

Reduplication without RED: Evidence from *Diddly*-infixation

Emily Elfner and Wendell Kimper
University of Massachusetts, Amherst

1. Introduction

Diddly-infixation is a novel language game made famous on the television show *The Simpsons*. The process involves infixation of the nonsense word *diddly* into a base word with initial stress as well as reduplication of the rhyme of the stressed syllable:

(1) *Diddly*-infixation

wélcome → wel-diddly-élcome
áction → ac-diddly-áction

We argue that the reduplication involved in *diddly*-infixation is motivated by phonological rather than morphological factors, because it appears only in specific prosodically-determined environments. This runs counter to claims made by Inkelas & Zoll (2005) and Kawahara (2004), who argue that phonological copying consists of epenthesis and feature sharing, and is therefore limited to a single segment and subject to locality restrictions. The reduplication in *diddly*-infixation is non-local and larger than a single segment, and as such is better captured by an account of phonologically-driven reduplication that involves copying via correspondence (McCarthy & Prince, 1995).

In this paper, we discuss the results of parallel questionnaire studies, one testing reduplicative preferences in *diddly*-infixation and the other testing reduplicative preferences in the related process of expletive (*fuckin*) infixation (McCarthy, 1982), which does not involve reduplication (e.g. *fan-fuckin-tastic*). In these experiments, speakers were asked to extrapolate patterns of reduplication to words with stress patterns other than those canonically found with the infixation processes under consideration.

With *diddly*-infixation, the majority of our subjects preferred reduplicative forms in words with initial stress (*wel-diddly-elcome*) but dispreferred reduplication when stress was non-initial (*fan-diddly-tastic* rather than *fantas-diddly-astic*). We argue that this asymmetry can be accounted for with reference to phonological factors: reduplication is necessary in initial-stress words in order to allow both infixation and correspondence between the position of main stress in the base and the derived form. We provide an account of this process using Optimality Theory (OT) (Prince & Smolensky, 1993/2004), showing the interaction between Output-Output faithfulness to main stress (Benua, 1997) and a preference for right-aligned word stress in English.

With *fuckin*-infixation, speakers behaved as expected with respect to non-initial stress words (*fan-fuckin-tastic*) but the majority dispreferred infixation in words with initial stress, either with or without reduplication (**wel-fuckin-come*, **wel-fuckin-elcome*). We argue that this difference relates to the ability of *fuckin* to appear as an independent, non-infixed word (*fuckin-welcome*), a possibility which is not available for *diddly* (**diddly-welcome*).¹

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides background on *diddly*-infixation and phonologically-driven reduplication. Section 3 discusses the questionnaire study on *diddly*-infixation and provides an OT analysis of the phenomenon. Section 4 discusses the questionnaire study on *fuckin*-infixation. Section 5 concludes the paper.

*Thank you to Lyn Frazier, John Kingston, John McCarthy, and the audiences at UMass Phonology Group and WCCFL 27 for many insightful comments. This research was partially supported by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. All remaining errors are our own.

¹The use of the word *diddly* as an infix is distinct from its use in expressions such as *diddly-squat* or *diddly-shit* — see Section 4.3 for further discussion.

2. Background

2.1. Diddly-infixation

Diddly-infixation is a form of expletive infixation popularized by the speech of Ned Flanders on the television show *The Simpsons*.² Even while those familiar with the show may not be aware of the process or use it productively in everyday life, it shares with other language games the characteristic of being easily generalized by speakers to be applied to a variety of environments.

In the most canonical examples of *diddly*-infixation, such as those most often used on the television show, the nonsense word *diddly* infixes following an initial stressed syllable, and triggers reduplication:

(2) Canonical Examples

wélcome	→	wel-diddly-élcome
áction	→	ac-diddly-áction
múrder	→	mur-diddly-úrder
órder	→	or-diddly-órder

As is common in language games involving infixation (Yu, 2007), *diddly* only ever occurs as an infix, never as a prefix or a suffix:

(3) Obligatory Infixation

wélcome	→	*diddly-wélcome
órder	→	*diddly-órder

This offers a stark contrast to other types of infixation, where the infix can appear outside the word (see, e.g., Prince & Smolensky (1993/2004); McCarthy & Prince (1986, 1990, 1993); Yu (2007)). For example, the material that can infix in expletive infixation in English (McCarthy, 1982) can also appear outside the word:

