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1. Introduction

The derivation of the English *tough*-construction (TC), shown in (1), has been an issue of contention since the advent of generative grammar.

(1) a. The book was easy to read.
    
    b. The book was easy \([CP \quad [IP \quad PRO \text{ to read } t]]\)
    
    c. The book was easy \([CP \quad C \quad [IP \quad PRO \text{ to read the book}]]\).
    
    d. The book was easy \([CP \quad OP \quad C \quad [IP \quad PRO \text{ to read } t]]\)
    
    e. The book was easy \([CP \quad t \quad C \quad [IP \quad PRO \text{ to read } t]]\)

The central issue in the debate over TCs is the relationship between the gap in the embedded infinitival clause and the subject of the matrix clause. There have been several proposals concerning the nature of this relationship ranging from: single step A-movement (Rosenbaum 1967, Postal 1971) (1b); an object deletion process (Akmajian 1972, Lasnik & Fiengo 1974) (1c); null operator movement (Chomsky 1977) (1d); and two step movement (Brody 1993, Hornstein 2001, Hicks 2009, Obata & Epstein 2012, Hartman 2012).

This paper makes two claims that add to the discussion of TCs: (1) TCs are governed by *MaxElide*. Ellipsis of the embedded VP of TCs patterns with ellipsis in VPs that contain an A’-trace and is governed by the constraint *MaxElide* (Merchant 2008). This novel data patterns with established tests for A’-movement: parasitic gaps (Chomsky 1982) and extraction out of double object constructions (Edmonds & Whitney 2006). This observation suggests that a derivation of TCs that solely involves A-movement (Postal 1971), a deletion process (Lasnik & Fiengo 1974) or does not leave a trace (Hartman 2012) cannot be maintained; (2) TCs exhibit (anti-)reconstruction effects similar to relative clauses. TCs display reconstruction effects with regards to Condition A of the binding theory, variable binding, and idiom chunks. TCs display anti-reconstruction effects with regards to Condition C of the binding theory and quantifier scope. These facts lead us to conclude that the TCs involve two-step movement; however, we depart from the analyses cited above in that I argue the second step of movement is not A-movement, but instead a movement similar to the one
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found in head-raising relative clauses (cf. Sportiche 2006). This argument is strengthened by the fact the two constructions are both sensitive to extraposition.

The paper is structured as follows: the second section investigates the first claim that TCs are governed by MaxElide and also reviews arguments un favor of TCs involving A’-movement; the third section investigates the second claim that TCs and relative clauses display the same (anti)-reconstruction effects; the fourth section sketches out a derivation of TCs that builds off the intuition that the mechanism behind TCs is the same as the one that underlies the derivation of relative clauses. The fifth section is the conclusion.

2. Tough Constructions Involve A’-Movement

2.1. Verb Phrase Ellipsis

While the VP complement of control (2a,b), raising (2c,d), and ECM (2e,f) infinitives\(^1\) can undergo ellipsis, eliding the VP complement of a Tough Infinitive results in a degraded utterance (3) (elided material is shown in <…>).

(2) a. John wants to win, but Mary doesn’t want to <win>.
   b. Kim isn’t sure that she can solve the problem, but she will try to <solve the problem>.
   c. John doesn’t like math, but Mary seems to <like math>.
   d. The printer works but the copier doesn’t seem to <work>.
   e. They say Mary doesn’t like raisins, but Bill believes her to <like raisins>.
   f. John wants (for) his team to win and Jill wants (for) her team to <win>.

(Wurmbrand 2011:3)

(3) a. *With a cheat sheet, History tests are possible to pass, but even with one, chemistry tests are not possible to <pass t>.
   b. *On most diets, fats are important to avoid, but on this one, carbs are important to <avoid t>.
   c. *On most days John is easy to please, but today, he is not easy to <please John>.
   d. *I know Federer is difficult to beat, but I want to know if Nadal is difficult to <beat t>, as well.

Interestingly, the expletive counterpart of TCs also license ellipsis of the VP complement of the infinitive, shown in (4).

(4) a. *With a cheat sheet, it is possible to pass this test, but without one, it is not possible to <pass this test>.
   b. On most diets, it is important to avoid fats, but on this one, it is not important to <avoid fats>.
   c. On most days, it is easy to please John, but today, it is not easy to <please John>.

