Dear Dr. Hynes:

I am delighted to have your letter of April 26 concerning Erving Goffman. We will be meeting Dr. Goffman at lunch today and I hope that we are going to succeed in persuading him to join the University of Pennsylvania. Letters like yours and Tony Wallace's are important to us in helping us reach a decision concerning our possible action.

Sincerely yours,

David R. Goddard

DRG:JP

Dr. Dell Hymes
Department of Anthropology
University Museum

CC: President Gaylord P. Harnwell
Dean Michael H. Jameson
Dear Dell:

First, thanks very much for that letter. The idea of codes in context is extremely appealing and whatever comes of where we are, I hope we can work together in the area.

Sue and John say you are to be here. My address is 2805 Hilgard; phone: 841-6545. Do please let us get together. I told John I have an empty house and would be delighted to house you. Also, except for Saturday (when I have to pick up my boy) I use my VW very little and you are welcome to borrow it. But in any case, do phone.

[Signature]
October 26, 1967

Dear Dell:

Thanks for your extremely quick reply of October 10. If you see Anthony Wallace please thank him for the kind letter he sent me. And I am sorry about your family's feeling about Berkeley; but that does leave open the other possibility.

Other possibilities for the meeting:


Gregory Bateson (if there is money to bring him from Hawaii).

? — Ned Hall (I think his role in the area is more important than his mild manner has allowed him to get credit for).

Exline (psychologist who has done considerable work at the University of Delaware on eye-to-eye looks during conversation).

? — Robert Sommer (UC Davis, psychologist, considerable work on territoriality and use of space).

As for people from the Garfinkel school, Schegloff is one possibility and David Sudnow (UC Irvine) is another.

Norman McQuown (whose place and work you know).

All of this of course is just discussion. Providing you are there and Labov, I would be willing to come; we could then haul in Birdwhistell and have a meeting. (Garfinkel is at Cambridge this year, working at Mass General I think with Eliot Mischler and I am sure he would come down.

Regards,

Erving Goffman

EG: mh
9 January 1966

Dear Brv,

We're pretty much in a state of nervous anticipation, hoping that you will decide to come. I had a long talk with Bill Labov, who is much concerned with the problems of training people to do good work, and who has been associated with Columbia (despite his real work, we hope, to give a course of seminar; and it might even be possible in two or three years to pry him loose from Columbia, if things don't go better there. He was much impressed by your presentation at the Annenberg conference, and reviewed it himself in connection with his own work at his Columbia University Seminar on the Use of Language the next week. Kater Bill said that if you were to come to Penn, that would be a strong pull for him. I shouldn't misrepresent the situation— he is very much tied to New York, and other things equal, would stay there. But he is disappointed with the prospects for training there, and he is quite supportive of the kind of work he wants to develop. I think he things there is much he could learn from you, and that there are things he could contribute to the kind of work you want to develop. In any case, I, we have close and constant communication; and that professorate involving and consulting him, were you in Philadelphia, would be easy.

Ward Goodenough will write you on behalf of the department as acting chairman, probably in more or less official tone. I know that Ward himself is very strongly in favor of your coming; he has students read your stuff, and both he and Bill Davenport feel that your presence would bring something seriously lacking here. It is understood that you want to give seminars with a small number of students, and would be involved with only a few anthropology students. (If you wanted to give other kinds of seminars and courses, that would be fine, but we don't understand that as what you want nor is it expected). Bill was talking excitedly about the prospect of a few good anthropology students getting involved in your kind of work, and attempting to implement it in other cultures; work in the United States is also, and clearly, something this department accepts (we have recently had a couple of dissertations, one for work in Philadelphia, one for work in Baltimore). The thought is that for you to work as you wish with a few students will mean both lead to some good work being done by them, and indirectly act as a very desirable stimulus to other students.

We've been holding off on definite formulation of the idea of a training program, waiting to know first if you would be coming, and waiting you to have a part in shaping it, if it seems something you would want to be part of. The sociolinguistics program would be very selective of students; four or five a year, I understand, is about as many as one could expect to ask support for. Such a program ought to help attract and provide for students who wanted to work with you, whatever their departmental basis. Sol Worth, Ken Goldstein, and I have talked about it in the past, and linguistics is...
favorable, too.

I believe that we are gradually building up an informal constellation of people with related interests and affinities that is approaching a sort of critical mass, where there just would be a large enough group who understood the point, of what you are doing, and what the rest of us are doing.

Finger-pointing must also is on its way to being institutionalized, at least on the anthropology/linguistic front as part of all this. We can play in the basement after my seminar.

Obviously Philadelphia doesn't have a bay or an ocean, but it does have a lot of nice things, and many advantages in being close to New York and Washington. If there is anything whatever about living here that you would like to know, get information on, my wife would be eager to help; she is marvelous at the low-down on such things.

I've been trying to think of the things that are vital to you in deciding what to do about the University's offer; the place isn't perfect but it has great possibilities, and I think believe you would find it a good place for yourself. And I want very much for you to come.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Dell
December 9, 1968

Professor Dell Hymes
52, Storey's Way
Cambridge, England

Dear Buddy:

I most certainly do want to go to New Orleans next November, in any capacity that suits your pleasure. We should start doing exactly what you say we should start doing.

The grant looks like it is almost in, and that is because John and I have worked so hard. Tomorrow morning when you shave, look at yourself and try to feel guilty.

Regards to the others putting up with the English climate.

Sincerely,

Erving
June 23, 1969

Dr. Dell Hymes
52, Storey's Way
Cambridge
England

Dear Dell:

I would be totally delighted to see your little monograph brought out in our series, as would everybody else who is connected with the venture. The big question is whether it is in your interests to offer your product to a small publication. Can you arrange for me to have a copy of what you want published, so that I can send it in to Gordon Hubel (who will be with us only through July) and start the ball rolling?

