DALABON PLACEHOLDERS

SOME OBSERVATIONS
PREAMBLE

- Organization of the talk
- Introduction
  - Definitions
  - Background questions
- Language and data
- Description of the Dalabon placeholder
  - Origins, categorization, distribution, morphology, discourse functions
  - Observations on speakers’ preferences.

This is “Atelier” style.
Not everything will go into the conference paper ;-)
### (MY) DEFINITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLACEHOLDERS</th>
<th>FILLERS</th>
<th>SELF-CORRECTION INTERJECTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The speaker intends to retrieve a specific target-constituent.</strong>&lt;br&gt;e.g. ‘whatyoucallit’</td>
<td><strong>INTERJECTIVE HESITATORS</strong>&lt;br&gt;No such specific intended constituent can be identified.&lt;br&gt;e.g. ‘er...’</td>
<td><strong>e.g. oops</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENERIC IDENTIFIERS</strong>&lt;br&gt;The speaker does not intend to realize anything more specific.&lt;br&gt;e.g. ‘thingy’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

- **MY**
- **DEFINITIONS**
INTRODUCTION

◦ Ideological ‘subtext’
◦ In some of the literature I’ve read.
◦ Not so surprising since we’re talking about something that characterized is as “disfluency”.
◦ It’s about speakers’ competence.
◦ Fluency is an asset (‘capital’, Bourdieu 2001).
◦ Links to power structures etc.

‘Deficit’ vs ‘benefit’ view of fillers.
INTRODUCTION

- The ‘deficit’ view of fillers
- Fillers as evidence of disfluency.
- Probably reflecting prescriptive stigmatization.
- But also surfaces in the linguistics literature:

Amiridze 2010:89 (in the conclusion)
“...They are used when the speaker cannot recall a lexical verb form because of problems in lexical retrieval; when (s)he cannot choose the right form because of lack of education, knowledge or information; or when (s)he intentionally avoids verbalization for different pragmatic reasons.
INTRODUCTION

- The ‘benefit’ view of fillers
- In response, many linguists have highlighted how fillers are used for added benefits.
- As opposed to a ‘reactive’ used oriented solely towards disfluency.

p. 102: ... expressions like what-d’you-call-it vividly illustrate the property of linguistic practice as ‘joint action’ (Clark, 1996a)...

- Keevallik (2010) provides a systematic account of the functions of placeholders.
- Based on Estonian see, but generalizable.
INTRODUCTION

- Functions of placeholders based on/inspired by Keevalik (2010)

DISFLUENCY MANAGEMENT

- Overcome disfluency
  ◦ Avoid prosodic interruptions (Dimock 2010).
  ◦ Allow to complete syntactic structure.
  ◦ Carry additional syntactic information.

- Channel search for delayed lexical content
  ◦ Afford the speaker some time (keeps the floor)
  ◦ Recruit collective resources (by flagging a missing element).

OTHER FUNCTIONS

- Stylistic functions
  ◦ E.g. help reception: Slow pace down for additional processing time (Fox Tree 2001).

- Discourse functions
  ◦ Topic marking, conversation boundaries...

- Pragmatic functions: politeness (Enfield 2003)
  ◦ Indirectness, euphemisms.

- Pragmatic functions: evaluative (Enfield 2003)
  ◦ Distanciation (something I can forget/not mention)
INTRODUCTION

- Observations from Dalabon
- Dalabon has a placeholder filler.
- *keninjhbi /kenjhbi /kenhbi* …
- Discourse and pragmatic functions not well attested.
- They are mostly responses to disfluency.

**FILLERS**

**PLACEHOLDERS**

The speaker intends to retrieve a specific target-constituent.

*e.g. ‘whatyoucallit’*

**INTERJECTIVE HESITATORS**

No such specific intended constituent can be identified.

*e.g. ‘er...’*

**GENERIC IDENTIFIERS**

The speaker does not intend to realize anything more specific.

*e.g. ‘thingy’*
INTRODUCTION

- Observations from Dalabon
- Does not mean that placeholders are indicative of lesser proficiency.
- Or that speakers are entirely ‘constrained’ by disfluencies in their use of placeholders.
- Speaker-specific patterns of use reveal different profiles of use of placeholders.
- Indicative of strategic disfluency-management.

