GLOSSOLALIA AS REGRESSIVE SPEECH*

WILLIAM J. SAMARIN
University of Toronto

Although there is considerable agreement about the phonological characteristics of religious glossolalia, based for the most part on utterances produced by native speakers of English, opinions differ widely about the causation of glossolalia. Most of the explanations are psychological or physiological.

It is demonstrated that these explanations are inadequate because they are *ad hoc* and because they do not comprehend enough data. One hypothesis is treated in detail, namely, that glossolalia is a product of trance.

This paper claims that a causative explanation for glossolalia must account for (1) religious glossolalic behaviour that is not demonstrably pathological or dissociative and (2) other spontaneous, ephemeral, and "meaningless" utterances in non-religious contexts.

It is suggested that there is a single phenomenon of linguistic "regression" whose basic component is a stream of speech produced unconsciously with early-acquired rules of phonation but more or less consciously modified according to socially meaningful values and attitudes.

It would appear, therefore, that there is a broad spectrum of anomalous speech of which religious glossolalia is only one manifestation. Moreover, although physiological-psychological states are not irrelevant to glossolalic output, socio-cultural factors are also determinant.

By tradition, linguistics has concerned itself with natural language. At one time this meant, for the most part, the study of literary languages. Then dialects of standard languages and exotic languages were included; only within the last decade or so have pidgins been added to the list. Yet many other anomalous forms of language are still ignored. They are left to other disciplines for study, especially those dealing with aberrant human behaviour.

This paper is an attempt to correct this bias, based on the belief that language will be thoroughly understood only when *all* of its manifestations are examined, not merely its ordinary, socially accepted ones.

THE THESIS

The suggestion is made here that glossolalia—one of these anomalies—is continuous with some other marginal linguistic phenomena. By "anomalous speech" is meant anything which cannot be accounted for (or generated) by the rules that apply

* This is a revised and enlarged version of a paper given at the Summer Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, Columbus, Ohio, July, 1970.

to ordinary language. Such speech can consist of brief, isolated utterances or, at the other extreme, connected discourse of (theoretically) unlimited length.

I contend that glossolalia is only the product of a set of processes that "works on" linguistic information acquired by the speaker. This "glossolalia-process" results in linguistic forms of various lengths, best illustrated in pseudo-language but which is also found here and there in ordinary language. There is no adequate term for this process: "primitivization" accounts for only part of it. I do not claim, however, to have identified all the processes nor to have accounted for them in terms of universal linguistic competence.

This interpretation of glossolalia can be summarized aphoristically in the statement that glossolalic discourse is to the glossolalia process as a pidgin is to pidginization (cf. Samarin, 1971).

TRADITIONAL "GLOSSOLALIA"

The most typical form of glossolalia is "speaking in tongues" in the Christian church, especially in its Pentecostal or "charismatic" forms. This is always believed to be God-inspired speech, and it is generally believed to be in real languages—human or heavenly, extant or extinct.¹

Glossolalia almost indistinguishable from this religious form in characteristic features is represented by pseudo-linguistic utterances created by children and adults in other contexts, such as in play or in connection with spiritism. (Samples are given below.)

A definition of this form of glossolalia is suggested as follows: Unintelligible extemporaneous post-babbling speech (1) that exhibits superficial phonologic similarity to language without having consistent syntagmatic structure and (2) that is not systematically derived from or related to known languages.²

¹ *For an objective history of Pentecostalism see Nichol, 1966; for an exposition of Pentecostal doctrine from a dogmatic point of view see Horton, 1966; for a description of the neo-Pentecostal movement from a social-anthropological point of view see Gerlach and Hine, 1970. A linguistic characterization for the layman is found in Samarin, 1968; the function of glossolalia in being socialized into the charismatic movement is discussed in Samarin, 1970 (in which the author's research methods are also discussed); the whole subject is treated from a sociolinguistic point of view in Tongues of Men and Angels: the Religious Language of Pentecostalism.*

² *Religious glossolalists claim, of course, that their utterances have meaning, and it is consistent with Pentecostal beliefs that there are "interpretations" of such utterances, usually of "messages" in a public context. However, when two such texts are compared—one glossolalic and the other its "interpretation" no covariant patterns emerge. Pentecostalists recognize this disparity and justify it by saying that what is given in natural language (also by divine inspiration) is an "interpretation" of the sense of the message, not its translation.*

Intentionally excluded from this definition are many anomalous kinds of verbal activity that some people have considered glossolalic, mostly on non-linguistic grounds. These include, for example, phonations without discernible syllable structure (such as wheezing, gasps, groans, independent articulations of contoids or vocoids), and, at the other extreme, speech that is either arcane or incomprehensible on purely semantic grounds (like schizophrenic "word-salads" and recondite utterances in some religious or poetic contexts). These are excluded, not because they should not be studied, but because they are fundamentally different from the phenomenon under examination. We must insist, in other words, that glossolalia should not refer to everything that is "meaningless" or "gibberish".