My word on Labov is that psychology is going to bring him here. The Center for Urban Ethnology offered to give him his first year for pure research, or part-time for five years, in a decision made in your physical but not spiritual absence; but it turns out this help will not be necessary.

See you soon.

Sincerely yours,

Erving

EG: bnb
P.S. Do arrange as soon as possible for me to get a copy of your manuscript so that I can start it through the works.
Dear Err,

The painful but inevitable date approaches when we must leave the woods and return to the jungle. During July I received a letter from Ben, proposing that a committee consisting of Bob and I review candidates for presentation to the department, and a letter from Dave, saying that he and Olga from the vantage point of Mexico were certain that they did not want to stay in Philadelphia (Samara Temple too being excluded on that ground). Not having heard from you about your meeting with the Provost, I informed that it was not encouraging.

I'm not of absolutely certain mind. I was sick to my stomach about the situation all the way West, and trust that that will not return on the return journey. The summer has been good in many ways, but I'm not sure how much if any of it is transferable from the vicinity of Mt. Hood. I've been accepted by the Wesleyan community as never before, and while the task will be hard to perform at this particular point in time, this is the time it needs doing—that is, together with Michael Silverstein, providing a dictionary, texts and grammar finally that these people can have. If I should get the NIH grant for which I applied, that would make substantial in 1972-3 financially possible, and I could devote myself to the crypt analysis on which the grant is promised together with the supporting work on the linguistic materials. There is nothing I enjoy more than Jimmy in enthusiastic about prospects of working here too, for her dissertation and beyond.

My mind still sticks on the question of bringing in a junior person. I don't see how I could encourage a junior person (without torture) to come. I don't trust the selection-seeking process, and don't believe it is based on professional/scholarly criteria. I am pretty certain that I will take a job in the West if a suitable one should arise—it may not, and there are many reasons for staying in Philadelphia. In particular, you and Bill. If I could find some way of working there indefinitely without having to associate with the senior staff in anthropology, I would repress the immediate past. But not only am I not a member of the club, as the past year made clear, I have every reason and desire not to want to be. I see no one of that bunch that I want to be like or in whose intimate company I can imagine growing old in an honest way. I wrote about this point of the two departments, one the inner club to Tony and he did not deign to comment, but I applied a sneer. I do not think I can trust him, and indeed there is evidence of understanding going on last spring to which he did not make us party. In sort, I see no way to change the feeling that I would be regularly eating shit to pretend that I regarded the bunch as a moral community of which I could feel conscience be a member. I have no plans or desire to cause trouble or make a nuisance of myself, quite the contrary; but I don't like the taste of it either.

Under the circumstances the thought has occurred to me to thank Ben for his proposal (which is pretty much what I proposed in the confrontation in May), and to say as nicely as I can that it does not seem possible at this time to proceed with a junior appointment in the field. That I do not know of anyone as qualified as Dave for the needs of the department (true) who is available (false) and I could not in good conscience encourage a junior person to come. Besides, there has been very little activity the past two years; our Ph. D. candidate of the spring is dead (Garnett Robinson) and the first year student (
of last year (Susan Brown) has withdrawn to Pittsburgh with her husband. The
news of Joe and of Mark David leaves Bernard Wailes holding the bag, and
from the standpoint of the department the greater need probably is for a junior
appt. in archaeology. The only hope the dept has of maintaining any reputation
indeed would seem to be in the historical, prehistoric fields, associated with the
Museum. There is indeed a need for someone to take care of the Linguistics
Laboratory, a task for which I have no competence; that need might be met by
bringing John Fought into the graduate group. He works with Mayan languages,
and has seemed to like him, and he knows technical equipment, as I do not.

I do not think I can try to move into Linguistics—they have problems now
of justifying their staff in relation to student numbers, and it is important that
Fought and Gandy have the chance for tenure. If a new department or program
in the social sciences develops, or a new program can be launched, I would
be glad to join it and even to take some responsibility for it. But basically,
I see no prospect of a future in the anthropology department in which intellectual
directions and moral premises that I hold have a chance. Maybe I will be stuck there
the rest of my life, and many people have been in worse situations—recall
Joe and the price he paid for his opposition to the First World War—so I don’t
intend to lose time and energy griping about it. But I will not be able to make
the assumption that the department is more than a fact. The thought of having to
deal with eggs, after what he has pulled on me—reflected on often enough now
in the face of my wife—is bad enough. The prospect of that consummate
hypocrite, and apostate Spooner will maneuver himself into tenure is sort of the
last straw. The look on his slimy face, barely able to conceal his pleasure behind
a feigned regret, also helped turn my stomach in late May. When that
upcountry mob, petty bourgeois, idle and passion for a safe niche secure from
the winds of reality gets loose with tenure, the place will really be a walking
cast from a Brecht play, the ancient stereotypes of the petty- bourgeois come to life.

You and Mattingley are the only two people in the place I trust and can talk to
seriously, and whether Bob will stay, once Dave is gone, if he has the chance to
leave, I doubt. I don’t want to desert you and Bill, and if there is a way or
a necessity of sticking it out, okay.