Scope of options particularly notable in morphologically rich, distributionally flexible languages like Dalabon.
INTRODUCTION

◦ Overall narrative
◦ Dalabon is morphologically rich and ‘agile’.
◦ Placeholder is distributionally flexible and morphologically polyvalent.
◦ Affords speakers with a broad range of options when using the placeholder.
◦ Including packaging rich linguistic information in it.
◦ And therefore with different ways to deal with disfluencies.
LANGUAGE AND DATA
LANGUAGE & DATA

- Dalabon
- Australian, Gunwinyguan (Non-Pama-Nyungan)
**LANGUAGE & DATA**

- **Dalabon**
- Polysynthetic.
  - Rich verbal morphology, fair amount of nominal morphology as well.
- Flexible word-order (Cutfield 2011).

(1) *Kenbo kanh ka-h-Ing-dje-bruH-minj-burrng djarrkno.*

then DEM 3sg-R-SEQ-nose/face-blow-PP-2duPOSS together
That’s why she’s upset with them then, with both of them.

(2) *Ngale langu-yih-ke-kun kardu bula-h- ngu-n, bala-h-burn-dih.*

INTJ hand-INST-EMPH-GEN maybe 3pl>3-R-eat-PRES 3pl-R-spoon-PRIV
Ah well, apparently they’re eating with their fingers, they have no spoons.
LANGUAGE & DATA

- Polyvalent word classes (Ponsonnet 2015).
- ‘Floating’ morphology.
- Dislocated NPs.

   - then DEM 3sg-R-SEQ-nose/face-blow-PP-2duPOSS together
   - That’s why she’s upset with them then, with both of them.

   - INTJ hand-INST-EMPH-GEN maybe 3pl>3-R-eat-PRES 3pl-R-spoon-PRIV
   - Ah well, apparently they’re eating with their fingers, they have no spoons.

3. *Bad bulah-yidjna-ninj boyenjboyenj.*
   - stone 3pl/3-R-have-PI big:REDUP
   - They had a lot of money.
LANGUAGE & DATA

- Kriol
  - Dalabon is severely endangered.
  - Kriol now the first language of these communities.
    - The largest Australian Indigenous language (20 to 30,000 speakers).
    - (Sandefur 1979, 1986, Schultze-Berndt et al. 2013)
  - Multilingualism and resulting mutual influences.
Corpus and data set
60 hours Dalabon corpus.
- Narratives, stimuli-based elicitation, pure elicitation...
- Transcribed in ELAN.
8 speakers in my corpus.
Bias towards older female speakers.
Corpus and data set
- Extracted all placeholders.
- 476 tokens coded in Xcell.
  - For target realization, morphology, morphological mirroring etc.
- Quantitative analysis (especially for comparison between speakers.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A Ref</th>
<th>speaker</th>
<th>form transcribed</th>
<th>dc realized</th>
<th>dc not realized</th>
<th>interjection</th>
<th>hesitation</th>
<th>generic identifier</th>
<th>realization</th>
<th>note dc</th>
<th>realization</th>
<th>dc = noun</th>
<th>dc = IN</th>
<th>dc = 2nd dpart of N</th>
<th>dc = prop</th>
<th>dc = any noun</th>
<th>dc = verb</th>
<th>dc = part of lexical verbal</th>
<th>dc = compound</th>
<th>dc = other</th>
<th>dc = function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>MK</td>
<td>keni bi</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>MK</td>
<td>keni bi</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>kenin yi</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>kenin yi</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>kenin yi</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>kenin yi</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>kenin yi</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KENINJHBI, THE DALABON PLACEHOLDER

Origins
Categorization (usages)
Pragmatic & discourse functions

Distribution
Morphology
ORIGINS
ORIGINS

- From interrogative pronoun *keninjh*
- As is common for fillers (Podlesskaya 2010:14)
- *bi* means ‘person’, so *keninjhbi* would have been ‘who’ diachronically?
- Some occurrences of the interrogative pronoun suggest reinterpretation as placeholder.
- Variation in placeholder realization:
  - *keninjh, keninjhkun (keninjh+GEN)*
  - Contraction: *kenjhbi, kenhbi*

Self-correction interjection *kenh*.
**ORIGINS**

(4-MT) *Kardu keninjh dja-h-yolh-ngu-n?*
maybe INTERR 3sg/2sg-R-feelings-eat-PRES

Lit.: Maybe *what* is eating your feelings?
What’s going on with you?