The question arises: why should this asymmetry exist? The ellipsis paradigm illustrated in (3) patterns with ellipsis of a VP that contains an A’-trace (Lasnik 2001, Fox & Lasnik 2003, Merchant 2008). A’-extraction out of a VP ellipsis site results in an ill-formed utterance.\(^2\)

---

\(^1\) There is some variability in the judgments regarding raising and ECM infinitives. See Martin (2001).

\(^2\) There are some counterexamples to this claim when the A’-moved element c-commands an element in Focus (see Schuyler 2001).
Ellipsis and Reconstruction in *Tough Infinitives* (T. G. Messick)

(5) a. *They said they heard about a Balkan Language, but I don’t know which they did <hear about>.
   
   b. *They attended a lecture about a Balkan language, but I don’t know which they did <attend a lecture about>.
   
   c. ??They studied a Balkan language, but I don’t know which they did <study>.
      
   (Merchant 2008:139)

These utterances are improved when a larger constituent is elided, as in sluicing, shown in (6).

(6) a. They said they heard about a Balkan Language, but I don’t know which <they heard about>.
   
   b. They attended a lecture about a Balkan language, but I don’t know which <they attended a lecture about>.
   
   c. They studied a Balkan language, but I don’t know which <they studied>.
      
   (Merchant 2008:139)

To account for the contrast between (5) and (6), Merchant (2008) proposes *MaxElide*.

(7) *MaxElide* (Merchant 2008: 141)

   Let XP be an elided constituent containing an A’-trace. Let YP be a possible target for deletion. YP must not properly contain XP (XP $\not\subset$ YP).

This constraint would explain the contrast between (5) and (6) because in both sets of examples there is an A’-trace in the VP. The target of sluicing (i.e. IP) would contain the target of verb phrase ellipsis, and thus deletion of the VP would violate *MaxElide*.

Turning to TCs, with *MaxElide*, we are able to account for why the utterances in (3) are ill formed, but when the matrix predicate is elided the utterances are improved.

(8) a. Without a cheat sheet, history tests are possible to pass, but even with one, chemistry tests are not <possible to pass t>.
   
   b. On most diets, fats are important to avoid, but on this one, carbs are <important to avoid t>.
   
   c. On most days, John is easy to please, but today, he is not <easy to please t>.
   
   d. I know Federer is difficult to beat, but I want to know if Nadal is <difficult to beat t>.
      
      (i) I know which books ABBY read and which ones BEN did.

(3) Takahashi & Fox (2005) define MaxElide differently and it has the attractive quality of not being limited to A’-traces. However, their definition appears to possibly overgenerate examples, such as (i)

(i) ??Ben knows who she invited, but Charlie doesn’t know who <she invited>
      
      (Merchant 2001:58)

(4) Lyn Tieu and Scott Anderbois (p.c.) raise the concern that sentences such as (i) violate a constraint like MaxElide yet seem well formed

(i) On most diets, fats are important to avoid, but on this one, carbs are important.

This example at first glance appears to be an instance of ellipsis, but it is important to note that the second constituent in the coordination is a well formed sentence on its own

(ii) Carbs are important

Suggesting that (i) is not a case of ellipsis. This becomes even clearer when you look at predicates that cannot “stand on their own”.

(iii) a. *Mary is easy.
   
   b. *John is not easy to please but Mary is easy
Again, there is an A’-trace in the embedded VP and the matrix predicate contains the VP and is possible target for ellipsis, so deletion of the embedded VP would violate MaxElide because it contains an A’-trace and it is properly contained within another possible ellipsis target.

It is important to note that MaxElide as defined only targets A’-traces and does not target instances of A-movement. Merchant (2008) provides evidence for this with (9).

(9) a. Someone solved this problem.
   b. i. Who?
      ii. Who did?

(Merchant 2008:143)

Both VP ellipsis and sluicing are available in (9) because the trace in the VP is one of A-movement to the specifier of IP, so deletion of VP would not violate MaxElide. Also note that both the matrix and embedded predicates can be elided in control, raising and the expletive counterpart of TC infinitives shown in (10).

(10) a. John wants to win and…
   …Bill wants to <win> as well.
   …Bill does <want to win> as well.
   b. John is likely to run for president and…
   …Bill is likely to <run for president> as well.
   …Bill is <likely to run for president> as well.
   c. On most diets, it is important to avoid fat, but on this one…
   …it isn’t <important to avoid fat>.
   …it isn’t important to <avoid fat>.