In July there was an inquiry from Dave Holliseter at Wesleyan and I wrote back
from my thoughts about the role that undergraduate training could play. No answer,
so maybe awkwardness wasn’t appropriate. When I was in Buffalo earlier this month,
John Searle talked to me about coming back to Berekeley. Nothing very come of that
either, he discuses any influences with the powers that be now. But there is a Dept. of
Language being set up to get round the linguistics dept. there, and bring together the
good people concerned in a broad way with language. He said he was going to look into
it when he got back and maybe he will. We are fixed for two years probably in any case,
next year for sure, and the year after probably, esp. if the NSE grant is awarded.
And maybe indefinitely who knows. (Incidentally the picture of Koyecono I got from both
Searle and people at Buffalo does not encourage hope of real action in good directions).
But in sum, sometimes after a flase up I feel I was wrong and want things to return
to a prior level or character. That hasn’t happened. The only new thoughts I have
riding out past Mt. Hood to the reservation, trampng around streams, shopping work,
talking with Indian friends, forgetting what a tie or slacks feels like, is that
this is where I really live, but like an African black in the colonies, one has to go
far away to work the tax. I’m more a part of this scene after 5 days than
I’ll ever be there. i’m grateful to Gini that she saw that this was what I and both of
us needed. If only there was a source of income to stay out here, we would.
God knows how many years I have left, and that bunch back there don’t deserve any of them.
Incidentally the thrill of many years was to be recognized in the trading after
during a memorial feast and be singled out to have to be given not just the
general stuff that everyone gets, but a blanket. Well, there may be important things
I don’t know. Get me straight if need be. I trust you. 
Dear Ery,

I have looked through the manuscript of 'Speech play on display'. All the individual contributions are publishable; several are first-rate. Given the absence of a book on the subject, and the importance of the subject to an adequate view of language, or of communication and conduct, I think that we could justify publishing something that departed from our policy heretofore of one-author books. But I am not happy with the present manuscript as it stands. I think it has the makings of the book that would justify our urging its publication, but that some further editorial reflection and action is required.

To say this is not to disparage the ms., in any way. It is better than many collections that have found their way between covers in recent years. It is only that we have to be as rigorous as possible, given the difficulty situation of all presses, and particularly this one, and of course our concern for our own series.

I have a number of specific comments to make on the papers, but the general comments are these:

(a) the introduction is good in what it does. I like the tone.

I like the setting of the contributions within a thoughtful discussion of the general concept of play. But I think that the introduction needs elaboration. While it develops the links among the articles in relation to the concept of play, it does not sufficiently emphasise the contribution of the book as a whole to various related fields.

The argument, I should think, would be along these lines: attention to language has focussed on reference, on meaning as semantics in the narrowest sense. A book that makes salient speech play forces (reinforces) attention to the importance of expressive meaning as well; such a book, and such study, has an essential part to play in developing an adequate conception of the nature of language and its roles in human life.

Moreover, the contributions show what is needed is comprehensive ethnographic or other empirical studies. Individual expressive features and uses are important (Stankiewicz on 'expressive language' (in Sebeok, Bateson, ? , Approaches to Semiotics, should be cited here)); but many problems specific to particular disciplines can only be adequately grasped and analysed in a larger context. Thus, Sutton-Smith students of folklore and literature discuss and debate the definition of genres such as riddle; Sutton-Smith shows that the riddle (at least in the communities he studied) belongs within a developmental sequence of genres. Ethnologists analyze the semantics of kinds of speech, and the extent to which the joint analysis of terms of reference and terms of address, and in contexts of a certain type of verbal genre, is necessary to understand the knowledge members of a community themselves have of the semantics of terms, and the use they make of them.

And so on; these things are not omitted wholly from the introduction. But they need to be present, in two places. ATHE
AT THE OUTSET, it should be said that various fields broach the subject—matter of the book, but deal with it partially, marginally; especially, the various fields tend to limit their attention to problems of referential meaning and definition of particular sets, genres, the like. The book aims to show that the nature of the phenomena yield only to a comprehensive point of view, rooted in a more comprehensive view of the nature and functions of language as part of human activity. That standpoint has to do with play/itsaxaxaxx is that of play.

Then, on to the rest of the present introduction; revised, as necessary in light of comments below on order and individual pieces.

Then, AT THE END, add a coda indicating specifically the ways in which the contributions enhance studies as conceived from the standpoint of particular disciplines and topics. (See p. further on this)

Some of this is present in the introduction as it stands, but integrated and dominated by the unifying concept of play. I would hope that it would be possible, without being unduly repetitively, to bring the discussion back to the ways in which the contributions bear on specific lines of work, in a way that catches the attention of readers oriented most to those lines of work.

This is not to undercut the unifying use of play, but rather to frame it (outset, end) in relation to the condition of most readers, leading into it, and then coming back from it; and so justifying it more firmly.

Now, as to the specific contents. We have really three kinds of papers, and it may be impossible of selecting at random and placing

GENERAL (synthesizing): Joel Sherzer
Sanchez and K-G. These plus introd. = 146 pp.

DEEP (case studies but with Gossen max 43
exemplary depth) 7Bricker 21
D. Sherzer 16 =59, or so 80 pp.

Cases: (okay, but not so deep) Sutton-Smith 17 (maybe belongs in Deep)
Stross 31 = 79 pages.

The last set not only adds to the length of the book (but less than 25 o/o
it also perhaps lessens the impact of the book. At least in the present arrangement. We have an introduction, and two papers, which are general, synthesizing; and individual pendants.

Now, the remaining individual papers have various kinds of significance, but I don’t think that the present arrangement sufficiently integrates them. Perhaps integration is not fully possible. But I would like to suggest the following:
Organize the papers in sets, titled sets. Such as following:

INTRODUCTION

I. IMPLICATIONS OF SPEECH PLAY FOR LINGUISTICS EXPLANATION

J. Sherzer, Play languages.

II. IMPLICATIONS OF LINGUISTICS FOR SPEECH PLAY EXPLANATION OF SPEECH PLAY

Sanches and K-G, Children's traditional speech play.

[That is, Joel stresses the greater adequacy of linguistic analysis based on knowledge of speech play; Mary and Barbra stress the need to invoke knowledge of language acquisition to understand development of children's speech play. Better titles could be found: perhaps for example Speech play and language acquisition. The two could be joined.]

I. SPEECH PLAY AND LANGUAGE STRUCTURE

J. Sherzer: Play languages and linguistic analysis.

Sanches and K-G: Children's traditional speech play and language acquisition.

