

UNIVERSITY of PENNSYLVANIA

PHILADELPHIA 19104

Feb. 11, 78

DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY
UNIVERSITY MUSEUM
33rd and Spruce Streets

Dear Bill:

Your letter of Jan. 30 containing five questions about my paper, "Response Cries" has just reached me in the field (Las Vegas), along with the contract.

First, the contract (enclosed, signed). No mention is made of reprint fees. Are these split, like with other journals, or not? (Not a vital point.) Perhaps, however, I should mention again that the paper was first given at a conference in Bad Hamburg, and the conference publication plan is to include the piece citing Language as the original source. I propose to pay for the reprint rights in this instance. That's ok, isn't it?

Now the five points. The chief problem here is that the version you cite from is differently paginated from the one I have here. Perhaps you are using the original version sent you (in triplicate), not the version that was responsive to the suggestions of the reviewers. I think I can clear the matter up when I return for a week at the beginning of March to Philadelphia. Until then all I can do is give your page number and then mine (identified as B and G respectively). In any case, thanks very much for the questions.

(1) B27,G24: The Sacks reference is to one of his unpublished notebooks and so might not be of great help to the wider linguistic reader. But I can certainly get the reference to you on my return to Philadelphia, providing you are willing to adjust for it in the bibliography.

(2) B29,G26: I agree. How about: ";response cries, namely, exclamatory interjections which are not full-fledged words. Oops..." If this change is made, then two others have to be made in the second section of the conclusion (G45) in the discussion of nonwords.

017 "As suggested, they seem to be drawn from two sources: taboo but full-fledged words (involving blasphemy and .."

"There is a nice division of linguistic labor here. Full-fledged words that are socially acceptable are allocated..."

(4) Footnote 6, G11: re "puts on". In my understanding, to put someone on is to encourage from them a line of response which they shortly see exposes... their provinciality, gullibility, vanity, etc. "Satarize" isn't quite right, nor is any other single word. Quotes would be possible, but quotes themselves imply the word is more arcane than I think it now is. The stylish thing, I think, would be to play it straight.

UNIVERSITY of PENNSYLVANIA

p.2

PHILADELPHIA 19174

DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY
UNIVERSITY MUSEUM F1
33rd and Spruce Streets

(5) Re Gumperz. "Working paper 46" applies to the whole collection of four papers. The Cook-Gumperz and Corsaro paper is the second of the four. But each paper is numbered from 1. So the inclusive paging for the one cited is 1-40, put inserted that way, I'm afraid one would be misleading readers.

Which leaves (3) and the matter of Jesus Christ. I guess I hear this as just another imprecation, although it does raise the the issue of the same word being used in quite different imprecatory contexts, e.g. surprise, disgust, impatience, etc. Without talking to you about the term, I don't think I can get any further with it. In any case, I am coming to think that my effort to identify types of response cries was foolhardy; the more I watch and listen, the longer the list gets.

And a final request. That you consider inserting the following paragraph just before the Conclusion section (G51), and just after "are not (Quang Phuc Dong 1971)".

Nor is this analysis of the unconversational aspects of certain conversational utterances meant to deny the traditional conception of transformation and embedding; rather, the power of the latter is displayed. Waiting with her husband and a friend for the casino cashier to count down her bucket of silver, a happy player says, "And when I saw the third 7 come up and stop I just let out 'Eeeee'." Here, through direct quotation, a speaker brings to well-circumscribed three-person talk what was, a few minutes ago, the broadly accessible eruption of a single. Showing clearly that what starts out as a response cry (or starts out, for that matter, as ^{any} ~~my~~ sounded occurrence, human, animal, or inanimate), can be conversationally replayed $\frac{1}{2}$ can be reset into ordinary discourse through the unlimited power of sound mimicry.

Again, thanks for all the work you've put in this,


Erving Goffman