No MaxElide effect is found because again there is no A’-trace in the embedded VPs.

The analysis presented in this section crucially assumes that TCs involve A’-movement. In the two following subsections, I summarize two well-established arguments in favor of TCs involving A’-movement.

2.2. Parasitic Gaps

It is well established that constructions that contain A’-movement, such as wh-movement (11a) and relativazation (11b), license parasitic gaps.

(11) a. What did Bill read t before filing pg?
   b. [The paper] that Bill read t before filing pg.

As the examples in (12) show, TCs also share this ability. Importantly, a similar example that only involves A-movement (12c) does not have the ability to license parasitic gaps.

(12)a. [This book] is hard to buy t without reading pg.
   (Chomsky 1982:56)
   b. [Lloyd Webber Musicals] are easy to condemn t without even watching pg.
   c. *[Lloyd Webber Musicals] are likely t to be condemned without anyone even watching pg.
   (Hicks 2009: 542)
2.3. Double Object Extraction

Finally, another well-established test for A’-movement is extraction out of double object constructions. It has been shown that A’-movement of the Recipient in double object constructions is disallowed. This is observed in wh-movement (13a), heavy NP-shift (13b), relativization (13c), topicalization (13d) and cleft constructions (13e).

\[(13)\]
\[
a. \ *Who, did you give t, a present?^5 \quad (Larson 1988:354) \\
b. \ *John sent t, a letter [every musician in the orchestra]. \\
c. \ *These are the girls, that the fool bought t, a gift. \quad (Marantz 1993:133) \\
d. \ *John, Mary said that she gave t, a gift. \quad (Larson 1988:355) \\
e. \ *It is Bill, that John gave t, a gift. \quad (Citko 2011:138)
\]

And again, we find that TCs pattern the same way, as shown in (14).

\[(14)\]
\[
a. \ *John, is tough to give t, a present. \quad (Edmonds & Whitney 2006:94) \\
b. \ *Kids, are easy to tell t, a story.
\]

Again, A-movement, such as passivization, (and A-movement followed by A’-movement) is allowed out of these constructions, as shown in (15).

\[(15)\]
\[
a. \ John, was given t, a present. \\
b. \ Who, was given t, a present?
\]

To summarize the main points of this section: ellipsis in the infinitives of TCs is governed by the constraint MaxElide. This is because TCs involve A’-movement (cf. control and raising infinitives). The claim that TCs involve A’-movement was further substantiated by known facts concerning parasitic gaps, and double object extraction. The novel data concerning MaxElide thus provides a new argument against proposals that posit TCs as a single instance of A-movement (1a) (Rosenbaum 1967, Postal 1971) or a deletion process (1b) (Akmajian 1972, Lasnik & Fiengo 1974). It can also be used as an argument against recent proposals that state that movement in TCs does not leave a trace (Hartman 2012).

In the next section, the reconstruction and anti-reconstruction paradigms for TCs will be reviewed. It will be shown that many of the effects found in TCs mirror those found in relative clauses, suggesting that the mechanism that underlies both constructions is the same.

3. (Anti-)Reconstruction in Tough Constructions

3.1. Reconstruction

TCs exhibit reconstruction effects in the domains of Condition A, variable binding, and idiom chunks. These effects dovetail with those exhibited by relative clauses. We will investigate each of these effects in turn.

---

^5 In certain British English dialects, (12a) is improved when the Theme is definite.

(i) %Who did John give the book?
3.1.1. Condition A

TCs license anaphors in subject position, as shown in the examples in (16). If these anaphoric expressions fall under Condition A, then it would be necessary for the subject to reconstruct to a position that is c-commanded by the experiencer (i.e., the embedded clause).

(16) a. Getting herself, arrested on purpose is hard for me to imagine Betsy, being willing to consider.
   (Postal & Ross 1971; as cited in Lasnik & Flengo 1974:540)
   b. Pictures of himself, are difficult for every photographer, to ignore.
   (Hicks 2009: 552)
   c. This aspect of herself, is easy for Mary, to criticize.
   (Pesetsky 2012:22)
   d. Interest in each other, was difficult for [Mary and Liam], to rekindle.

