

from Goffman

Explanations for Corrections in "Response Cries"

Galley 1

1. Doesn't make sense as is. It is not the self-talk that qualifies as incest or masturbation but the other kind of intercourse--the sexual, not the social kind--that does.
2. Footnote 3: I have reworked the version you objected to and I hope it is clear now.

Galley 2

3. "With" should be in lower case. My mistake. It is the second use of the term and therefore (following practice in the rest of the paper) no italization or its equivalent is necessary.

Galley 3

4. line 2: I think peoples' sound preserve is harder to say and think of than the sound preserve of others.
5. lines 7-10: A coparticipant "can naturally be taken to exist" is different from a natural coparticipant, and it is the latter idea that I wanted to get across. So although I agree the sentence is long, your version changes the sense a little. The sentence could be chopped up this way:
. . . thought improper. Even though our coparticipant is not visually present, a natural one can be taken to exist, and an accounting is available as to where, cognitively speaking, we have gone. Moreover, this where is a familiar place. . .
6. My mistake. Earlier I implied in a footnote that there might not be good reason for this imputation, and so correctly has to come out.

Galley 4

7. I don't think commas should be used here, because I meant "in almost all situations" to be restrictive.
8. I had "flooding out into tears" (perhaps unwisely) because "flooding out" is a term I use to refer to a sudden breach in the affect control required of interactants. A brief flooding out into tears would thus be somewhat briefer than a flood of tears, and it is the former, not the latter, that I think is allowable.
9. "Might be expected." Here you opt for the active, as opposed to passive, tense. If you want that, then "one," not "we," should be used, because "we" throughout the paper refers only to we citizens; "one" refers to students and other social scientists.
10. Re the omission of "uncontrolled." The discussion concerns breaches in "proper" orientation and "presence," so the concern is not that a legitimate place is provided for anything but rather for certain kinds of delicts, namely, those pertaining to poise, self-control, situational orientation, etc.
11. The original "encourage" allows for parallel construction; "encouraging" does not.

Galley 5

12. Again, I think commas are not appropriate, because the clause is meant to be restrictive.
13. First, speaker's is incorrect. I mean it as a bound form parallel to second speaker.

Galley 6

14. "This is very often true" as a phrase repeats "this" and is itself a little ambiguous. What's wrong with my version?
15. Suffice means that something is enough; to say that something will do it means that it is an instance of the class that will produce a given result, not necessarily that it is a special instance, namely, one that just manages to do it.

Galley 7

16. "May be" introduces the notion that there is a choice, and that issue is irrelevant here and a little off-putting. "Is presumably," I think, is better.
17. "The threat startle is." This seems to me an odd construction and not very consonant with the others in the list. Could we just omit "is" and add a comma?
18. "but from a position. . ." is not a complete sentence, and I think should be preceded therefore not by a semicolon but a comma or (if you want) a dash.
19. "use actually to compose ourselves." Once actually is brought forward so as to avoid splitting an infinitive (which here, I think, would be passable), it ceases to carry much meaning, and I think should therefore be omitted.
20. "Seem" and "might seem." The first means that I think it, the second that some people (among whom I might not be numbered) might think it, and with feminist issues, I like to employ all the distance I can get.
21. cf. argument given in #17 above.

Galley 8

22. "Approach" is ambiguous, meaning either that orgasm is about to be experienced or that climactic experience could be authentically realized. True, my phrasing employs a set phrase, but it has a single meaning.
23. Re omission of "in a typing pool." Your version reads much smoother, but the trouble is that a typist in the presence of the person she is typing for is unlikely to employ these cues. She does it when she is in a section of an office where only typists are at work.

24. "Seat of the prototypes." I accept your rephrasing, but yours brings seat too close to prototype, and other meanings are generated. So if your version is to be used, please use "source" instead of "seat."

Galley 9

25. "We" would have to be changed to "one," but I think my version is more concise and hope you will allow it.
26. "But" for me introduces a nonsequitor, and so "and" should be used.
27. "Since" renders the sentence ungrammatical and should be omitted.
28. On the face of it, it looks as though 12 had gotten lost. A possibility would be to call the discussion 12 and immediately jump in with 12.1, but since this is your numbering system, the matter is entirely in your hands.
29. "Animal animals:" This may sound cute to you, but a specifier is necessary, for persons are also animals. If you object to animal animals, then lesser animals might do.

Galley 10

30. The original manuscript was very badly organized at this point, since a reservation in the form of a "yet" was introduced into what was already a reservation in the form of a "yet." The proposed change handles the problem, and I hope the transposition can be made.
31. Your change makes the sentence less cumbersome, but it brings in the last idea (following the semicolon) as a separate and distinct thought--a comment, as it were, on the prior clause--and that is not quite what I had in mind.

Galley 11

32. Again, I think the commas should be removed because the clause is restrictive.
33. Same argument as #32.
34. "In" and "inward." Although inward parallels outward, the sound and rhythm of the sentence is much better, I think, with "in."