do not obtain, and the selectional requirements of the matrix verb are not met. Hence T-to-C movement bleeds selection.} \]

Further extensions to German root phenomena are provided:

5) V2-declarative (German): Bücher hat Peter gelesen. (books has Peter read)
   a. TP=Peter Bücher gelesen hat  \text{External Set Merge of C}
   b. \{C, TP\} \text{Internal Pair Merge of T to C}
   c. \{<T, C>, TP\} \text{Internal Set Merge of Bücher}
   d. \{Bücher, \{<T, C>, TP\}\} \text{Agreement (as Minimal Search of \{XP, YP\}) fails}
   \quad \text{as C is hidden within <$T+C_o$>}
   e. \{who$_0$, \{<T, C$_0$, TP\}\} \text{Labeling fails (no prominent feature shared)}

\[ \Rightarrow \text{RE is met; an exocentric structure is not an object for selection by verbs, cf. den Besten (1977/1983) and Reis (1997) on embedded V2 in German.} \]

We suggest that probe-goal AGREE between the relevant features on C and e.g. the WH-phrase at stage (4-b) is not enough for determining a shared label in a subsequent XP-YP-configuration, captured in (6):

6) Shared Label Condition

\text{Minimal Search labels \{XP, YP\} as <$F, F$> (where X and Y bear F) iff agreement holds wrt X and Y at this derivational point.}

Root polar questions (\textit{Does John like milk?}) derive like in (4), except that Set Merge of a silent operator (akin to overt \textit{whether}) instead of an overt WH-phrase applies at stage (4-c). V1-conditionals can be accounted for in an analogous fashion to root polar questions. Adopted are Bhatt & Pancheva (2006) and Haegeman’s (2006) independent claims that V1-conditionals involve movement of a silent operator to the left periphery. The necessity to end up with an exocentric XP-YP-structure (RE) thus lends theory-internal support to the operator idea. We thus have a uniform picture of V1/V2-clauses, independent of their functioning as an adverbial or argument (unselected V2-argument clauses, cf. Reis 1997): V/T-to-C movement hides C, which entails that there can be no agreement between C and OP/XP; absence of agreement entails that there can be no labeling. Lack of a label, finally, entails that selection by higher verbs is barred, respectively.

C) (Two) Consequences: i) If V/T hides C, C ceases to function as a phase head (cf. Epstein et al. 2016; Sugimoto 2016). If hidden C is not a phase, there can be no reflexes of movement via the edge of hidden C. There can then be no language with simultaneous embedded V/T-in-C and some reflex of successive-cyclic A’-movement in “SPEC”-CP, because hidden C cannot force intermediate stopover. There is indeed a curious typological gap: e.g. while West Ulster English allows Q-float under long-distance WH-movement in intermediate clausal edge positions (McCloskey 2000) and many other varieties of English allow for embedded subject-aux-inversion (McCloskey 2006), no single variety mixes these two properties. Likewise, while Afrikaans does allow the combination of WH-copying and finite verbs adjacent to the embedded pronoun copy, there are reasons to believe that the finite verb is in T, not C (cf. Biberauer 2002). This gap thus provides evidence for our analysis. ii) Cross-linguistically, only finite verbs tend to undergo movement to C. Specifically, non-finite verbs never move to C accompanied by XP in “SPEC”-CP (cf. Rizzi 1982 and Raposo 1987 for Aux-to-Comp in Italian and E. Portuguese respectively). Why? The approach leads to a natural interpretation of this fact. If the purpose of head movement to C is hiding C from undergoing agreement with XP, this only makes sense if the type of C-head can undergo agreement in principle. If we are dealing with a C-head which bears no agreement features lexically, no hiding is necessary to begin with, and thus no movement to C by non-finite verbs.