(5-QB) *Kanidjah bala-ing-bo-ninj*
DEM 3pl-SEQ-go-PI

*keninjhbi-ngong* [3.76s] *kunj-ngong bala-h-bo-ninj keninjhbi djakana* ...
PH-group kangaroo-group 3pl-R-go-PI PH jacana

They were going there, all the whatsit... [pause] all the kangaroos were going there, the whatsit the jacanas...
CATEGORIZATION
### CATEGORIZATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FILLERS</th>
<th>SELF-CORRECTION INTERJECTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLACEHOLDERS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The speaker ‘intends’ to retrieve a specific target-constituent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERJECTIVE HESITATORS</td>
<td>GENERIC IDENTIFIERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No such specific intended constituent can be identified.</td>
<td>The speaker does not intend to realize anything more specific.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Best described as

I use these labels to describe functions based on usage criteria. How I call the device itself is its most common function.
CATEGORIZATION

- Why is it best described as a placeholder?
- Most often, a target constituent can be clearly identified.
- Morphology is often a good indicator.
- Although word order and prosody can be indicators too.

(5-QB)  
Kanidjah  bala-lng-bo-ninj  
DEM  3pl-SEQ-go-PI

keninjhbi-ngong  [3.76s]  kunj-ngong  bala-h-bo-ninj  keninjhbi  djakana ...  
PH-group  kangaroo-group  3pl-R-go-PI  PH  jacana

They were going there, all the whatsit... [pause] all the kangaroos were going there, the whatsit the jacanas...
CATEGORIZATION

Why is it best described as a placeholder?

Target-constituent realized more than 70% of the time.

When not realized, it is often because:

- Speaker is interrupted.
- Speaker has searched for the word but abandoned after hesitation/discussion.
- Speaker is absorbed in other tasks.
CATEGORIZATION

- Why is it best described as a placeholder?
- 40% of tokens have a pause, a discussion, or another marker of hesitation.
  - Not infrequent that the search is discussed (‘ah, I can’t find this word!’).
- 40% of occurrences in “lexically challenging” contexts:
  - (Not the same 40% as above!)
  - Species nouns, a very large open class and relatively technical.
  - Before borrowings (from Kriol, English, or other languages).
  - Or when speakers search for rare words for the benefit of elicitation.
The speaker ‘intends’ to retrieve a specific target-constituent.

No such specific intended constituent can be identified.

The speaker does not intend to realize anything more specific.

kenh
Occasional occurrences without an identifiable constituent
Therefore fits the definition of/sounds like an interjective hesitator.
Relatively rare though.
About 10 clear cases out of 476 i.e. ≈2/3%.
Possible mutual influence with Kriol?
Filler is *wanim* (interrogative pronoun, from *<Eng. what + him*>).
No morphology so somewhat more prone to interjective hesitator usage? (TBC)

(6-QB)  *Keninjhi bala-h-Ing--- bala-h-Ing-monwo-rr-inj manjh  wanjkih*
PH 3pl-R-SEQ 3pl-R-SEQ-make-RR-PP animals like

Whatsit they were... they were turning themselves into animals.
### CATEGORIZATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FILLERS</th>
<th>SELF-CORRECTION INTERJECTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLACEHOLDERS</strong></td>
<td>kenh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERJECTIVE HESITATORS</strong></td>
<td><strong>GENERIC IDENTIFIERS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The speaker ‘intends’ to retrieve a specific target-constituent.</td>
<td>No such specific intended constituent can be identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The speaker does not intend to realize anything more specific.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CATEGORIZATION

- **Generic-identifier usage**
- Sometimes plausible if no target constituent is realized.
- And there is no sign of hesitation, search for word etc.
- I.e. no evidence the speaker has any intention to produce a more specific word.
CATEGORIZATION

- Generic-identifier usage
  - About 20 cases are plausible generic-identifier usage.
  - I.e. around 5%.
  - Not a salient function.
  - *Keninjhbi* is not used to implicitly activate socially distributed knowledge.

In spite of Australian preference for reliance on shared background (Garde 2013), not a feature of placeholders.
CATEGORIZATION

- Conclusion on the categorization and usages of Dalabon *keninjhbi*
- Best described as a placeholder.
- Usage as interjective hesitator or generic identifier remains very occasional.

*Keninjhbi* is not primarily a tool for indirectness and activation of shared background.
PRAGMATIC & DISCOURSE FUNCTIONS
Pragmatic functions not well attested

- Based on my data and my preliminary examination.
- Could not identify negative evaluation.
- (Enfield 2003)

Other functions

- Stylistic functions
  - E.g. help reception: Slow pace down for additional processing time (Fox Tree 2001).

- Discourse functions
  - Topic marking, conversation boundaries...