II. THE CREATIVE ASPECTS OF LANGUAGE USE

Bricker, Strategies for joking with Zinacanteco kin terms.

Gossen, Verbal dueling in Chamula.

[That is, Bricker deals with a fixed set, small, of strategies. Gossen deals with a more elaborate, subtler activity.

Stress suggests an opener, extralinguistic beginning of a kind of play.

Sutton-Smith begins at a point analogous to that at which Stress starts, and goes onward.

D. Sherzer shows the significance of the perspective of the book for insight into highly sophisticated literary art. THIS IS ONE OF THE BEST AND MOST IMPORTANT PIECES IN THE BOOK; IT DESERVES GREATER ATTENTION.] More than any other, it shows the scope of the subject and the attention that the book itself deserves—not a subject limited to children and peasants, or to linguists and folklorists. Insofar as Dina's work can be justifiably taken as rooted in insight from the same sources as the others, that ought to be headlined.
Price and Price is not included here. Perhaps a closer reading, or Joel's understanding of its significance, would change my opinion. It ought to be published, it's a valuable contribution. As it stands, it is not as neatly tied down or tied together as Conklin on Hanunoo in my reader. It is a valuable empirical contribution, but does not add to the general scope, and seems redundant after Joel's paper. Joel could incorporate whatever general point it adds. I like Price; I am only being hardnosed about a viable book that we could genuinely urge the Press to publish.

I am not sure about S. His case of the two children does not seem to me to support the general conclusions. The presentation seems defective in two respects: (1) his initial comment (p. 22) about 'ease' makes no sense; 'ease' does not equate lack of appropriateness or constraint as to occasion; he himself has given four rules, why (p. 21), why does he go back on his one empirically grounded generalization (p. 24).

(2) S. says the play is surprising but we don't know that it is; what counts as being surprised among the Tzeltal? Has he no other observations, evidence, as to what goes on among Tzeltal children? or other children somewhere else? So far as this text goes, these two children could be the only ones ever in the world to act this way—crazy from malnutrition for all we know. If any general suggestions are to be given, more than one record must be offered, something said on ethnographic authority beyond it.

In general, this is weak and does not seem to show much thought. I like Brian and have had an interesting correspondence with him recently. But this doesn't accomplish anything. Would the children act this way at any time, in presence of anyone? I doubt he would want to say that. If not, then there is some constraint on appropriateness and it is hard to see the sense of his 'anti-rule' Hemamga. He says it is rather typical (p. 8, line 7), but in fact it seems that the two children were NOT among siblings within the household compound where much of the play takes place and is observed (pp. 7-8). IS IT BECAUSE THEY WERE OUTSIDE THE COMPOUND, AWAY FROM SIBLINGS, 'in front of my house', that they were so free with this sort of thing? May be not.

It is absurd anyway. If it is appropriate to behave this way than is the appropriateness condition there. It's not as if all rules have to be completely constraining and negative. (Though presumably not all situations are defined as situations of play for even children). And it is a whopping nonsequitur to say (pp. 21-22) that the linguistic rules don't specify sociolinguistic conditions, but this doesn't bother the users (pp. 21-22). HOW DID BARABARA LET THIS PASS? Since when did linguists rules, grammatical alone, ever constrain anyone's sociolinguistic conduct in the senses mentioned by S. (when to speak, to use metaphor). Isn't it the point of the book to argue that it is a failure of linguistic study NOT to go on to consider such things as when to speak, to use metaphor, etc.???? IF TAKEN SERIOUSLY, without reflection on its illogic, this statement of S. undermines the premise of the entire collection!! Ix rules are enough. Two tzeltal children show it.

(notice that S. speaks [p. 21, lines 6-7 up] of 'contexts approximating that in which the two children were participating'
comparative study of dimensions of speech play, typologically, going beyond Mary Haas' broad addition, subtraction, etc., to specificity of the sort given by Conklin in Hanunoo, but traced in relation to cultural areas, language types, etc. Much could be done. They say stimulate consolidation and exploration (intro. 14) but more CHALLENGE could be LAID DOWN. (Price and Price contribute to this; as does Hale on Walbiri semantic reversal in a paper published elsewhere)

THE SUGGESTION about specifying contributions to specific lines of research could be couched in terms of research that is needed. It is important, I think, as part of our justification for publishing. Not only a set of good papers, but a one-time significant effort. With regard to future policy: we would not take sets of papers per se, but only where we believed that the set was a way to make an important point for the field as a whole. We would rule out sets of papers for which an initial book-form focus of attention, of current value, already existed. If there were another set of papers on speech play, available in book form, and stimulating the subject and its contributions to the general field, we'd not consider this one, no matter how excellent the individual contributions.

Does that make sense?

Now, further on some individual papers.

INTRODUCTION: pp. 5-6: not 'reaction to', but 'opposition to' the deviance view. Cite K. Burke, 'Psychology of literary form', in his Counterstatement (in the 1980s), don't restrict the deviation view to American linguists and psychologists; there is the French tradition of de Saussure (Valéry, et al.). In this connection might want to note my comments, p. 335, in Sebeok (ed.), Style in language (citing Burke) and pp. 109-110 of my paper there.

p. 8: Jakobson 1960 is not cited in the references.

p. 9: 'control tower' is not commensurate with 'speech play'; at the right of the diagram at bottom, substitute something like 'purely instrumental'.