Relative clauses follow the same pattern, as shown in (17).

(17) a. The portrait of himself, that John, painted is extremely flattering.
   (Schachter 1973:32-33)
   b. The interest in each other, that John and Mary, showed was fleeting.

3.1.2. Variable Binding

Both TCs (18) and relative clauses (19) allow for reconstruction for variables to be bound by quantifiers. Again, to receive a bound interpretation the variable must reconstruct to be c-commanded by the experiencer.

(18) a. Pictures of his, friends are hard for every photographer, to sell.
   (Sportiche 2006:8)
   b. Friends of his, are easy for every photographer to shoot.
   (Hicks 2009:554 n. 12)
   c. The argument that his, student cheated is difficult for every professor, to dispute.
   (Takahashi 2011:1)
   d. The death of her, husband is difficult for every widow, to get past.

(19) a. The picture of his, mother that every soldier, kept wrapped in a sock was not much use to him.
   b. John generally has an opinion of his, book that every novelist, respects.
   (Bhatt 2002:52)

3.1.3. Idioms

Idiom chunks can appear as TC subjects, as shown in (20) and the NP head of relative clauses, as shown in (21). Under the assumption that an idiom must be together at LF to receive an idiomatic reading then these examples also provide evidence for reconstruction into the embedded clause.

(20) a. The hatchet was difficult to bury.

---

6 The inability of D heads, as in (i), to reconstruct will be discussed in section 3.2.2.
   (i) ??His, mother is easy for every boy, to talk to
b. Headway was easy to make.  
(Hicks 2009:554)
c. Pictures are easy to take with my new camera.

(21) a. The headway we made was satisfactory.
b. The careful track that she’s keeping of her expenses pleases me.  
(Schachter 1973: 31-32)
c. The pictures that Liam took came out nicely.

To summarize, TCs show reconstruction effects for Condition A, variable binding and idiom chunks. These facts suggest that the TC subject moved out of the embedded clause into the matrix subject position, but not all test point to this conclusion, as we will see in the next section.

3.2. Anti-Reconstruction Effects

TCs exhibit Anti-Reconstruction effects in the domain of Condition C and quantifier scope.

3.2.1. Condition C

Both subjects of TCs (25) and heads of relative clauses are able to circumvent Condition C effects. Condition C is assumed to hold throughout the derivation and so in order to circumvent the effect, there should not be a trace of the R-expression that is c-commanded by the experiencer.

(25) a. Pictures of John are hard for him to ignore.
b. *It is hard for him to ignore pictures of John.
c. John’s mother is difficult for him to please.
d. *It is difficult for him to please John’s mother.

(26) a. I respect any depiction of John he’ll object to.  
(Sauerland 2003:12)
b. The pictures of John that he likes are on his wall.

However, when an R-expression is placed in an idiom chunk, the idiomatic reading is lost in both TCs (27) and relative clauses (28), suggesting that reconstruction is not possible when it would violate Condition C.

(27) a. Pictures of himself are easy for John to take  
(Idiom: √  Literal: √)
b. Pictures of John are easy for him to take  
(Idiom: ∗  Literal: √)

(28) a. the picture of himself that Bill took  
(Idiom: √  Literal: √)
b. the picture of Bill that he took  
(Idiom: ∗  Literal: √)  
(Sauerland 2003:19)

3.2.2. Quantifier Scope

In previous investigations of TCs, it has been found that subjects of TCs do not show reconstruction effects for quantifier scope. The TC does not appear to be able to take scope under the matrix predicate, as shown in (29).
(29)  a. Nothing is hard for Melvin to lift.  \( (\text{Nothing} \gg \text{hard, } *\text{hard} \gg \text{nothing}) \)
    b. Few girls would be difficult for Jim to talk to.  \( (\text{Few} \gg \text{difficult, } *\text{hard} \gg \text{few}) \)
    c. Many people are easy to talk to.  \( (\text{Many} \gg \text{easy, } *\text{easy} \gg \text{many}) \)

Even when combining an anaphor with the quantifier does not force reconstruction of the quantifier below the matrix predicate.