- Pragmatic functions: politeness (Enfield 2003)
  - Indirectness, euphemisms.

- Pragmatic functions: evaluative (Enfield 2003)
  - Distanciation (something I can forget/not mention)
PRAGMATIC & DISCOURSE FUNCTIONS

- Polite / euphemistic usage is insignificant
- Only 2 vaguely plausible tokens in my data (476 tokens).
  - Proportionate with chance.
- Although circumvolution is common in Dalabon.
  - Avoid direct reference to sacrality.
  - Avoid direct personal reference.

Derives from lack of generic-identifier usage.
PRAGMATIC & DISCOURSE FUNCTIONS

- Some ‘stylistic’ functions?
  - Probably not all uses are prompted by disfluency.
  - Deserves closer examination.
  - ‘Rhyming’ usage, slowing down the pace?
  - Following example suggests ‘cognitive focus’?

OTHER FUNCTIONS

- **Stylistic functions**
  - E.g. help reception: Slow pace down for additional processing time (Fox Tree 2001).

- **Discourse functions**
  - Topic marking, conversation boundaries...

- **Pragmatic functions: politeness** (Enfield 2003)
  - Indirectness, euphemisms.

- **Pragmatic functions: evaluative** (Enfield 2003)
  - Distanciation (something I can forget/not mention)

(From slide 7)
They are getting this what you call it, this spike rush.

They are digging this nice food in the large billabong. What you call it, spike rush.

They are picking the spike rush. The spike rush!

Placeholder and target on each side of verb.
(Common with O targets.)
DISTRIBUTION
DISTRIBUTION

- Syntactic polyvalence
- *keninjhibi* can target several word classes.
- Nouns most frequent.
  - Nearly 70% of all tokens with clear target constituents.
  - Including proper names (people and places).
- Verbs less frequent but by no means rare.
  - Nearly 30% of all tokens with targeted constituent.
- Also predicative adjectives.

(8-LB) *Bulu-ngan ka-h-wrokebm-inji*
father-1sgPOSS 3sg-R-work-VBLR-PCUST

*langa keninjh-kun*
to (Kr) INTERR-GEN

*kenhbi-kah bikûri-yad*
PH-LOC place.name

My father used to work at where...
At whatsit... ?Pickery?-Yard.
DISTRIBUTION

- Syntactic polyvalence
- *keninjhibi* can target several word classes.
  - Nouns most frequent.
    - Nearly 70% of all tokens with clear target constituents.
    - Including proper names (people and places).
  - Verbs less frequent but by no means rare.
    - Nearly 30% of all tokens with targeted constituent.
  - Also predicative adjectives.

(9-MT) Dohkardu munu kanh barra-h-djarrk-or.maybe LIM DEM 3du-R-together

*barra-h-djarrk-kenjhibi-mu*
3du-R-together-PH-PRES

*barra-h-djarrk-yenjhyenjdju-ng yang*
3du-R-together-talk:REDUP-PRES language

Or else they two may just be together... they two what you call it together... they two are talking language together.
DISTRIBUTION

- Syntactic polyvalence
- *keninjhbi* can target several word classes.
- Nouns most frequent.
  - Nearly 70% of all tokens with clear target constituents.
  - Including proper names (people and places).
- Verbs less frequent but by no means rare.
  - Nearly 30% of all tokens with targeted constituent.
- Also predicative adjectives.

(10-LB) *Ka-h-dorrung-kenjhbi*
3sg-R-body-PH

*ka-h-dorrung-mondi-duninj yuno pudiwan*
3sg-R-body-PH-good-INTENS CONJ pretty(Kr)

she’s whatsit in appearance...
she’s really good looking... you know, pretty.
DISTRIBUTION

- Syntactically polyvalent
- Prevalence of noun targets matches cross-linguistic preferences.
  - Podlesskaya (2010:14)
- But the frequency of verbs and the relative polyvalence is less common.
- Word class and morphological flexibility in line with Dalabon tendencies.
MORPHOLOGY
MORPHOLOGY

- Dalabon is polysynthetic
- Exhuberant verbal morphology.
- Rich nominal morphology.
- Placeholders seem to afford any morphology.
- Apart from reduplication.

- Offers many possibilities for morphological marking on placeholders.
- This informs my observations on speakers’ usage preferences.
MORPHOLOGY

- Morphological mirror
- The placeholder can mirror the morphology of the target constituent.
- Even when the marking is complex.