A topical index to the book might be possible and would be valuable. p. 17, l. 5: Hanunoo is the right spelling.


p. 19, line 6: this is bad. I have put revisions in the ms.

p. 20: vastly oversimplified and in error. Consider work of Carol Chomsky, Lella Gleitman, etc., Labov on stages of acquisition. Must qualify as indicated in ms. notes.

p. 31, last paragraph: Say this at the outset, too, to signal significance of this section.
p. 37. This analysis is not wholly convincing. If the rule is that the rhyme demarcates line, then it is okay; it even has a curving pattern, from short to long to short again, in terms of syllable lengths:

Since the first part of the throw-away last line repeats the initial rhyme line, and rhyme, perhaps it is only the last 4 syllables alone which defeat expectation and constitute throwaway. So one has:

A neat little pattern, if one looks at it closely. It is not at all evident that the 3 beat line applies to all of it. It rather appears that the pairs of 3 beat lines are enclosed by 2 pairs of 2 beat lines. The repetition of the first line of the first pair sets up expectation of a rounding off of the only metered rhyme, and then, in just 4 syllables, 2 lambs: zilch.

Who decided that the line printed as first line was only one line anyway? the source? or Roger? PLEASE TAKE THIS ANALYSIS INTO ACCOUNT BEFORE PRINTING THE ONE INK THE TEXT.

p. 44, note: so does DH and his brother Corwin. (Know this from inside of his B.B. and inside of my own book of 1909 in Portland) p. 67, 1. 4: overstated: 'considerably' would be more just. p. 68-9: This probably reflects the public official disapproval of attention to stylistic surface in white middle class culture. Is it the same among blacks, working class???? Don't miss out entirely on historical perspective, recalling the 'school of Donnet' euphuisms, etc. Another sin of the middle class.

(Cf. Lantham, Style: an anti-textbook, ch. 13, on American public education disattentions to stylistic surface).

The df underlined definition on p. 8 is a little awkward, in its utmost abstractness. Something like: the answer to which involves preserving in the questions' object of reference.
so again, it's not the semantic relationship alone that defines the genre's activity.

As to Price, on interest in other languages, this is not apparently a product only of subordination and slavery; cf. R. P. Salisbury, article on bilingualism in New Guinea among the Siane [si-3-ne] now reprinted in J. Pride, and J. Holmes, Sociolinguistics (Penguin, 1972).

In sum:

Obviously it would be difficult for Barbara to drop pieces after so long a commitment to the authors. But it is not her responsibility, if, the expected publisher having reneged, we offer to publish the book, but make certain conditions in order to be able to do so. She could consult others, as to whether or not this is acceptable. And perhaps there are counterpoints to be made to my comments. At the present, I would propose that we recommend publication of the book (if you agree), on the basis of:

(1) some expansion of the introduction along lines suggested,

(2) minor revisions (a Press editor may catch some things too)

(3) a table of contents as follows:

INTRODUCTION: M-C and R.J. Sherzer

SPEECH PLAY AND LANGUAGE STRUCTURE
J. Sherzer, Play languages and linguistic analysis
Sanchez and K-C, Children's traditional speech play and language acquisition

CREATIVE ASPECTS OF LANGUAGE USE
Bricker, Strategies for joking with Zinacanteco kin terms
Gossen, Verbal dueling in Chamula

(??Sutton-Smith, A developmental account of fiddles)
P. Sherzer, Saying is inventing......
puzzling question the answer to which involves preserving the
question's object of reference, synonymically, but reclassifying
its significance, synonymically.

Is this better than: puzzling question, the answer to which
involves giving a different meaning involves giving
taking the words of the question in a different meaning.

(One might have riddles playing on other than 'objects of reference')

But what about:

"Why don't you need to take food to the beach?"
"Because you can always eat the sandwiches there."

Maybe, then:

riddle: a question and answer sequence, such that the
question sets up an answer which exploits different meanings for
the same word(s).

So that an inexact question could intentionally provide for a
riddling answer. This verges into spontaneous punning (or punning
involving conventional play on words). Such does occur.
Perhaps the point is that riddling is an activity, conventionally
defined, and in which the question has to come from the
one who provides, or stands ready to provide, the answer.

So that PARTICIPANT RELATIONS are necessary to differentiate
true riddling from punning. Sutton-Smith's 'puzzling' attribute
of the question implies the participant role (the Q is puzzling,
in principle, because answer is known to the questioner but not,
hopefully, to the one asked; though people might play by exchanging
riddles known to be known to both). But the limitation of the
definition primarily to the synonymic/homonymic relation does not
suffice to exclude play on the part of the answerer alone, i.e.,
punning. Or so it seems on first glance.

Thus this is the case (my notion that participant roles
need to be specified), then the paper falls short of what satisfactory
ethnographic study would require; not only collection of instances
by age and grades, but observation of action, and analysis in terms
of components of events other than verbal text alone.

Again, one could open up: p. 12, apple: it is a commonplace
of Indian American conversation (Apple: red outside, white inside,
in ethnic sense; some resort to 'reverse colors' for a while).

(End of page)
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...
Page 13, p. 7: 

Content:

"Don't make sense."

Page 22:

- "Store"?

27. One case from a general...

Examine? Discuss.

Page 24, left 4 miles after (121): (Be advised: 2 miles in big supplies.

Good luck.

Bonding? Correctly mark & penetrate?

Check form. 63. of Service 4.02. (no in Book 6/18/11? 1922)

O slt. Great! (Selling Stim?)

Dw right hand!
less blue, white blue? place more strongly - fence, 22

92 S + 6 - omit 34 s. 17

41 green (3 92 s+116)

21 blank (21 s. 1)

34 2 sh. (21 s. 1)

1/6 1/6 0 sh.

2/28

Consider included piece carefully.

or shift order (story of melody, or story before S-stand)

(visual steps)

as per sketch above.

(rubber)

Consideration: place on under shelf. (A-11.11)

Could position with color?

in 1st half only

2.5 mm

5 sh.

1 sh.

1 sh.

1 sh.

1 sh.

1 sh.

1 sh.