(4) Non-obligatory Infixation

fantastic	→	fan-fuckin-tastic, fuckin-fantastic
incredible	→	in-fuckin-credible, fuckin-incredible

Diddly-infixation also differs from other types of infixation by targeting words with initial stress, as seen in the above examples. Expletive infixation in English typically involve base words with non-initial stress, and these cases do not involve reduplication:

(5) *Fuckin*-infixation

fantástic	→	fan-fuckin-tástic
incrédible	→	in-fuckin-crédible

We hypothesize that reduplication is used as a phonological repair. Because *diddly* must appear within the word, infixing it into words with initial stress poses difficulties for stress assignment that are not found when infixation occurs in words where stress is non-initial. Reduplication might then occur to allow the position of stress to remain faithful to its base form. If this is the case, the reduplication that comes with *diddly*-infixation is expected to occur only in this environment and not as an integral part of the process. This hypothesis was tested in the two parallel questionnaire studies discussed below.

2.2. Phonologically-driven reduplication

Yu (2004, 2005), Inkelas & Zoll (2005), Kawahara (2001, 2004) and others have noted that phonological copying can serve as a phonological repair, resolving marked configurations like illicit clusters or onsetless syllables. For example, the vocalic plural marker in Hausa infixes between consonants in a stem-final cluster. If no cluster is available, a single consonant reduplicates:

²Data are from The Simpsons Archive, <http://www.snpp.net/guides/flanders.file.html>

(6) Hausa (Newman, 1972)

	<i>Root</i>	<i>Singular</i>	<i>Plural</i>	<i>gloss</i>
a.	gurb	gurbii	guràabuu	‘hollow place’
b.	turk	turkèe	turàakuu	‘tethering post’
c.	gaɓ	gaɓàa	gaɓàaɓuu	‘joint, limb’
d.	kaf	kafàa	kafàafu	‘foot’

In (6a-b), the stem ends in a cluster, and the plural morpheme *àa* infixes between the two consonants. However, in (6c-d), the stem ends in a single consonant which reduplicates, and *àa* infixes between the two copies. In this case, reduplication does not contribute to the meaning of the form. This differs from reduplication as a morphological phenomenon, where it originates as an abstract RED morpheme (McCarthy & Prince, 1995) which carries semantic content.

Inkelas & Zoll (2005) and Kawahara (2004) claim that phonologically-driven reduplication³ is limited to a single segment and subject to locality restrictions. Yu (2005) argues against the single-segment limit on the basis of ma-infixation (Yu, 2004) and Cantonese loanword adaptation. Another example involves syllable reduplication by German children to satisfy minimal word requirements:

(7) German Child Speech (Dressler et al., 2005)

	<i>Adult Form</i>	<i>Jan, 1;3</i>
a.	Bär ‘bear’	bebe
b.	Bauch ‘belly’	baubau

In addition, under Kawahara (2004)’s analysis, phonologically-driven reduplication must necessarily be *radically local* — the two copies must be adjacent on some tier. In other words, vowels can copy across consonants, but not other vowels, and consonants can copy across vowels, but not other consonants. This is a consequence of the fact that, according to both Inkelas & Zoll and Kawahara, what appears to be “copying” is in fact the result of epenthesis plus assimilation. An epenthesized segment receives its features by sharing them with another (necessarily local) segment.

Diddly-infixation, if phonologically-motivated, provides evidence against both the single-segment limit and the locality restriction, since the material copied is the rhyme of a syllable, not a single segment, and copying occurs across the infixed word:

(8) Multiple Segments

wélcome	→	wel -diddly- él come
áction	→	ac -diddly- á ction

Non-locality of the sort seen in *diddly*-infixation is not compatible with an epenthesis-plus-feature-spreading account like Kawahara’s, since it would require feature spreading to skip intervening segments. To account for non-local, multi-segment phonological copying, it is necessary to posit that there is in fact copying involved — copying via correspondence relationships (McCarthy & Prince, 1995) may be non-local, and correspondence relationships may hold between segments in a string in addition to single segments.

2.3. Summary

Diddly-infixation is a novel language-game process that involves obligatory infixation of the nonsense word *diddly* into base words with initial stress. In these words, infixation always involves reduplication of the rhyme of the stressed syllable, and in the resulting form, the infix *diddly* precedes the main stress.