(11-MT) MT  
djud-*keninjbi*-no  ke  
neck-PH-3sgPOSS  EMPH
MP  
djud-*kon*-no  *kardu*  
neck-fin-3gPOSS  maybe
MT  
nomo...  *djud-*kon*-no*  
NEG(Kr) neck-fin-3sgPOSS

MT  
Its neck-whatsit again...
MP  
Its dorsal fin maybe?
MT  
No... Its dorsal fin.

(12-LB) Nunda  
dja-h-dje-*kenhbi*-minj  
DEM  2sg-R-nose/face-PH-PI

*dja-h-dje-*boled*-minj*  
2sg-R-nose/face-turn-PI

On this one your were was whatsit your face... you were turning your face.
MORPHOLOGY

- Morphological mirror
- Full, as in previous slide.
  maybe 3sg/3-R-PH-PP first 3sg/3sg.h-R-COM-ask-PP
  Maybe he whatsit first, he asked him first.

- Or none. (14-LB) Bala-h-yaw-djudju-mu.
  3pl-R-DIM-bath:REDUP-PRES
  Kardu kenhbi sister-yih kardu.
  maybe PH nun-ERG maybe
  The little cuties are having a shower. Like the nun showers them maybe.
MORPHOLOGY

- Morphological mirror
  - Full mirroring is more frequent with nominal targets.
    - 30 to 50% depending on speakers.
  - Than with verbal targets.
    - 5 to 10% depending on speakers.

Verbal morphology is richer than nominal morphology in Dalabon.
MORPHOLOGY

◦ Morphological mirror
◦ ‘Easy’ full-mirroring when both placeholder and target are morphologically unmarked.
◦ As with species nouns, which are often unmarked.
  ◦ Rarely possessed.
  ◦ Rarely falling under a case semantic category.

(MT-7) 7’04

*Bula-h-beyu-ngiyar kanh keninjhbi kuladj.*
3pl/3-R-fetch-FUT DEM PH spike.rush

They are getting this whatsyoucallit, this spike rush.
MORPHOLOGY

- Notes on morphology with nominal targets
- Placeholder has more informative morphology.

(15-MT)  
\textbf{Yila-h-Ing-dulubu-n} \quad \textit{kardu} \quad \textit{keninjbi-yih}  
1pl.excl-R-SEQ-pierce-PRES \quad \text{maybe} \quad \text{PH-INST}

\textbf{brikno} \quad \textbf{yila-h-dulubu-n} \quad \textit{kahnunh.}  
\textsc{sharp} \quad 1pl.excl-R-SEQ-pierce-PRES \quad \text{DEM}

We pierce it with a whatsit... we pierce it with a needle this one.

Unsurprising given Dalabon grammar.
MORPHOLOGY

- Notes on morphology with verbal targets
- Placeholders with verbal targets always carry *some* morphology.
- Contrasts with placeholders with noun targets that can often have zero marking.

Dalabon verbs **must** have morphology.
MORPHOLOGY

- Notes on morphology with verbal targets
- *keninjhibi* is assigned to its own conjugation.
- I.e. it always takes the same verbal theme with associated sets of TAM marking.
- Regardless of the conjugation to which the target verb belongs.

\[(9\text{-}MT)\]  
\[\text{Barra-h-djarrk-} \text{*kenjhibi*-mu} \]
\[3\text{du-R-together-PH-PRES} \]
\[\text{barra-h-djarrk-} \text{yenjhyenjdju-ng yang} \]
\[3\text{du-R-together-talk:REDUP-PRES language} \]

They two whatyoucall it together...
they two are talking language together.
MORPHOLOGY

- Notes on morphology with verbal targets
- Patterns of replication.
- Three options.
Notes on morphology with verbal targets

- Most frequent: bilateral replication, prefix + suffix.
- Moderately frequent: suffix replication i.e. prefix not replicated on target
- Rare: placeholder stands for the root, no morphology is replicated.

(16-QB)  
Kardu  dje-ngan  
maybe nose/face-1sgPOSS  
kanh  DEM
ng-a-h-Ing-keninjbi-miyan  
1sg/3-R-SEQ-PH-FUT
ng-a-h-bodjobodjoh-miyan...  
1sg-R-rub:REDUP-FUT
Maybe my nose I’ll whatsit... I’ll keep rubbing it...