1 sh.
The page contains handwritten notes and calculations. The text is not clearly legible due to the handwriting style. It appears to include mathematical operations, possibly involving algebra or arithmetic, along with some annotations and explanatory notes. The page seems to be part of a study or homework session with various equations and calculations written in pencil.
November 15, 1974

Professor Joel Sherzer
Department of Anthropology
University of Texas
Austin, Texas 78712

Dear Joel:

On behalf of Dell and myself, I inquired of Erwin, the editor of the University of Pennsylvania Press, about the possibility of the Indian language book, to run about 450 pages with the odd diacritical signs here and there, and a subinvention of $1000 from the University of Texas. Apparently the costs would run around $7000 and Erwin feels that if $5000 could be raised, there might be a possibility. We buried scholarship, praised the wage that the laboring man was getting these days, and I said goodbye. I think it's a good idea to give general courses to undergraduates, but dissertation writers ought to be trained in something practical, like screenplays, TV scripts, and grant proposal writing.

You are boobs, party poopers, etc. for not going to Mexico City.

Love to the great French chef,

Erving Goffman

E3/LAD

cc: Dell Hymes
May 17, 1976

Mr. Erving Goffman
2048 Rittenhouse Square
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

Erv:

Dell Hymes and I are more or less inclined to hit the Press Editorial Committee with a manuscript on THE SOCIAL USE OF METAPHOR, edited by David Sapir. It belongs to what is sometimes called symbolic anthropology, the anthropology of meaning, the study of symbolic action. You can get a notion of the enterprise from the enclosed Table of Contents and the Preface.

Dell asks: are you disposed to go along with us on this one, so far as including the book in the Conduct and Communication Series is concerned?

Regards,

Robert Erwin
Director

cc: D. Hymes
THE TOURIST: By Dean MacCannell, 214 pages. Basic Books, $12.50 hardcover, $5.95 paperback

"FOR MODERNS," says Dean MacCannell, "reality and authenticity are thought to be elsewhere: in other historical periods and other cultures, in purer, simpler life styles. The tourist, then, becomes a traveler in modernity, an importer of ideas, and tourism itself serves as 'the ethnography of modernity.' "

"Modernity" is one of the key words in "The Tourist." It refers to a "post-industrial" society in which, according to the author, we affirm our basic social values not in work, but in leisure. In what may be part of a consistent tendency to overgeneralize, Mr. MacCannell contends that creativity, intimacy and spontaneity are more likely to be found in our free time than on the job.

"The deep structure of modernity," he writes, "is a totalizing idea," an ethnographer's version of "one world.

"As a tourist, the individual may step out into the universal drama of modernity." Only tourism, according to him, can deliver a "total" experience. It is also part of the "collective quest for an over-arching system... which makes of the entire world a single solitary unit.

We are all tourists, says the author, desperately engaged in the denigration of otherness. The decline of religion, our once-successful organizing force, has left us with an indiscriminate hunger for experience in the hope that, when we have it all, it will fit together like a jigsaw puzzle.

"The touristic integration of society," Mr. MacCannell observes, "resembles a catalogue of displaced forms. Even work, according to his rather extreme view, has become little more than a touristic attraction. The fact that he uses work in a fairly stereotypical sense only partly mitigates the sweepingness of his statement.

More structural in his anthropology than Claude Lévi-Strauss, who held that an ethno-logy of modernity is possible, more semiotic in his analysis than the "epigraphic" Roland Barthes and Marshall McLuhan, dissatisfied with Erving Goffman's "Front-Back" dichotomy, dividing it into six stages, Stage one is the front region, "the kind of social space tourists attempt to overcome or get behind." Stage two is a "touristic front region that has been decorated to appear, in some of its particulars, like a back region: a seafood restaurant with a fishnet hanging on the wall." Stage three: "a front region that is totally organized to look like a back region; the live shows above sex shops in Berlin." Stage four: "a back region that is open to outsiders; official revelations of the details of secret diplomatic negotiations." Stage five: A cleanup or improved back region. Stage Six: Goffman's "Mysterious back region, a genuine otherness, toward which the tourist incessantly strains in his lust for authenticity, spontaneity and intimacy.

The tourist is confronted by an "infinite regression of stage sets," which, depending on the degree of his sophistication, he will recognize and attempt to penetrate. We might define tourism, in this sense, as a cultural rape or strip-tease. Just as it used to be said that American girls went abroad to have affairs with foreign men, so the American tourist now has romances with foreign cultures. Tourism is so widespread, says the author, that for several days in August every resort in the temperate zones is filled. The whole world of tourism is booked solid. The ultimate trip today is that airplane flight to the exact location of the North Pole.

"The Tourist" is one of those books that can be best enjoyed for its heuristic value, for the questions it raises as much as for the answers it offers. Here's a good example: "... by refusing to distinguish between truth and untruth, the modern consciousness can expand freely, unfettered by formal considerations. At the same time, it is necessarily undermined by an agonizing doubt." One could hardly find a better description of "The Tourist" itself: an exciting trip, some stunning goods.
December 6, 1976

Mr. Robert Erwin, Director
University of Pennsylvania Press
3933 Walnut Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19174

Dear Bob:

Enclosed the outline of and sample papers for the proposed Sankoff volume. Dell, I think, is familiar with most of the papers, and so I am sending him only the outline. Sankoff won't be long in these parts, and I hope we can tie the thing down with a decision quickly. Let me know about anything else you might need in this connection by phone.

Seasons greetings,

Erving Goffman

EG/LAD

cc: Dell Hymes

Enclosures
5 July 1977

Dear Erv,

Thanks very much for your letter of June 27. Your analysis of Maynard's paper is very cogent. I won't publish it.