The above linguistic definition, motivated by a desire to differentiate several kinds of phenomena, contrasts with commonly accepted definitions and characterizations of glossolalia. Two from the psychological literature are the following: "a fabricated language or speech in an unknown tongue, occurring in religious ecstasy, in hypnosis, in mediumistic trances, and in certain pathological mental states" (Drever, 1958); "the entranced submission to some obsessive gibberish under the illusion of being inspired by mystical 'tongues', which are thought to come from heaven" (Luchsinger and Arnold, 1965, p. 790). And an anthropologist says that glossolalic utterances vary "all the way from a series of gurgles and grunts to deviant forms of normal language" (Burling, 1970, p. 152). From a socio-cultural point of view, of course, one would have to accept various kinds of phonations *if the members of a single social unit consider them to be glossolalic*. But a linguist's task is different, in some respects at least, from that of an anthropologist. In any case, great caution must be exercised in making cross-cultural identifications.

Our definition implies that a given sample of discourse can be identified as "tongues" on purely formal grounds. The sample, however, must be of reasonable length if its intelligibility is not already in question. No experiments have yet been conducted to determine how much text is required for identification. There is no *a priori* reason why, for example, *kitárpú kimáku*—produced spontaneously by myself when first writing this sentence—should be identified as glossolalic nonsense, since close phonologic parallels can be found in real languages, but adding *kisárku finimárku* increases the probability. Four times this much data would, in my opinion, prove the identification.

Four formal features are characteristic of tongues. The first two are most striking because they are least characteristic of ordinary discourse in natural language. They are (1) echoism and (2) a tendency towards regularity of cadence. The first is illustrated by the repetition of the vocalic sequence *i-a-u* as well as the segments *kitár* and *kisár* in my bit of glossolalia. The other two features are (3) a reduced inventory of sounds and (4) a preference for open syllables. But these are less criterial, for they are characteristic also of some natural languages.

Other products of the glossolalia process are not so easily identified on purely formal, that is, non-semantic, grounds. The difficulty is due to differences they manifest in the selection of specific processes and the degree to which these processes are applied. In

one text there might be nothing but open syllables and no consonant clusters whatsoever but very little echoism; in another text the characteristics might be fairly reversed.

But this difficulty in agreeing on a taxonomy of glossolalic artifacts should not deter us from continuing our examination of anomalous and marginal phenomena, because the processes that produce them may be more interesting (at least for certain purposes) than the end results. In any case, the observable phenomena may not be fully understood without a diachronic perspective. It is thus with the study of pidgins: although we are not in agreement on how to identify a pidgin synchronically, we are beginning to understand what it is that produces what we should like to call a pidgin. With glossolalic material, diachrony is personal, not social. It involves describing what the speaker does to what he already knows of language to produce what society would not want to call ordinary language.

Two processes are discussed here, echoism and primitivization. The first is concerned with the lineal production (or arrangement) of new or subsequent material in full or partial imitation of antecedent material. This might be called the associative or syntagmatic aspect of the glossolalia process. The other—primitivization—might be called the “morphophonemic” one. This is using the term loosely, of course; in both instances we are dealing with phonology.

Echoism is illustrated in the following breath-group from a prayer in tongues: *kóyentrey piyliysiý gambóy yambóy hambóy žəndriy peyləsəntriúw kúwnya pəkey*. And in the next breath-group is found *ziyžindriy piyliysindriy*. It is seen also in the “jargon” of a patient with Wernicke’s aphasia. In fact, the analyst makes precisely those observations that we should like to make here: “What characterizes the phonological deficit in the patient’s jargon episodes, especially episodes that demonstrate word-finding difficulty through perseveration, in their stereotypic patterns of alliteration and assonance” (Green, 1969, p. 106): e.g. /ʔamfi/ and /kimfi/. This difficulty in phonologically hitting the correct target is probably similar to the difficulty a normal, but especially drowsy adult has in repeating long, complex, and rather anomalous sentences. Among the several modifications of test sentences in one research project were changes based on the sounds of words: e.g. *The duck-billed committee of students scattered a furry advisor once a year* became *The duck-billed committee of students scurried a furried advisor once a year* (Slobin and Welsh, 1968). This same phenomenon is reported among the feeble-minded, among adults who are under the influence of cortical depressants, and among normal children. In fact, normal children play with such echoic forms. Typical is a two-year old child’s pre-sleep monologue that contained the sequence *fumbelina, tumbelina, lumbelina, Thumbelina* (Weir, 1966, pp. 166-7).

