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1. WORKSHOP DESCRIPTION

The year 2023 marks the 100th anniversary from the birth of Morris Halle. To honor his memory and his contribution to Slavic morphophonology we propose a workshop devoted to the morphosyntax, morphosemantics, and morphophonology of the Slavic verb, including diachronic aspects and issues of micro-, mezzo-, or macro-variation. Particular attention will be paid to following topics:

1.1. Verb formation

Traditional Slavic grammars unify under the heading of thematic suffixes a number of morphemes with disparate functions, and this unified denotation has partially persisted in the modern linguistic tradition (e.g., Es'kova 1989, Gladney 1995, Itkin 2007 for Russian, Marvin 2002 for Slovenian, Jabłońska 2004, 2007 for Polish, Medová 2013 for Czech, etc.). Questions of unification and differentiation of these suffixes have been addressed in a number of studies, but the issues raised are far from resolved.

- Slavic inner aspect and (im)perfectivity. The apparently indirect link between verbal morphemes and (im)perfectivity (Tatevosov 2013, 2015).

- The internal composition of the secondary imperfective suffix (taking a special form (-yw-) and coexisting with the denominal suffix -ow- in Russian, yet both collapsed into -ow-, -aw- or -uw- in other Slavic languages), which have been hypothesized to involve reduplication (Milosavljević et al. 2021, Simonović, Milosavljević and Arsenijević 2021, cf. also Enguehard 2017 for a phonological take).


- The pan-Slavic suffix -nq- (-nq-, -nou-, -ni-, -nu-, etc., Dickey 2001). Do its (productive) occurrences in semelfactive verbs and its (non-productive) occurrences in mutative verbs correspond to a single suffix or to different ones (Jabłońska 2007, Taraldsen Medová and Wiland 2019)? What are its semantics (Plungjan 2000, Sokolova 2015, Gorbova 2016, Sokolova and Birzer 2022, etc.; cf. also Makarova and Janda 2009, Bacz 2012) and its morphosyntactic status (Markman 2008, Nesset and Makarova 2012) in different Slavic languages?

- Vocalic suffixes: the much-examined relation between inchoative deadjectival verbs in -e- (-ej-) and their transitive counterparts in -i- (Marvin 2002, Medová 2013, Arsenijević and Milosavljević 2021, Mišmaš and Simonović 2021, etc.), the rarer comparisons of -a- to -i- (Milosavljević and Arsenijević 2022), and of -i- to -ow- (Kovačević, Milosavljević and Šimonović 2021).
1. Segmental and autosegmental phenomena

The phonological side of verb formation has the deepest connection to the work of Morris Halle and has been woefully neglected in recent research. We welcome contributions dealing with hiatus resolution (at the juncture of stems, thematic suffixes and tense), glide insertion in this environment (Garde 1972) or deletion (Jakobson 1948, Lightner 1965, Melvold 1990, etc.), and morphologically conditioned iotation (Halle 1963, Lightner 1972, Coats and Lightner 1975, Bethin 1992 and Brown 1998, see also Melvold 1990 on the alternation of the sequence -owa- with -uj-), as well as stem and affix allomorphy. A proper investigation into the interaction of these processes with stress, accent and tone appears to be almost totally lacking after Melvold 1990.

1.3. Architecture of the Grammar

In the Distributed Morphology (DM) approach developed by Halle and Marantz 1993, 1994 (see also Marantz 1997, 2001, Arad 2003, Embick and Halle 2005, Embick and Marantz 2006, Embick and Noyer 2007, Acquaviva 2009, Harley 2014, Haugen and Siddiqi 2013, etc.), the architecture of the grammar (1) is in essence a syntactic theory of morphology. There is no Lexicon distinct from the syntax where word formation takes place; the basic building blocks of both syntax and morphology are two types of primitives: i) roots (lexical terminals), and ii) abstract morphemes (functional categories), and the default case is one in which morphological structure simply is syntactic structure.

(1)  
\[ \text{(Syntactic Derivation)} \]
\[ \begin{array}{c} \text{Morphology} \\ \\ \text{PF} \quad \text{LF} \end{array} \]

In DM roots start out as acategorial and acquire lexical category by being by merger with a categorizing head (v, n, or a) and stems have no place in DM. The empirical issues enumerated above are of the utmost relevance to the Distributed Morphology (DM).

Hypotheses treating thematic suffixes as v must take affix pleonasm into consideration and potentially distinguish verbalizers like -yw- (cf. Milosavljević et al. 2021, Simonović, Milosavljević and Arsenijević 2021) that take verbs as input from those that, like -ow-, derive verbs from non-verbal categories. Proposals separating prefixes and suffixes from aspect (Tatevosov 2008, 2011, 2013, 2015) raise non-trivial questions in this context, as do verbal derivatives, which have been only partially addressed. The fact that secondary imperfective allomorphy appears to demand a notion of locality that takes into account the prefix-root combination (see Sadler, Spencer and Zaretskaya 1997, Feldstein 2006, Matushansky 2009), the root-determined choice of the thematic suffix and the apparently unpredictable stress assignment in derived verbs (Red'kin 1965, Halle 1973:344-347, Zaliznjak 1985:107, Gladney 1995) are of direct relevance to the phase-based locality hypothesis (Embick 2010, Marantz 2013).

The aim of this workshop is to facilitate and enhance cross-pollination between studies at different interfaces of morphophonology of the Slavic verb, so our topics of interest are not limited to the list above.
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