(17-QB)  
Ka-h-Ing--- keninjbi-miyan  yenjdju-ngiyan.  
He’ll what’sit... speak.
3sg-R-SEQ  PH-FUT  speak-FUT

(18-LB)  
Kenbo-yah  dja-h-marnu-kenbi-bimbu-yan.  
She’s going to draw it for you.
then-just  3sg/2-BEN-PH-draw-FUT

A clue to Dalabon wordhood?  
(Evans, Fletcher & Ross 2008).
MORPHOLOGY

○ Placeholders morphology and the linguistic message

○ Placeholders afford rich morphology.

○ Partly due to polysynthesis.

○ Communicates considerable linguistic information.

○ Without lexical content.

○ Especially on verbs with fully mirrored morphology.

(9-MT) Dohkardu munu kanh barra-h-djarrk-or.maybe LIM DEM 3du-R-together

barra-h-djarrk-kenjhibi-mu
3du.HAR-R-together-PH-PRES

barra-h-djarrk-ymenhyenjdu-ng yang
3du-R-together-talk:REDUP-PRES language

Or else they two may just be together...
they two whatyoucall it together...
they two are talking language together.
SUMMARY OF PROPERTIES
SUMMARY OF PROPERTIES

- *Keninjhbi*
- Primarily a placeholder.
- Lexical-disfluency-management is a key function.
- With possible discourse functions.
- Higher proportion of nominal targets.
- Yet distributionally flexible, with frequent verbal targets.
- Open to a broad range of morphological inflections.
- In line with polysynthesis and Dalabon tendencies to fluid morphology.
Functions of placeholders based on/inspired by Keevalik (2010)

DISFLUENCY MANAGEMENT
- Overcome disfluency
  ◦ Avoid prosodic interruptions (Dimock 2010).
  ◦ Allow to complete syntactic structure.
  ◦ Carry additional syntactic information.
- Channel search for delayed lexical content
  ◦ Afford the speaker some time (keeps the floor)
  ◦ Recruit collective resources (by flagging a missing element).

OTHER FUNCTIONS
- Stylistic functions
  ◦ E.g. help reception: Slow pace down for additional processing time (Fox Tree 2001).
- Discourse functions
  ◦ Topic marking, conversation boundaries...
- Pragmatic functions: politeness (Enfield 2003)
  ◦ Indirectness, euphemisms.
- Pragmatic functions: evaluative (Enfield 2003)
  ◦ Distanciation (something I can forget/not mention)
SUMMARY OF PROPERTIES

DISFLUENCY MANAGEMENT

- Overcome disfluency
  - Avoid prosodic interruptions (Dimock 2010).
  - Allow to complete syntactic structure.
  - Carry additional syntactic information.
    Particularly effective due to rich morphology.

- Channel search for delayed lexical content
  - Afford the speaker some time (keeps the floor)
  - Recruit collective resources
  - (by flagging a missing element).

OTHER FUNCTIONS

- Stylistic functions
  - E.g. help reception: Slow pace down for additional processing time (Fox Tree 2001).

- Discourse functions? (Further research needed.)
  - Topic marking, conversation boundaries...

- Pragmatic functions: politeness functions (Enfield 2003)
  - Indirectness, euphemisms. Not attested.

- Pragmatic functions: evaluative (Enfield 2003)
  - Distanciation. Not attested?
SUMMARY OF PROPERTIES

- Disfluency management as a central function
- Does it take us back to a ‘deficit view of fillers’?
- E.g. placeholder usage would correlate with lesser mastery of the language?
- Closer examination of speaker-specific patterns suggests otherwise.
- Even when *keninjhbi* is used to manage disfluencies, there are different ways to do it.
DISFLUENCY-MANAGEMENT PROFILES

Based on comprehensive quantitative analysis.
DISFLUENCY-MANAGEMENT PROFILES

- Cohort
- 8 speakers in my corpus.
- 3 with more than 50 occurrences of *keninjhbi*.
  - More or less commensurate with hours of recording.
Variation in placeholders frequencies

† Maggie Tukumba (with Dalabon L1) has the least placeholders per minute.
  • 1 every 16 min.

† Lily Bennett (relatively balanced bilingual with Dalabon L2) has the most.
  • 1 every 2.5 min.