As discussed above, *diddly*-infixation differs from other forms of expletive infixation in English which may appear as an independent word, typically do not involve reduplication, and target base words with non-initial stress. *Diddly*-infixation also differs from certain cases of phonologically-driven copying in that it involves reduplication of more than a single segment, and the two copies are non-local. This

³Inkelas & Zoll (2005) refer to the phenomenon as “phonological copying”, while Kawahara (2004) uses the term “echo epenthesis”.

paper seeks to question the extent to which the reduplication associated with *diddly* infixation can be considered to be an example of non-local, prosodically-driven reduplication.

3. Experiment 1: *Diddly*-infixation

We conducted a questionnaire study intended to test the preferences of native English speakers with respect to reduplication in *diddly*-infixation. In order to probe the hypothesis that the location of word stress (initial vs. non-initial) crucially correlates with the presence of reduplication, we presented our subjects with words containing a variety of stress patterns and asked them to choose their preferred form. Our hypothesis is that if reduplication in *diddly*-infixation is acting as a phonological repair, it will appear only where it is phonologically improving (see Section 3.3 for discussion of the motivations for the repair). If, on the other hand, it is a meaningful part of the process, it will appear in all environments.

3.1. Methods

The questionnaire study was performed on 113 undergraduate students who were all native speakers of English. Subjects were trained on canonical examples of *diddly*-infixation, five initial-stress words with reduplication and one monosyllabic example. They were then presented with initial-stress words, non-initial-stress words, and monosyllabic words. The complete word list is given in (9):

(9) List of words used in Experiment 1

<i>Initial Stress</i>	<i>Non-Initial Stress</i>		<i>Monosyllabic</i>
1 0	2 1 0	2 0 1 0	1
captain	artistic	anaconda	bite
maple	magnetic	application	cord
panther	October	California	dream
pilot	pandemic	information	jump
serpent	umbrella	intervention	march
winter	Wisconsin	Massachusetts	past

For words with initial and non-initial stress, subjects were asked to choose between infixation with and without reduplication, and were given options for “both” and “neither”. An example of the task is given in (10):

(10) Winter

- A) win-diddly-inter
- B) win-diddly-ter
- C) A and B are equally acceptable
- D) Neither A nor B is at all acceptable

For monosyllabic words, the choice was between reduplication of all or part of a coda cluster (e.g. jump-diddly-ump vs. jum-diddly-ump), and were again given choices for “both” and “neither”. A and B responses were counterbalanced, and examples were presented in pseudo-random order.

Reduplication is predicted in initial-stress and monosyllabic words, regardless of whether reduplication in *diddly*-infixation is phonologically-conditioned or is morphological:

(11) Predictions: Initial Stress⁴

<i>Stress Pattern</i>	<i>Morphologically Driven</i>	<i>Phonologically Driven</i>
1 0 (captain)	Reduplication (cap-diddly-aptain)	Reduplication (cap-diddly-aptain)
1 (bite)	Reduplication (bi-diddly-ite)	Reduplication (bi-diddly-ite)

⁴Examples of this type appear frequently on *The Simpsons* and were used as training in this experiment.

However, reduplication should be dispreferred in words with non-initial-stress if copying is being used as a phonological repair. On the other hand, if reduplication is indeed morphological, it should occur regardless of the placement of main stress:

(12) Predictions: Non-Initial Stress⁵

<i>Stress Pattern</i>	<i>Morphologically Driven</i>	<i>Phonologically Driven</i>
2 1 0 (artistic)	Reduplication (artis-diddly-istic)	No Reduplication (ar-diddly-tistic)
2 0 1 0 (anaconda)	Reduplication (anacon-diddly-onda)	No Reduplication (ana-diddly-conda)

3.2. Results

In initial-stress words, the majority of participants preferred the reduplicative form to any of the other responses, including non-reduplication. Similarly, speakers preferred to reduplicate simple codas in monosyllabic words. In contrast, speakers preferred not to reduplicate in words with non-initial stress. This is illustrated in the following two tables:

(13) Questionnaire Responses: Initial Stress.