(30)  a. No picture of himself is easy for Bill to ignore.  \( (\text{No} \gg \text{easy, } *\text{easy} \gg \text{no}) \)
    b. Many of each other’s pictures are hard for [Mary and Bill] to ignore.  \( (\text{many} \gg \text{hard, } *\text{hard} \gg \text{many}) \)

The inability of quantifiers to reconstruct seems to be a piece of a larger paradigm: D heads do not reconstruct in TCs. This is illustrated in (33), where it is shown that possessive pronouns in D cannot reconstruct

(33)  a. *His friends are easy for every photographer to shoot.  \( \text{(Hicks 2009: 552)} \)
    b. *Her work is hard to convince [every woman in the group] to share.  \( \text{(Rezac 2006: 301)} \)

This again patterns with relative clauses, as shown in (34).

(34)  *His pictures that every boy loves are on the dresser.

To summarize the main points of this section: subjects of TCs show reconstruction effects with Condition A, (non-D head) variable binding, and idiom chunks. Suggesting that the subject moves out of the embedded clause. Subjects of TCs have the ability to circumvent Condition C, but not when placed within idiom chunks. The inability of quantifiers to reconstruction seems to be part of a larger paradigm that disallows D-heads to reconstruct. These characteristics are similar to those in relative clauses.

In the next section, I review some of the literature concerning relative clauses and show that TCs share even more in common with that construction. I then sketch out a proposal for TCs built upon proposals used for relative clauses.

4. **Tough Constructions & Relative Clauses**

As shown in the previous sections, TCs and relative clauses behave similarly in several domains, and thus suggest that the same mechanisms should be used to derive both constructions. Following Sauerland (2003), Hulsey & Sauerland (2006) and Hackl & Nissenbaum (2012), I assume that English relative clauses are in fact ambiguous between a raising structure (35a) and a matching structure (35b). In the raising structure there is only one NP head of the relative clause that undergoes A’-movement, but in the matching structure, there are two distinct heads: an internal head that undergoes A’-movement to the specifier of CP and external head that is the complement to D. The internal and external head must match (modulo vehicle change) and the internal head undergoes a mandatory ellipsis process.


(Sauerland 2003:4)

Relative clauses that require reconstruction (e.g. for Condition A, variable binding or idiom chunks) are unambiguously raising, while relative clauses that must not reconstruction (e.g. to circumvent a Condition C effect) are unambiguously the matching structure. All other relative clauses are ambiguous between the two structures.

The question now becomes are TCs similarly ambiguous. And the answer appears to be no. Hulsey & Sauerland (2006) show that the two relative clause structures behave differently with regards to extraposition. Raising structures do not allow extraposition (36), while matching structures do (37).

(36) a. I saw the picture of himself that John liked.
b. *I saw the picture of himself yesterday that John liked.
c. Mary discovered the book about himself that Bob wrote.
d. *Mary discovered the book about himself yesterday that Bob wrote.
e. *Mary praised the headway last year that John made.
f. *I was shocked yesterday by the advantage that she took of her mother.

(37) a. I saw the picture of Clinton yesterday that John liked.
b. Mary discovered the book about Rome yesterday that Bob wrote.

(Hulsey & Sauerland 2006:115)

In (36), the relative clauses are unambiguously raising since they require reconstruction for Condition A or because they contain an idiom chunk and the construction does not allow extraposition, but in (37), the constructions do not require raising and such do allow for extraposition. Heycock (1994) and more recently Bruening (2012) notice similar effects in TCs, but unlike relative clauses, all cases of TCs seem susceptible.

(38) a. *The papers were tough for me yesterday to grade.
b. It will be tough tomorrow to get an audience with the Pope.
c. *The Pope will be tough tomorrow to get an audience with.
d. It was very hard last year to give up sugar.
e. *Sugar was very hard last year to give up.
f. It is enjoyable in the summer to eat strawberries.
g. *Strawberries are enjoyable in the summer to eat.

(Bruening 2012:2-3)

(39) a. It was difficult on weekends to make headway.
b. *Headway was difficult on weekends to make.
c. It was hard last year to bury the hatchet.

d.  *The hatchet was hard last year to bury. \(^8\)

It does not seem to matter whether the subject needs to reconstruct (39) or not (38), extraposition is not allowed in TCs, suggesting that TCs behave like raising relative clauses. The current two step proposals for TCs (Brody 1993, Hornstein 2001, Hicks 2009, Obata & Epstein 2012, Hartman 2012) do not seem fit to account for these facts, since the second step in those derivations is always A-movement, and as Bruening (2012) shows, extraposition does not interfere with A-movement, as shown in (40).