Queenie Brennan (with Dalabon L3) is in between.
  • 1 placeholder every ≈5 min

No correlation btw dominance/proficiency and frequency of placeholders.
DISFLUENCY-MANAGEMENT PROFILES

- Differentiated patterns of use of placeholders
- Comparison between Maggie Tukumba (L1) and Lily Bennett (L2).
  - Reveals very different ways of using placeholders.
- Queenie Brennan (L3) is more like Maggie Tukumba (L1).
  - Not only in sheer numbers, but also in patterns of usage.
DISFLUENCY-MANAGEMENT PROFILES

Maggie Tukumba

Lily Bennett
### DISFLUENCY-MANAGEMENT PROFILES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>LB</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>QB</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>all tokens</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>dc realized</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>76.81 of spkr's total</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>69.08 of spkr's total</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>verb dc</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15.94 of spkr's total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>39.76 of spkr's total</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>noun dc</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>74.64 of spkr's total</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>51.41 of spkr's total</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>with morpho</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>49.28 of spkr's total</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>65.86 of spkr's total</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>without morpho</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50.72 of spkr's total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>34.14 of spkr's total</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>ph has verbal morph</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15.94 of spkr's total</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>38.96 of spkr's total</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>alternative verbal pattern</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>prefix not repeated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>ph has nominal morph</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31.88 of spkr's total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>26.91 of spkr's total</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>all matches with morph</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>53.62 of spkr's total</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>38.55 of spkr's total</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>matches with morph</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.67 of spkr's total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>24.50 of spkr's total</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>all matches</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>64.71 of with morpho</td>
<td>40.85 of with morpho</td>
<td>52.34 of noun dc</td>
<td>52.27 of noun dc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>all with morpho</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>64.71 of with morpho</td>
<td>40.85 of with morpho</td>
<td>52.34 of noun dc</td>
<td>52.27 of noun dc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>ph lacks morpho altogether</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.49 of spkr's total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15.66 of spkr's total</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MT realizes her dc's more than others.
LB uses proportionally more verbs.
MT and QB have an even split between w/out morpho.
LB uses more morpho because she uses more verbs.
When the dc is a verb, the ph almost always has morphology.
Only half or less of the ph where the dc is / was a noun has.
For MT and QB nominal morpho represents nearly two third of.
But about a third of all tokens for MT and QB, a quarter for LB.
Altogether, MT has more matches, then QB, then LB - who is a.
Note that for MT matches are "easier" because she mostly has.
So LB has less matches but they are "harder" matches.
We see that LB's fares higher on the match where there is more.
DISFLUENCY-MANAGEMENT PROFILES

Maggie Tukumba
- Uses placeholders less often.

Lily Bennett
- Uses placeholders more often.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 placeholder every</td>
<td>16 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISFLUENCY-MANAGEMENT PROFILES

Maggie Tukumba
- Uses placeholders less often.
- Proportionally more nominal targets.

Lily Bennett
- Uses placeholders more often.
- Proportionally more verbal targets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal targets</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal targets</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Some tokens have unclear targets etc.)

- High proportion of ‘lexically challenging’ contexts for Maggie Tukumba.
  - E.g. species nouns etc.
  - Verbs are a smaller word-class = > less lexically challenging.
DISFLUENCY-MANAGEMENT PROFILES

Maggie Tukumba
- Uses placeholders less often.
- Proportionally more nominal targets.
- More ‘lexically-challenging’ contexts.

Lily Bennett
- Uses placeholders more often.
- Proportionally more verbal targets.
- Less ‘lexically-challenging’ contexts.

maybe 3sg/3-R-PH-PP first 3sg/3sg.h-R-COM-ask-PP

Maybe he whatsit first, he asked him first.

(7-MT) 7’04 Bula-h-beyu-ngiyan kanh keninjhbí kuladj.
3pl/3-R-fetch-FUT DEM PH spike.rush

They are getting this whathoucallit, this spike rush.
DISFLUENCY-MANAGEMENT PROFILES

Maggie Tukumba
- Uses placeholders less often.
- Proportionally more nominal targets.
- More ‘lexically-challenging’ contexts.
- Realizes target constituent more often.

Lily Bennett
- Uses placeholders more often.
- Proportionally more verbal targets.
- Less ‘lexically-challenging’ contexts.
- Realizes target constituent less often.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target is realized</td>
<td>77%&gt;69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISFLUENCY-MANAGEMENT PROFILES

Maggie Tukumba
- Uses placeholders less often.
- Proportionally more nominal targets.
- More ‘lexically-challenging’ contexts.
- Realizes target constituent more often.
- Proportionally less tokens have morphology.

Lily Bennett
- Uses placeholders more often.
- Proportionally more verbal targets.
- Less ‘lexically-challenging’ contexts.
- Realizes target constituent less often.
- Proportionally more tokens have morphology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PH has morphology</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISFLUENCY-MANAGEMENT PROFILES

Maggie Tukumba
- Uses placeholders less often.
- Proportionally more nominal targets.
- More ‘lexically-challenging’ contexts.
- Realizes target constituent more often.
- Proportionally less tokens have morphology.