A child I observed was in a fully wakeful state. Hitting the body of the city bus in which we were riding, she repeated the expression *Gus, bus*. (The mother explained to me that *Gus* was her nickname.) The same behaviour may be behind a certain form of speech used by one five-year old child with Down’s syndrome (mongoloidism). The speech, reports the observer, was different from everything else the child said. The researcher called it a hokus-pokus style, because the child’s behaviour reminded

her of spell-casting. The examples are said to be "characteristic of the entire hokus-pokus speech": [tó-pi], [thó-phə], [tə-phə] [čá-pi]; [pi-ya-pi-tá], [pi-yi-pi-ti-pá] (Bodine, 1968).

These examples of echoic production on the part of children are not from isolated cases. Ervin-Tripp has observed (1969, p. 26) that there is strong evidence that for children under eleven, language is sound; for adults, sense. It would appear that for adults language is transparent, since adults rapidly penetrate the surface of an utterance to its meanings, to a network of connected thoughts. Children, on the other hand, seem to attend more to the surface, just as they also connect speech more to the immediate situation in which it occurs. These observations are illustrated by the word-association study of Entwisle. She found that whereas male college students associate the words *moth*, *butterfly*, and *caterpillar* with *cocoon*, male kindergarten children associate with it *racoon*, *baboon*, and *moon*. What is more relevant to our immediate purposes is the fact that children actually create words—that is, neologisms—in imitation of stimulus words. Thus, among the words kindergarten children associated with English *man* (that is, *can*, *dan*, *fan*, *hand*, *jan*, *mad*, *pan*, *ran*, *tan*) are found *shan* and *slan*. As one might expect, the inventory of words decreased as the subject's ages increased: first-grade children gave *and*, *ban*, *band*, *can*, *fan*, *han*, *hang*, *men*, *nan*, *pan*, *ran*, *snan*, *tan*; third-grade children gave *band*, *can*, *fan*, *gam*, *han*, *men*, *nan*; and fifth-grade children gave *fan*, *hand*, *man*.

Echoic devices, as no one needs to be told, figure in discourse that we call poetic. They are used there to create a special genre. But this genre is produced only in the sense that the speaker selects material from what is already common to the society. In anomalous speech, on the other hand, the speaker creates freely. The processes are the same, the constraints are different.

Jakobson saw the relationship between poetry and glossolalia years ago (as reported in 1966), and I only recently—but independently. (He by way of proverbs. I by way of the study of African ideophones.) He tells me of mumbling *kára Makára* 'Maker's penalty' when still a child and comments on the "impressive reversible alternation" of *k* and *m* that constitutes the "trite proverbial spoonerism" in *Makár da kóška*, *komár da móška* 'Makar and the cat, the gnat and the midge'. He compares these with bits of glossolalia used by members of the Khlysty sect in the eighteenth century: *kindra fendra kiraveca*, *rentre fente*, and *natrufuntru*.

PRIMITIVIZATION

By primitivization is meant the reduction of the number of discrete phonological types at the levels of "phoneme" and syllable by comparison with those of the languages known to the speaker (perhaps only the primary language). It also includes "simplification". This is clearest with syllables, which tend to be open and have either no consonant clusters, or clusters of very limited types. Simplification applies to consonants and vowels primarily with respect to the loss of units that are statistically less frequent in the speaker's normal language.

There is a sense, moreover, in which this primitivization is atavistic in a biographical and perhaps even universal sense. An open syllable, Malmberg claims, "represents the most primitive, and without doubt historically the oldest, of all syllabic types, the only one which is general in all languages" (1967, p. 129). An equally strong case might be made for the vowels of tongues, some of which have only [i] and [a]; if there is a third vowel, it is often [u] or [o]. (Other texts, however, have more vowels.) This is as true for people whose native language is English, as it is for others. Practically every time I produce pseudo-linguistic material I use only three vowels: [trishata kunamínu karabánki minamínu] and above. (Notice again the echoism.) But here is a spell from another but unidentified language that also exhibits the predominance of *i* and *a*:

Au, au, šixarda kavda!
šivda, vnoza, mitta minogam,
kalandi, indi, yakutašma bitaš,
okutomi mi nuffan, zidima (Jakobson, 1966, p. 639).