(40) Ruprecht seems in meetings to be a masterful commander.  

(Bruening 2012:3)

Based on these facts, I propose that second step in TCs is not A-movement as the previous work assumes, but is more similar to the second movement in the derivation of raising relative clauses. The departure is not as radical as it first sounds. For independent reasons, Hicks’s (2009) “smuggling” derivation of TCs looks strikingly similar to the raising analysis of relative clauses, as shown in (41) (cf. (35a)). \(^9\)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{(41) The book was easy } \{_{\text{CP}}[_{\text{Op}} \text{the book}] \}_{\text{C}} \{_{\text{IP}} \text{PRO to read } [_{\text{Op}} \text{the book}] \}
\end{array}
\]

The derivation in (41) would capture almost all the behaviors of TCs discussed; however, it still cannot account for the lack of reconstruction for scope. Hicks suggests:

“…an NP constituent of an A-moved DP may optionally reconstruct, whereas the D cannot. The D head is what determines scope relations, so the absence of reconstruction of D accounts for only the surface scope reading being available in TCs [Tough Constructions]”

(Hicks 2009:553).

An alternative to this account would be to take the parallelism between TCs and relative clauses all the way. In relative clauses, all that undergoes movement is the head NP. If the same were true in TCs, then the lack of reconstruction of the D head would be expected because there would be no trace of D in the embedded clause only the trace of NP (cf. Sportiche 2006). The derivation would then look like the one in (42).

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{(42) The book was easy } \{_{\text{CP}}[_{\text{Op}} \text{book}] \}_{\text{C}} \{_{\text{IP}} \text{PRO to read } [_{\text{Op}} \text{book}] \}
\end{array}
\]

\(8\) Hartman (2009) notices the same effect with experiencers.

(i) a.  It is important to Mary to avoid cholesterol.

b.  *Cholesterol is important to Mary to avoid.  

(Hartman 2009:390)

\(9\) (39) is a simplified version of Hicks’s derivation, which actually has movement to the embedded Spec\(vP\) before movement to Spec\(CP\).
5. Conclusion & Future Research

Before I conclude, I would like to discuss a few avenues for future research. First, the proposal made here would force the explanation of the lack of Condition C effects to be different in TCs and relative clauses since Sauerland (2003) makes use of the matching analysis to circumvent the effect. A possible explanation may lie in the mechanism used in circumventing Condition C in raising constructions.

(43) Pictures of John seem to him, to be on the table.

To account for this Takahashi & Hulsey (2009) argue for what they call “wholesale late merger”. A similar mechanism can be used for TCs.

The second avenue for future research concerns case assignment. It appears that the TC subject needs to escape accusative case marking in the embedded clause. Even more interestingly, it appears that Case must be assigned in the embedded clause as illustrated by the unacceptability of passive and unaccusative verbs in the embedded clause (noted by Postal 1990).

(44) a. *He was easy to be arrested.
   b. *He is easy to arrive.

Yet again, this appears to pattern with relative clauses, as Bhatt (2006:12) points out the trace in infinitival relative clauses also must receive case. This is illustrated by the unacceptability of an infinitive relative clause that lacks the case-assigning of

(45) a. *[a person], to be fond of t.
   b. [a person], to be fond of t.

Hicks (2009) suggests that the null operator that contains the TC subject is assigned the accusative case in TCs and that would also work in these relative clause constructions under the assumption that raising relative clauses involve a null operator. The NP would then have its Case feature unvalued until it moved to the matrix clause where it is valued nominative.

To conclude, this paper provided novel evidence that TCs involve A’-movement and that that movement leaves a trace in the embedded clause. The (anti)-reconstruction effects displayed by TCs lead us to conclude that there is a second step in TCs out of the embedded clause, but we depart from most mainstream two-step approaches in assuming that the second step in TCs is not A-movement, but is in fact more similar to the movement found in raising relative clauses. This assumption was further motivated by the fact that both TC and relative clause constructions are sensitive to extraposition, while A-movement is not. The lack of reconstruction of D heads in TCs can be accounted with a raising relative clause like derivation because all that would undergo movement would be the NP, and thus there would be no trace of D in the embedded clause for it to reconstruct to.
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