In this talk I discuss the interaction of stress and syntactic movement (Bresnan 1971, 1972), in German. I look upon this as stress reconstruction. Thus, in (i) the VP in the relative clause does not require accent/stress because the stress on the coindexed head noun 'reconstructs' into the position of the trace in the relative clause.

(i)  Was ist das?
     Das ist ein BUCH(1) [ das ich [ t(1) bestellen werde ] ]

By comparison, the adjunct in (ii) has no base position inside of the relative clause VP; therefore (with or without stress reconstruction) it could not satisfy the stress requirements in that VP. Stress must therefore be assigned in that VP. The distinction reflects the argument-adjunct contrast discussed by Krifka (1984).

(ii) Was ist das?
     # Das ist ein TERMIN [ an dem ich t [ reisen werde ] ]
     √ Das ist ein TERMIN [ an dem ich t [ REISEN werde ] ]

Chomsky (1993) analyzes LF-reconstruction in terms of the copy theory of movement (see also Heycock 1995, Fox 1999). The question of this talk is whether stress reconstruction on the PF side of grammar might go back to the presence of the same syntactic copy, as illustrated in (iii). In this analysis the copies of the chain of the stressed element satisfy the stress-requirements of the VP in the relative clause. (This is here shown in the head-matching analysis of relative clauses from Munn 1994, Hulsey & Sauerland 2006, Salzman 2006 and others).

(iii) Was ist das?
     Das ist ein BUCH(1) [ das <BUCH> ich [ <BUCH>(1) bestellen werde ] ]

The talk covers interaction of stress-assignment with idiom chunk reconstruction, Condition C reconstruction and other phenomena.

I think it can be shown that (a) the data are compatible with such an analysis and (b) the data weakly support such an analysis insofar either (i) stress reconstruction and LF-reconstruction go hand in hand on a case-by-case basis or (ii) they go hand in hand insofar there is always a lower copy for the purposes of both phenomena.