in which some of the basic evidence was presented in an appendix, even if only for
the benefit of scholars looking at the situation fifty years from now. T was able to
use Kökeritz's and Lowman's field work records in preparing for his study; future
scholars will find T's study tantalizing in its presentation of the data from his
survey. In every other way, however, they will find it a useful, stimulating, and
rewarding work to consult.
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Xenoglossy: a review and report of a case. By IAN STEVENSON. Charlottesville:

Reviewed by WILLIAM J. SAMARIN, University of Toronto

Xenoglossy refers to the phenomenon where a person speaks a language he has
not learned. It is not the same as glossolalia, which, as one sees in Samarín 1972,
refers to pseudo-language—though this would be denied by most glossolalists, who
believe that they speak real languages, and that therefore, when they 'speak in
tongues', they are really xenoglossists. It is understandable that among these
Pentecostals there are many stories of cases where a speaker's 'tongue' was
supposed to have been identified by someone in the audience who knew that
language, and who translated or at least provided the sense of the speech that was incomprehensible to everyone else, the speaker included (see Harris 1973—a popular religious booklet). Stevenson's book, however, is not interested in these cases, and refers to them only by citing two books on glossolalia (one published in 1927 and the other in 1964), although the literature is extensive.

S's review of xenoglossia, taking only 22 pages, is concerned therefore with what has been reported in connection with studies of parapsychology. The term itself was coined by C. Richet, as xénoglossie, in reporting on a case of automatic writing. S adheres to the anglicization of the word (whereas I, for purely esthetic reasons, prefer to make xenoglossia analogous to glossolalia, which term is also used by S). For him the term applies both to the phenomenon in general and to individual cases. I find the latter use awkward: e.g., 'xenoglossies occurring during hypnotic regression'.

The present work would appear to be an important contribution to the study of xenoglossia by comparison with all that has preceded it. S accepts the authenticity of 'paranormal components' in xenoglossia. His goal, in fact, is to provide convincing evidence for one such case. In his words: 'I report the following case because I believe that it provides an example of genuine responsive xenoglossy. I think it almost certain that the medium could not have learned Swedish, the foreign language concerned, by normal means. Yet under hypnosis she underwent a transformation to a male personality which called itself Jensen and which spoke and understood Swedish in an intelligible way. This personality was not merely reciting meaningless phrases: there was exchange of meaningful phrases with Swedish-speaking persons' (23).

As suggested by this quotation, S considers it important to distinguish responsive from recitative xenoglossia. The one manifests the learning of a skill (what we can call linguistic competence) whereas the other only exhibits acquired information.

The case of T.E. is discussed in 66 pages. The presentation is commendable. S, who is Professor of Psychiatry and formerly Chairman of the Department of Neurology and Psychiatry of the School of Medicine at the University of Virginia, organizes his arguments carefully. The subject could not have learned Swedish by any 'normal' means. She wasn't even a particularly good student of languages. The language used by the Jensen personality speaking through the medium was indeed Swedish; there was no possibility of fraud; and so forth. S dispassionately considers one possible explanation after another. If he has ignored any, I cannot suggest what it might be.

S believes, then, that this case provides strong evidence of the survival of human personality after death. And languages persist after their speakers are dead. If this is so, linguists must consider bolder hypotheses than that, e.g., of universal grammar. Whatever the explanation might be, xenoglossia should not be ignored by linguists. If language or parts of language can be acquired paranormally, this should teach us something about the nature of language itself. Anomalies, as much as normal language, will make their contribution to a theory of language. Another reviewer might expatiate on this point; I am more interested, consistent with my preoccupation with the field of sociolinguistics, in what we observe in this study about the layman's approach to the study of language.
What we see here, in fact, is a failure to account for all the linguistic facts. For S, the overriding fact is that the subject produced intelligible Swedish while under hypnosis, and interacted (albeit minimally) with 'sitters' who spoke Swedish to her. The interaction, however, could hardly be called conversation. The transcription of one session, to which 168 pages are devoted (representing over one-half of the book), reveals that the Jensen who 'manifested' through T.E. was a very passive participant. Usually tired, sleepy, and sluggish, he responded in single words to what was said to him (39), only rarely in full but very short sentences (29). Moreover, they matched very poorly, in terms of normal dialog, with questions put to him; e.g.,

Q. *What do you do for a living?*
A. *En bonde.* [A farmer] (101)

Q. *Hur många gånger går du till Haverö? Går du dit ofta? [How often do you go to Haverö? Do you go there often?]*
A. *Ja, ja. Här torv.* [Yes. Yes. Here market.] (107)

The functional vocabulary of the personality was just over a hundred words, but of these, only 60 were introduced by Jensen before they were used in turn by the interviewers (47). In many instances it was difficult to understand what Jensen was saying (35, 38, 96, 97). There were occasional grammatical mistakes (39, 40, 107). In fact, one Swedish-speaking person who participated in the study could only say that 'by and large [the subject] used the correct articles ... and correct inflectional endings' (37). S is impressed by the subject's accent, which he says was 'mastered ... so perfectly' (55). But while it is considered excellent (48), it was excellent only 'in some places' (71); some words were actually mispronounced (47), and others had an American quality (48).