It is well known, of course, that the minimal vocalic system of human language is /a/i/u/, although Jakobson adds /a/i/e/ (Jakobson, 1968, p. 49, also Malmberg, 1967, p. 172). The priority of these vowels is due, we should imagine, to their acoustic properties, not to any social element like "sound symbolism", since vowels [i] and [a] are in greatest contrast, and then comes [u].

In other respects glossolalia does not illustrate primitivization, at least in the Jakobsonian sense. In question is the relevance of his laws of phonological solidarity. These are implicational in essence, whereby the presence of Y presupposes X, X arises before and disappears after Y. They are illustrated by the order in which classes of phonemes arise in child language: labial, labial stop/nasal, labial/dental, labial and dental/velar, and stops before fricatives. Jakobson's view is stated as follows (1968, pp. 58, 59):

"the relative degree of utilization of particular phonemes in language (i.e., the relative frequency of their occurrence as well as their combinatorial capacity) is also affected by these laws, provided that their validity is not restricted by specific structural principles. When, therefore, both phonemes—the implying as well as the implied—are introduced into child language, the implying element generally appears in speech more frequently than the other, takes part in a greater number of phoneme combinations, and possesses a more active assimilating force... Without the primary value [the implying sound], the corresponding secondary value [the implied] cannot arise in a linguistic system, and without the secondary value, the corresponding primary value cannot be eliminated. Thus, the laws of solidarity turn out to be panchronic. They retain their validity at every stage and in the course of every change of all of the languages of the world."

The inapplicability of Jakobson's "laws" to glossolalia is best attested with

TABLE 1

Frequencies of syllable-onset consonants in a sample of glossolalic prayers from a native-speaker of English.

(a) By manner of articulation	
p, t, č, k, b, d, j, g, tř, dž	54.0%
f, s, š, h, v, z, ž	24.7
m, n, ŋ, ř, l, y, w	19.0
ø (absence of consonant)	2.2
(b) By manner of articulation	
m, n, ŋ	2.9%
p, t, č, k	33.4
b, d, j	9.8
tř, dž	10.8
f, s, š, h	22.4
v, z, ž	2.3
ř, l	8.3
y, w	7.8
ø	2.2
(c) By point of articulation	
m, p, b, f, v	17.2%
n, t, d, s, z, ř, l, tř, dž, č, j, š, ž	56.7
k, g, ŋ	14.6
h	1.4
y, w	7.8
ø	2.2

TABLE 2

Frequencies of consonants in two glossolalic texts as compared with English, based on an interpretation of Wolfram, 1966, pp. 53 ff. where the total number of sounds is 3,000 in each text; the English is based on Hayden (1950). Consonants represent 48% of the total number of sounds in glossolalic Text I (as numbered by Wolfram), 55% in Text IV, and 63% in the English texts. The figures represent percentages of consonants only.

	ENGLISH	TONGUES I	TONGUES IV
Bilabial	14.1%	14.0%	11.2%
Labio- and Interdental	12.3	.002	6.4
Alveolar	56.7	61.3	60.9
Alveopalatal	5.0	13.3	6.6
Velar	7.8	.05	14.6

labials, which are supposed to be the most retentive of phonemes.³ In the religious glossolalia of one of my informants (to whom I give the name "Rev. d'Esprit"), labials represent only 17.2% of the total number of syllable onsets, followed by velars, at 14.6% but overwhelmed by apical sounds at 56.7%^o (see Table 1). This is confirmed by an analysis of the total number of consonants in the religious glossolalia of two speakers (Table 2). In the one, bilabials represent 14% and in the other 11.2% of the total whereas alveolars represent 61.3% and 60.9% respectively. These are compared with normal adult English where bilabials are said to make up 14.1% of the consonants and alveolars 56.7% (Hayden, 1950, as interpreted by Wolfram, 1966). In both kinds of speech, therefore, bilabials make up less than 20% whereas apicals more than 50% of all consonants.