Binomial probability Redup vs. Non-Redup: $z = 3.68$, $SE = 0.10$, $p < 0.05$

Reduplication	(cap-diddly-aptain)	62%
Non-reduplication	(cap-diddly-tain)	25%
Both		5%
Neither		8%

(14) Questionnaire Responses: Non-Initial Stress

Binomial probability Redup vs. Non-Redup: $z = -3.69$, $SE = 0.11$, $p < 0.05$

Reduplication	(anacon-diddly-onda)	17%
Non-reduplication	(ana-diddly-conda)	56%
Both		7%
Neither		19%

(15) Questionnaire Responses: Monosyllabic Words

Binomial probability Redup vs. Non-Redup: $z = 2.59$, $SE = 0.11$, $p < 0.05$

Simple coda	(jum-diddly-ump)	47%
Complex coda	(jump-diddly-ump)	19%
Both		10%
Neither		24%

The results of the study support the assertion that the preference for reduplication is phonologically-conditioned: speakers prefer to reduplicate with initial stress and monosyllabic words, but not with non-initial stress words. If reduplication was morphological (i.e. not phonologically-conditioned), reduplication should have been preferred in all forms.

3.3. Analysis: Motivating Reduplication

The results of the experiment conform to the hypothesis that reduplication in words with initial stress is conditioned by phonological factors:

(16) Reduplicated and Non-Reduplicated Forms

	<i>Non-Reduplicated</i>		<i>Reduplicated</i>
anaconda	→ ana-diddly-conda	winter	→ win-diddly-inter
artistic	→ ar-diddly-tistic	captain	→ cap-diddly-aptain

⁵Examples involving non-initial stress do not typically appear on *The Simpsons*.

We argue that by reduplicating, speakers create an environment where *diddly* can be infixed without disrupting the assignment of primary stress. In this section, we develop an account of the infixation patterns using OT, where prosodic constraints interact with a faithfulness constraint banning reduplication.

When stress is initial, *diddly* cannot precede the stressed syllable without preceding the entire word. As discussed previously, *diddly* may not appear outside the word, as is common with language games that involve infixation (Yu, 2007). However, if *diddly* is infixed following the main the main stress, it will disrupt the normal application of English word stress. Assuming that primary word stress in English normally occurs on the stressed syllable of the rightmost foot as long as it is non-final (Liberman & Prince, 1977), infixing *diddly* within a word with initial stress would require either that *diddly* bear main stress or that the main stress occur on a foot which is not rightmost:

(17) Two possibilities

- wélcome → a. wél-diddly-come
b. wèl-diddly-come

However, both of these possibilities violate prosodic constraints. Possibility (17a) violates the markedness constraint 1ARYR, which requires word stress to occur on the rightmost foot:⁶

(18) 1ARYR: assign one violation mark for every prosodic word whose head is not the rightmost foot.

Possibility (17b) violates a correspondence constraint on Output-Output faithfulness (OO-Faith) (Benua, 1997), which requires transderivational correspondence between the base and morphologically-related forms. When main stress falls on *diddly* rather than on the initial syllable of the target word, OO-faithfulness to main stress is violated even though 1ARYR is satisfied. This constraint can be formalized as follows:

(19) OO-1ARY: assign one violation mark for every word where the head foot in the base does not correspond to the head foot in the derived form of the base.

By reduplicating the initial syllable, the infix precedes the head foot while allowing the main stressed syllable to satisfy both 1ARYR and OO-1ARY. Reduplication violates the faithfulness constraint INTEGRITY (McCarthy & Prince, 1995), which is dominated by both 1ARYR and OO-1ARY:

(20) INTEGRITY: assign one violation mark for every segment in the input that has two correspondents in the output.

(21)	(wél)come+diddly	1ARYR	OO-1ARY	INTEGRITY
a.	☞ (wèl)(dìddly)(él)come			2
b.	(wèl)(díddly)come		W ₁	L
c.	(wél)(dìddly)come	W ₁		L

As discussed above, *diddly* is infixed without reduplication when stress is non-initial:

(22) Non-Initial Stress

- anacónða → ana-diddly-cónða
fantástic → fan-diddly-tástic

This generalization falls easily from the above analysis, because the infixed forms satisfy both 1ARYR and OO-1ARY. Reduplication gratuitously violates INTEGRITY, and is therefore avoided:

⁶It should be noted that English stress is subject to some degree of exceptionality — words like *sálamànder* and *Ládefòged*, for example, run counter to the generalization expressed by 1ARYR. However, these cases may be accounted for by suggesting that there is exceptional foot extrametricality in English. Foot extrametricality does nothing to help the cases in (17), and reduplication is a necessary repair here.