Lily Bennett
- Uses placeholders more often.
- Proportionally more verbal targets.
- Less ‘lexically-challenging’ contexts.
- Realizes target constituent less often.
- Proportionally more tokens have morphology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PH has morphology</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>&lt;66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of which verbal morphology</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>&lt;59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of which nominal morphology</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>&gt;41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Reflect proportion of nom/verb targets.
- Verbal placeholders must have morphology.
DISFLUENCY-MANAGEMENT PROFILES

Maggie Tukumba
- Uses placeholders less often.
- Proportionally more nominal targets.
- More ‘lexically-challenging’ contexts.
- Realizes target constituent more often.
- Proportionally less tokens have morphology.
- Morphology less accurate with verbal targets.

Lily Bennett
- Uses placeholders more often.
- Proportionally more verbal targets.
- Less ‘lexically-challenging’ contexts.
- Realizes target constituent less often.
- Proportionally more tokens have morphology.
- Morphology more accurate with verbal targets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion of full mirroring with verbal targets</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>&lt; 10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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DISFLUENCY-MANAGEMENT PROFILES

Maggie Tukumba
- Uses placeholders less often.
- Proportionally more nominal targets.
- More ‘lexically-challenging’ contexts.
- Realizes target constituent more often.
- Proportionally less tokens have morphology.
- Morphology less accurate with verbal targets.

Lily Bennett
- Uses placeholders more often.
- Proportionally more verbal targets.
- Less ‘lexically-challenging’ contexts.
- Realizes target constituent less often.
- Proportionally more tokens have morphology.
- Morphology more accurate with verbal targets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of full mirroring with verbal targets</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>&lt; 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of full mirroring with nominal targets</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>&gt; 29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokens with 0 morphology (all matches)</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>&gt; 15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISFLUENCY-MANAGEMENT PROFILES

Maggie Tukumba
- Uses placeholders less often.
- Proportionally more nominal targets.
- More ‘lexically-challenging’ contexts.
- Realizes target constituent more often.
- Proportionally less tokens have morphology.
- Morphology less accurate with verbal targets.
- More 0 morphology.
- Syntactically less informative.

Lily Bennett
- Uses placeholders more often.
- Proportionally more verbal targets.
- Less ‘lexically-challenging’ contexts.
- Realizes target constituent less often.
- Proportionally more tokens have morphology.
- Morphology more accurate with verbal targets.
- Less 0 morphology.
- Syntactically more informative.
DISFLUENCY-MANAGEMENT PROFILES

Maggie Tukumba
- Uses placeholders less often.
- Proportionally more nominal targets.
- More ‘lexically-challenging’ contexts.
- Realizes target constituent more often.
- Proportionally less tokens have morphology.
- Morphology less accurate with verbal targets.
- More 0 morphology.
- Syntactically less informative.

Lily Bennett
- Uses placeholders more often.
- Proportionally more verbal targets.
- Less ‘lexically-challenging’ contexts.
- Realizes target constituent less often.
- Proportionally more tokens have morphology.
- Morphology more accurate with verbal targets.
- Less 0 morphology.
- Syntactically more informative.
DISFLUENCY-MANAGEMENT PROFILES

- Differentiated patterns of use of placeholders
  - Sparing use, focus on lexical fix.
  - Liberal use, focus on syntactic enrichment.

- Use of placeholders does not depend solely upon levels of mastery of the language.
- Speakers choose how they handle placeholders as disfluency fixes.
DISFLUENCY-MANAGEMENT PROFILES

- Implications?
- Consequences on speech/narrative style etc.?
- Given the discourse and stylistic functions of placeholders/fillers (Keevallik 2010).
DISFLUENCY-MANAGEMENT PROFILES

- Implications (more speculative)
- What motivates speakers’ preferences?
- Attitudes to language/to the language situation?
  - Here elicitation, with an expectation of linguistic accuracy.
- Speakers’ broader perspectives on norms?
  - Very plausible knowing the speakers.
Placeholders in polysynthetic languages?
- Tendencies are particularly visible in Dalabon due to:
  - Wide distribution of placeholder and rich morphology.
  - Offer speakers a lot of scope.
  - Resulting from the grammatical profile of the language.

To be continued with speakers of more vital languages.
Polysynthetic and others.
THANK YOU!