I appreciate your Penguin agent asking about Foundations. I remember there was some interest there. What has happened is that about two years Tavistock Press asked to bring it out in England, and indeed, over a year ago were supposedly well along. There was then some delay, a change in personnel (I remember discussing the question with someone who had left Tavistock for Open Court in London after the 'Festival of the Social Sciences' affair). Well, at last Tavistock got going. They waited last summer for a foreword promised by Basil Bernstein, which was never forthcoming. And finally about two months ago, the book came out in England. It was mentioned in a Tavistock ad then in TLS, but hasn't been reviewed there. I would have been glad to have Penguin bring it out, that probably would have been advantageous, but am seem to recall that I was already obligated to Tavistock when Penguin first came up. I may not recall everything rightly.

I am hoping to finish at last the second volume of papers for Penn. It won't perhaps be as generally interesting as the first, in that it will focus on anthropology (and in England I sense that American anthropology is not very welcome, e.g., John Sewell's experiences, and the side comments in Im. M. Lewis' recent little book). This is the volume that was planned a long time ago, mostly the same, but somewhat different. I want to include as last item the paper for the AAA meetings last November.

I have been told that the NLM issue is just out and should get some reprints shortly, and certainly will send you one.

In the spring I undertook to stir up some business for the Penn series, among other things writing Ray McDermott. Harvard had a negative reading but has not abandoned the idea, and in the coming year on the ms. He writes that if you and I would give it a careful critique, that would be inducement enough to offer the ms. to Penn. I also wrote Mehler to find out status of his ms. It is being considered at Harvard also. (Both facts through agency of Michael Cole). If Harvard doesn't take it, Bud would be glad to have us consider it. It may be annoying to be second to Harvard, but their reasons for not taking the books, if they don't, probably almost certainly are the mirror-image of our reasons for thinking them worth publishing. Ray apparently got a lot of criticism in terms of the dominant statistical-quantitative methodological language of U. S. education. Which dominance of course I want to subvert.

I hope everything has gone all right with Gillian's appointment. When I left, it had been on the docket of the Provost's Staff Conference, but not yet acted upon; the last minute June crisis of budgets through FAS, among others, into turmoil and uncertainty—Greg
said there was still not a problem, because of the reinvestment funding. But he was in a despondent mood about PAS generally when I last was with him. He could use moral support if opportunity arises. I worry particularly about prospects in sociology if present trends continue unvaried. It would appear that there would be no chance of tenure for Eli Anderson, for instance, whatever the merits, on purely financial-categorical grounds. If he were to get into work involving education, maybe there would be a chance to work something out involving GSE—that's just hopeful thinking.

We are getting going on a project involving implementation of a reading program in District 1 (the district around the University), and trying to make ethnography a part of it—for the principals, many of whom will be entering a special doctoral program at GSE—and for the teachers (Sawed and Rose have helped Jim Larkin begin to introduce ethnography into the teacher training)—and for the communities. Mort Botel, who is author of the reading program and who is organizing the whole thing, is enthusiastic about an ethnographic approach. We are working this summer on a proposal to Ford through the University. Jim Larkin is coordinating it. If we can get outside funding, there, or in Washington (Botel is working on that), maybe we can involve Ray McDonald in guiding some research of his kind in the spring, or a year from now; and maybe we can launch some "urban ethnography," guided by Sawed, Shirley Heath, etc. The ideal would be a sustained program over the years focused on the Philadelphia area. Eli is interested in such a thing. Maybe the Center for Urban Ethnography could rise again, phoenix-like, and retain Eli on an adjunct (part-teaching, part research) basis, after the tenure crunch came. If you have any thoughts and suggestions along such lines, they'd be very welcome. The University these days appears willing to be cooperative in working out any appointment for which there is money and an appropriate category.

Have a good Guggenheim. Will you get back to Philadelphia? or when? We will be back in September, of course.
Dr. Erving Goffman  
518 University Museum  
Fl

Dear Erv:

Warren Slesinger of the Press has asked if I think the manuscript by Nancy Dorian, THE DEATH OF LANGUAGE: A STUDY OF A GAELIC-SPEAKING COMMUNITY, suitable for our "Conduct and Communication Series."

You may know about the book already, since Gillian reviewed it for the Press, as did Bill Labov.

I would think myself that the book would be suitable in being analogous to the character of Gillian's book. There appears to be a good deal of clear accounting of the social setting of the linguistic change. From what I have seen of her work, she writes well. In its own sphere, the study is in keeping with your concern about "the neglected situation." It refers language change squarely and inescapably to the social setting in which its causes lie. At the same time there is control of linguistic fact in close detail. A blow struck for the unity of the two that so many manage to avoid.

In any case, the book would certainly do us credit.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Dell H. Hymes  
Dean

DHH: js

cc: Warren Slesinger
Dear Dell,

Thanks for your letter on Sue's manuscript. I agree we should publish it but, like yourself, I was a little disappointed--although perhaps not fully in the same way. The introductory conceptual material on species constraints on communication is a late superimposition and not entirely relevant. It draws from Hall very closely, and this part of his writing can only be taken as a secondary source, and a widely available one at that. One might have expected Sue to go back to the materials that Hall read and do her own workup. Coincidentally her actual conceptual frame draws from Hall too, but a different aspect, namely, his argument about the unintentional misunderstandings created in cross-cultural contacts because of different interaction practices.

I sensed also a rather glib involvement in San Diego Eth Meth. "Conversational Analysis" centered in audio tapes and strict turn taking, focusing on utterances much more than on face-to-face interaction generally. Sue's approach (I feel rightly) addresses itself to the situational matrix in which talk is embedded, drawing as much on visual cues as on audible ones, and points to the participation framework (if I can use my term) in which talk occurs. And all of this could in fact be more easily presented as a critique of conversational analysis as opposed to a continuation and extention of it. The same could be said for her (and Hall's thesis concerning cultural differences in communication practices. All of this might be partly a product of Sue's apparently not have last 4 or 5 years of discourse literature, of which, especially in regard to classroom interaction, there has been a great deal.