My interpretation of these figures is the following. In producing a pseudo-language a speaker maximizes what is already common in his primary language. The corollary of this motivation is the diminution of what is less common. Thus, when the frequencies of stops and fricatives are compared for both English and tongues (from speakers whose native language is English) one finds a decrease in the frequency of fricatives. Whereas fricatives make up 27% of all consonants in the English corpus already referred to and stops 31.5%, in two samples of glossolalia the figures are 23.1% *v.* 49.2% and 18% *v.* 47.9% respectively. (This is therefore not evidence for the weak retentiveness of fricatives in Jakobsonian terms.)

THE SOCIAL ELEMENT IN GLOSSOLALIA

It must be remembered that only one kind of glossolalia is under consideration at the moment, namely, language-like discourse of unlimited length. Different forms of glossolalia will exhibit different characteristics. The explanation is that the glossolalic process works to some degree or other under social constraints.

It is therefore reasonable to expect that aphasics and people under drugs or in some altered state of consciousness (such as sleep or trance) will perform differently from those in a normal state. And people in a normal state will produce different products depending on how they imagine themselves as speakers, that is, as users of language. Some religious glossas are clearly simpler than others.

The same difference can be seen in non-religious forms of pseudo-language. Some texts I have examined are indistinguishable from religious ones in their segmental shape (like Text 2 below; see also samples in Le Baron); but the more complex ones are far more complex than any religious ones I have examined or heard. I have heard several hours of tape-recorded religious glossolalia, but never anything like the occultic

³ Jakobson himself, it should be made clear, did not apply his "laws" to glossolalia. But his assertions are so strong that they need to be tested. My own attempt to do so would suggest some modification of the "laws of phonological solidarity" or else necessitate segregating glossolalic pseudo-language as some kind of special case.

sample of Text 3. It would appear that the tongue speaker is less motivated to produce speech that is really exotic; or if he is equally motivated, he does not work so hard at it. The context of the speech event would certainly account for some of this difference.

ACCOUNTING FOR GLOSSOLALIA

There is therefore a social factor in the production of all anomalous or marginal speech. Man cannot escape this fact once he has been exposed to and acquired some parts of normal speech. Yet it appears that when he does depart from normal language, he follows certain paths. It is, however, not clear what triggers the departure in every instance.

It would appear that a physiological state is not the sole causation for the glossolalia process. (All speech is, of course, neurological in origin.) The same linguistic processes are seen in pathological and normal speech, in speech produced when a person is in some altered state of consciousness as well as in a normal state. A person in a fully conscious state who wants to talk a "language" no one has ever heard will in all likelihood do some of the things that an aphasic does when he really wants to talk the only language he knows.

The only reasonable explanation that can be entertained at this time is that the speaker returns to processes that characterized his language learning in early childhood, at a time when he was first learning the part of language most obvious to a child—its phonetic representation. It is in this sense only that I use the term "regressive" for glossolalia.⁴ Moreover, the adult never can go all the way back to when he knew very little of language. He knows too much to be able to do this. (Perhaps even a 6 year-old child's glossolalia will be similar to an adult's. Lack of data prevents such a comparison.)

Implicit in what I say is the rejection of trance as the causation of glossolalia. Yet this is the most common explanation of this phenomenon, perpetrated—it need not be said—by people who pay insufficient attention to a broad corpus of linguistic facts. The

⁴ *This interpretation of glossolalia as "regressive" or "primitivized" speech might be taken as supporting some kind of independence for the phonological component of language. This view, says Eugene Green (personal communication) is suggested by the behaviour of some aphasics with "isolation syndrome" who can repeat flawlessly without the least awareness of the significance of their utterances. A counter argument could be proposed by the firm believer in the "species specificity" of language competence among humans. In this view the child brings to the decoding/encoding task an ability to handle operations that we call "syntax". As children play with sound, so—we are reminded—do they play with syntax (illustrated by some examples in the writings of Ruth Weir). It is not crucial to the present discussion to take sides in this argument.*

most recent description asserts, in fact, that religious glossolalia is nothing more than an artifact of trance (Goodman, 1969).

The claim is made that there is "no other way in which to account for the perfect regularity of the organization and cross-cultural agreement in the glossolalia utterance" (p. 127). The organization—that is, the set of features—that is supposed to be trance-induced are the following:

- (1) Syllables that always have a consonant onset that is never plurisegmental;
- (2) Stretches of speech between non-final pause are of equal duration;
- (3) Stretches of speech between final (that is, sentence like) pause are of equal length;
- (4) Pause-groups always begin with a stressed syllable;
- (5) Intonation contour is regularly rising-falling;
- (6) Phonological patterns (her "audio signals") are stereotyped for each group of tongue speakers.