(23)	(fan)(tás)tic+diddly	1ARYR	OO-1ARY	INTEG
a.	(fàn)(dìdly)(tás)tic			
b.	(fàn)(tàs)(dìdly)(tás)tic			W ₂

In summary, reduplication is used with initial stress words to allow infixation without violating OO-1ARY or 1ARYR. However, reduplication is not necessary when stress is non-initial, because *diddly* can be infixed without violating either constraint. The distribution of reduplication as shown in the results of our experiment support this analysis, where reduplication is conditioned by phonological constraints and is not a meaningful part of the process. Further, *diddly*-infixation involves reduplication of more than a single segment where the two copies are not adjacent, because they are separated by the infix. This aspect supports the claim that phonologically-driven reduplication can be non-local and can exceed a single segment.

One advantage of this analysis is that it relies on speakers' knowledge of their own grammar. Experiments like the one discussed above are interesting cases of the *poverty of the stimulus* problem — speakers are asked to create generalizations about a process and extrapolate these generalizations to new situations based on extremely little data. Given only six examples, subjects were able to make remarkably consistent decisions about how that process should apply with a stress pattern they have not seen it applied to before.

This ability is unexpected under a subcategorization approach to infixation processes like the one proposed by Yu (2007) — the problem of learning an extrapolation should be too great. However, if speakers are making generalizations about the patterns involved in novel tasks (like infixing language games) based on grammatical knowledge they already have,⁷ the ability to extrapolate based on so few examples is entirely plausible.

4. Experiment 2: Expletive Infixation

As discussed above, the results of the experiment on *diddly*-infixation showed that subjects were willing to infix *diddly* without reduplication when reduplication did not allow for the satisfaction of the two higher-ranked constraints 1ARYR and OO-1ARY. We conducted a second, similar, experiment on *fuckin* infixation, which asked whether or not speakers are willing to reduplicate with a different infix where it would be necessary. Unlike *diddly*-infixation, *fuckin*-infixation typically operates on non-initial stress words. This experiment tested the behavior of *fuckin* in initial-stress words: if reduplication is possible as a phonological repair in *diddly*-infixation, it should be a possible repair for *fuckin*-infixation as well.

4.1. Methods

The experiment was performed on 119 undergraduate students who had not participated in the previous experiment and elicited reduplicative preferences in *fuckin*-infixation. In this experiment, subjects were trained on four canonical examples consisting of infixation with non-initial word stress (e.g. *fan-fuckin-tastic*, *in-fuckin-credible*). The task was the same as in the previous experiment: subjects were presented with initial-stress words, non-initial-stress words, and monosyllabic words using the same word list as in Experiment 1. As before, speakers were presented with a choice between infixation with reduplication and infixation without reduplication for initial and non-initial stress, and between simple and complex coda reduplication for monosyllabic words. Speakers were also offered the option of choosing both or neither option.

4.2. Results

In non-initial stress words, subjects preferred non-reduplication:

⁷In this case, restrictions on metrical structure in English — see McCarthy (1982) for similar claims about grammatical knowledge in *fuckin* infixation.

to specific lexical items, and the use of *diddly* outside the word is unacceptable with other cases — the use of *diddly* in these particular items is distinct from its use as an infix.

Because speakers have no prior knowledge of *diddly* outside the word as an alternative to the infixed form, the fact that such forms did not appear in the training set means that speakers would not posit non-infixation as an acceptable alternative repair to reduplication.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we have provided experimental evidence that supports the assertion that the reduplication found in *diddly*-infixation is phonologically-conditioned: for the majority of speakers, it is used only when it is necessary to satisfy high-ranking prosodic constraints. Specifically, we argued that reduplication in *diddly*-infixation is triggered by the constraints 1ARYR and OO-1ARY, which outrank INTEGRITY. This result provides further evidence for the claim that phonologically-driven reduplication can be non-local and can exceed a single segment.

Finally, we suggested that the absence of reduplication in *fuckin*-infixation was the result of the subjects' knowledge that *fuckin* can occur outside of the word. This contrasted with *diddly*, which can only be found in an infixation environment. This finding supported the above analysis by showing that infixation is marked for *fuckin* in the same environment that triggers reduplication with *diddly*.