Obviously, the speaker did not have the kind of command of this language that one would expect of a native speaker. There is also some doubt about what the language really was, in spite of S's acceptance of it as Swedish. For one thing, Jensen's usage is said to have 'a clearly Norwegian flavor' (32). One of the Swedish-speaking interviewers testified that the language in question was 'Swedish with a little Norwegian in it' (37). Another reported that it had 'considerable Norwegian and some Danish in it', and that both the accent and vocabulary resembled those of Norwegian (37–8): e.g. *morsom* in the sense of 'funny', 'curious', or 'interesting' (215). However, Jensen did not understand Norwegian well when it was spoken to him by one of the interviewers (48). Even the Swedish dialect could not be identified. S reports that someone from the Dialekt- och Folkminnesarkivet in Uppsala suggested that it might be 'a middle Swedish' rather than a northern or southern variety (48). S also has difficulty in locating the language in time. According to one of his Swedish-speaking collaborators, this is an 'early form of Swedish' (37). But it is on the basis of material culture—whether or not objects were identified and what they were called—that S concludes that this was 'definitely modern Swedish'. He therefore places it between 1400 and 1800 A.D., sometime before 'the Scandinavian languages had fully differentiated from their common predecessor Old Norse' (36).

It is said that Jensen spoke as well as understood English, but nothing is said about the quality of this English or of its location in place and time. One of his English utterances, of which there are very few in this book, is certainly anomalous. When he was asked if he knew about the Dutch, he answered by saying 'Dutcherman, they are ruler' (36).

S is aware of Jensen's checkered linguistic performance. He attempts to account for it only by the personal history of this personality: his mother came from Norway, his father possibly from central Europe (49); Jensen himself emigrated to New Sweden (in what is now the United States) in the 18th century (79). It is typical of S's linguistic naïveté that he failed to analyse
Jensen's English, to learn what he could about the dialect that was spoken. He should also have given some attention to Swedish interference in this second language.

What I have tried to suggest is that S has paid far too little attention to linguistic details. It would appear that the most important fact for him was that the subject, without ever learning Swedish, was observed to produce utterances in this language that were, by and large, intelligible. He may feel that everything else one might say about the verbal data could only interest linguistic specialists; if so, he failed to recognize that, without information on these linguistic technicalities, linguists would be justified in remaining skeptical of the whole study. (It is curious that, although S corresponded with linguists—i.e., linguistic scientists—he chose to use them in a very selective manner. Thus he corresponded with one over a period of six years without raising any discussion about the kinds of thing that linguists would need to know about this study. One cannot help but suspect that all, or most, of S's collaborators were in some degree or other 'fellow believers'—inclined to start with the premise that bona-fide xenoglossia is possible. On this point, however, S is silent.)

Since language constitutes, for S, evidence of the survival of some aspect of human personality after death, he would have been advised to organize his 'informant sessions' with more attention to eliciting techniques. If my students in field linguistics performed as poorly as his collaborators did, they would certainly have received some guidance from me! For example, when the interviewers showed T.E./Jensen a seed, one of them asked: 'Now, what's this? Did you ever see that before in your life?' And another immediately added: 'Tell us what it is. What do you call that? What do you call that? Hm?' (200). Maybe this is why Jensen, whose denatured peasant brain was cluttered up with at least two languages and whose messages had to be mediated through the brain of another person, found it difficult to respond to this barrage of questions with more than a word or two.

I hope readers will forgive my lapse into sarcasm; I really do believe that this is an interesting case. There are very few so well documented. Another one is perhaps that of 'Rosemary', who is supposed to have conveyed the spoken form of Egyptian of the XVIIIth Dynasty as heard from the Princess Nona (Wood 1955). From her have been collected 4910 non-English and ostensibly Egyptian phrases, some of them even recorded on gramophone records, between 1928 and 1961. Although these are not yet analysed, one researcher (not a linguist) is planning to describe the corpus. Wood admits that the data present some problems. Rosemary may not have heard or repeated correctly; and added to this is the fact that the Egyptian must speak through 'an alien throat', as the princess puts it. Wood's comment is that 'Egyptian is a language full of guttural and nasal sounds', and although 'Rosemary certainly lived in Egypt as "Vola"', 'in this life her speech-organs are adapted to English usage' (31). Compare this naïveté with S's speculation, concerning another case, that the subjects reached into the minds of the Tibetan persons and 'pulled out Tibetan words which were near or at the surface of their minds' (22).

It is appropriate that a book of this kind be reviewed in a serious linguistic journal. Cases of alleged xenoglossia, as well as all other forms of anomalous verbal phenomena, merit our attention, if for no other reason than that they are part of the total behavior—sometimes characteristic behavior—of human beings. Seeing language from a sociolinguistic perspective requires us to give attention to such data. But even those linguists concerned with the more formal analysis of the properties of language should find xenoglossic behavior a challenging field of study. Acquiring the data is a little more difficult than through introspection; but for those who are bored with trying to think up new kinds of rules for overworked grammars, the effort might be rewarding.
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