I feel we are going to have a problem with our criticisms. Had I not been co-editor of the series, I would have made specific suggestions on the ms as I read along, and then argued with Sue about them, as I would ordinarily do. But I didn't take such notes because I felt my complaints would not be taken as those of a critic, to be attended to or not as the writer sees fit, but as an editor who might not accept a ms if displeased by it. You might be in the same position. Let's have a chat about it.

Sincerely,

Erving

EG/ki
March 11, 1980

Erving Goffman  
2048 Rittenhouse Square  
Philadelphia, Pa. 19103  

Dear Mr. Goffman:  

I am happy to confirm our mutual understanding that works in the Conduct and Communication Series will be issued simultaneously in clothbound and paperback editions. Work that ought not, by joint agreement, be issued in paperback will be published by us separately and not as a part of the series.  

I trust this assurance will impell you to affix your signature to the contract for Forms of Talk.  

Sincerely,  

Maurice English  
Director  

bcc: Dean Dell Hymes  
John McGuigan  

War 1 0 1980
28 February 1981

Professor Erving Goffman
Dept. of Anthropology
University Museum

Dear Erv,

Did you receive these communications from Van Horn separately? (Did we see something like this before?)

The study appears to be a useful one, but does not excite me as a book in the series. But abstracts are dull. The chapters on speech events and individuals could be fascinating or not. My impression on limited data is that it ought to address Americanists as much as sociolinguists. If we had both kinds of things, going at our Press, it would make more sense.

One wonders where the dissertation has been since 1977, but there might be personal reasons.

We are pretty fully scheduled for a bit, are we now, with your book, and mine, and that of Sol Worth's writings?

To use a distinction of your own, my impression is of merit rather than lustra.

Maxim English does sometimes use words unfortunately, if quoted correctly—didn't realize we started our series with a disreputable press, and failed to redeem it.

all best,
24 December 1931

Dr. Erving Goffman
University Museum

Dear Erv,

I was delighted to hear from John McGuigan that your book has been nominated for an award (I think the National Book Award?), and also to see it featured as the first review in the TLS that just arrived this week. That's great for you, us, the Press, and the series, and the University.

Although I must say that Harris' review in TLS strengthened my impression that the new professor of General Linguistics at Oxford is a man of profound superficiality. He gets so much detail so wrong—at least I have always thought that your approach on Aran did not begin with your arrival there and discovery of what the people were like—that it was not unconnected with people and traditions at Chicago. And of course when structural linguistics in this country became confident of the levels of phonology and morphology, it both investigated syntax (Hill-Trager-Smith) and launched out into paralinguistics, kinesics, literary style, and the like. And so on.

I have before me a book by one Marshall Morris (who showed up in Philadelphia a month ago—his brother works at the Science Center on a literacy project that involves Dave Smith)—very eager to be sure I'd gotten the copy he'd sent of his book. Yet in the book there is one minor reference to you and none to me. Although the book is entitled: Saying and meaning in Puerto Rico. Some problems in the ethnography of discourse. Perhaps it is no
surprise that the book begins a series, Language and communication Library, edited by Roy Harris. Whose two books, like his review of *Forms of Talk*, seem dedicated to the British vein of pooh-poohing generalization and theory, and saying, really, history and common sense show that these fashionable triggis are mistaken.

It makes Oxford seem insular, since the relevant ideas have been published and discussed to a fair extent in England itself, even, indeed, in books emanating from Oxford (ed by Edwin Ardener, and written by a student or two of his). It looks like Professor Harris wants to reinvent the subjects for himself.

I did note that he said nothing clear as to the points you yourself made in regard to response cries, the implications of the talk of announcers, etc.

Maybe in this field we have to think of ourselves as the Greek originals, and the universities of England, such as Oxford, as being like the Romans, wanting to translate and make their own what they were not able to create. So that Harris is Cicero. Although I have always felt it wrong of Antony to have proscribed Cicero, even though some scholars say it was inevitable, given Cicero's attacks, my sympathy is more strained in the modern case.

At least you have the comfort of being able to write in an inimitable way! Others can get the words, but not the tune!

Enclosed is a bit of holiday hijinks.

All best to all,
ON FIRST READING A BOOK SUBTITLED "SOME PROBLEMS IN THE
ETHNOGRAPHY OF DISCOURSE" FROM ENGLAND

Many speak of speaking, who were dumb
When rationalist Chomsky's unrelenting thumb
Pressed hard on every antecedent -ist,
Behavioral-, structural-, fell aside unmissed;
Social interaction went down the traps,
Conflated with fatigue and memory lapse.

Now all allow (even the most dogmatic)
Themselves to be at least a bit 'pragmatic'--
But happy the few, in early sixties' Berkeley,
Who saw 'the neglected situation' starkly,
Whole, saw SPEAKING to its tongue-tied core
By life framed aft, beneath, above, before,

Saw each communicative modality
Inseparable from all in the sodality
of interacting mankind--So soft
A vision and so hard to hold, of what oft
Is done but ne'er so well expressed--And 'til
Well expressed, ill seen.

The seeing, O gentle
GOFFMAN, students of language now owe, they know,
To thy quick, quirky quizzing of their status quo.

24 December 1981
July 26, 1982

Dr. Erving Goffman
518 University Museum/Fl

Dear Dr. Goffman:

Enclosed please find a copy of a letter dated 7 July 1982 from Dr. Ruth Wodak addressed to Dr. Hymes: He has requested that I forward a copy of this letter to you with the following comments.

"Dr. Ruth Wodak is well known associate in research of Wolfgang Dressler; Language in Society is publishing a summary article about their various lines of research (highly value by John Gumperz among others)."

Sincerely,

Rosemary Klumpp
Dean's Office

rk
Encl.