With *diddly*-infixation, subjects drew robust generalizations based on very little evidence, suggesting that processes like infixing language games make use of speakers' grammatical knowledge. In our analysis, constraint rankings governing the placement of primary stress in English give rise to generalizations about the placement of the infix. However, reduplication is not typically used as a repair strategy in English. Yu (2007) suggests that reduplication is particularly common among language games, and Ferguson (1983) and others have noted that non-morphological reduplication is widespread in child phonology. Further research is needed to determine why reduplication is so often preferred over alternative repairs.

References

- Benua, Laura (1997). *Transderivational identity: Phonological relations between words*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Dressler, Wolfgang, Katarzyna Dziubalska-Kolaczyk, Natalia Gagarina & Marianne Kilani-Schoch (2005). Reduplication in child language. *Studies on Reduplication*, Mouton de Gruyter.
- Ferguson, Charles (1983). Reduplication in child phonology. *Journal of Child Language* 10, pp. 239–243.
- Inkelas, Sharon & Cheryl Zoll (2005). *Reduplication: Doubling in Morphology*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kawahara, Shigeto (2001). Reduplication not driven by a red morpheme. Ms. University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Kawahara, Shigeto (2004). Locality in echo epenthesis: Comparison with reduplication. *Proceedings of the North East Linguistics Society*, vol. 34, pp. 295–309.
- Lieberman, M. & A. Prince (1977). On stress and linguistic rhythm. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8:2, pp. 249–336.
- McCarthy, John (1982). Prosodic structure and expletive infixation. *Language* 58, pp. 574–590.
- McCarthy, John & Alan Prince (1986). Prosodic morphology. Tech. rep., Rutgers University Center for Cognitive Science.
- McCarthy, John & Alan Prince (1990). Foot and word in prosodic morphology: The Arabic broken plural. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 8, pp. 209–282.
- McCarthy, John & Alan Prince (1993). Prosodic morphology i: Constraint interaction and satisfaction. Tech. Rep. 3, Rutgers University Center for Cognitive Science.
- McCarthy, John & Alan Prince (1995). Faithfulness and reduplicative identity. Beckman, Jill, Suzanne Urbanczyk & Laura Walsh Dickey (eds.), *University of Massachusetts Occasional Papers in Linguistics 18: Papers in Optimality Theory*, GLSA Publications, pp. 249–384.
- Newman, Paul (1972). Syllable weight as a phonological variable. *Studies in African Linguistics* 3:3, pp. 301–323.
- Potts, Christopher (2003). Expressive content as conventional implicature. Kadowaki, Makoto & Shigeto Kawahara (eds.), *Proceedings of the North East Linguistics Society*, Amherst, MA: GLSA, vol. 33.
- Prince, Alan & Paul Smolensky (1993/2004). *Optimality Theory: Constraint Interaction in Generative Phonology*. Blackwell.
- Yu, Alan (2004). Reduplication in Homeric infixation. *NELS*, vol. 34.
- Yu, Alan (2005). Toward a typology of compensatory reduplication. et al., John Alderete (ed.), *Proceedings of the 24th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, 397–405, Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Yu, Alan (2007). *A Natural History of Infixation*. Oxford University Press.

Proceedings of the 27th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics

edited by Natasha Abner
and Jason Bishop

Cascadilla Proceedings Project Somerville, MA 2008

Copyright information

Proceedings of the 27th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics
© 2008 Cascadilla Proceedings Project, Somerville, MA. All rights reserved

ISBN 978-1-57473-428-7 library binding

A copyright notice for each paper is located at the bottom of the first page of the paper.
Reprints for course packs can be authorized by Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Ordering information

Orders for the library binding edition are handled by Cascadilla Press.
To place an order, go to www.lingref.com or contact:

Cascadilla Press, P.O. Box 440355, Somerville, MA 02144, USA
phone: 1-617-776-2370, fax: 1-617-776-2271, e-mail: sales@cascadilla.com

Web access and citation information

This entire proceedings can also be viewed on the web at www.lingref.com. Each paper has a unique document # which can be added to citations to facilitate access. The document # should not replace the full citation.

This paper can be cited as:

Elfner, Emily and Wendell Kimper. 2008. Reduplication without RED: Evidence from *Diddly*-infixation.
In *Proceedings of the 27th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. Natasha Abner and Jason Bishop,
150-158. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

or:

Elfner, Emily and Wendell Kimper. 2008. Reduplication without RED: Evidence from *Diddly*-infixation.
In *Proceedings of the 27th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. Natasha Abner and Jason Bishop,
150-158. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. www.lingref.com, document #1827.