In addition to these structural features that supposedly signal trance is the fact that the utterances are always non-communicative.

This is the specific evidence enumerated by Goodman, but most of it is implicitly rejected by her own admission of a 14-second discourse in *comprehensible English* (therefore exhibiting no alteration other than what one expects in, for example, song) as a sample of glossolalia "rather than an ordinary-language utterance" (p. 123). The reasons given are principally two: (1) the discourse is divided into pause-groups and (2) the "stress and intonation pattern is the same" as that of three other samples of linguistically meaningless glossolalia. It would appear, therefore, that for Goodman the criterial features of glossolalia as trance behaviour are simply prosodic.

This explanation of glossolalia fails to account for glossolalia, first because it inconsistently and inaccurately describes the data examined, and, secondly, because it is *ad hoc*. It does not show, for example, that pseudo-linguistic utterances produced in a normal state need not have these prosodic features. If this were done, it would be found that what is segmentally glossolalic is prosodically natural. This is confirmed by experiments—mine and others. The analyst has therefore done nothing more than identify some of the intonational features of a style of discourse that is characteristic of a certain religious sub-culture. These features will be found in sermons and prayers in Pentecostal and holiness groups wherever the religion has been propagated. Both Pentecostalism and tongue speaking have a world-wide distribution with frequent and intensive contact between various groups.

It is damaging to the trance explanation of glossolalia that the described intonational features are found elsewhere without dissociation. It is further damaging that these features are absent in other instances where glossolalia is accompanied by trance. I have four lengthy recordings of such discourse, but all of them are from non-religious contexts. They are, nevertheless, unquestionably glossolalic in terms of their segmental organization. This is further evidence for the fact that the non-linguistic analyst mistook the artifacts of religious behaviour for trance.⁵

Glossolalia, as I have pointed out elsewhere (Samarin, 1969b), is learned behaviour. This is not so say that the speaker must learn what consonants, vowels, and syllables he must use and how he should put them together. He already has this knowledge, since he is a normal speaker of language. Yet there are some things that he does learn. First, that glossolalia (in some form) must be produced to be accepted as a member of the Pentecostal society. Second, that there are some phonological and paralinguistic features that are valued by the in-group and other features that are eschewed. He learns also that he can vary the features (hence the total discourse) according to what he would like to "say" (that is, through affect). Finally, he may learn to use (that is, borrow) certain sequences of syllables that he hears from the lips of other glossolalists. (And he may assume that they are "words", although not using them invariably: e.g., *malahoya*, *marahoya*, *mandahaya*, etc.) In other words, although every glossolalic discourse is potentially idiosyncratic, the glossas (that is, glossolalic "languages") of the members of a frequently-interacting group of individuals show similarities that are not purely random.

Samples of Glossolalia⁶

Text 1. Non-religious glossolalia with "translation" (Le Baron, p. 291): Intelete te intelute. Bule te skuru te sinte omkoton. Stinte te lete ode tinka ong. Lepe lute impre sute compo intope. Lute su empri. Lute lu lelee inkapon. Instute te binkalong te pelee te obde de pere. Bolotele te sinte. Inde tere somte compo. Peme tu stimele inkepe. Surume tome lete skuru. Istepe tompo dere ombo luto lutoston. Amen Ra, Amen Ra, Amen Ra. "The book of the past is not the book of the love! It is the song of the sadness! The great light has come to help the darkness! Love is emperor!

⁵ Goodman is satisfied that she has cared for all counter-evidence by saying that it was obtained under "laboratory" conditions. She refers to the procedure, for example, of asking a glossolalist or a group of glossolalists to tape record their prayers in tongues. But the difference between this procedure and her own—recording a public meeting of traditional Pentecostals with their full knowledge—is difficult to see. Tongue speakers are genuinely concerned about doing something "in the flesh", that is, for show. Here is what one wrote to me "Although I am able to speak in tongues at will—any time— anywhere—I cannot see myself doing this rather coldly and clinically in an office at the university. I feel I would [in that setting] have my eyes on myself and what I was doing rather than on Jesus, and the results would be more of a performance instead of a time of true praise, love expressed to God, or intercession for someone else ". Nevertheless, extensive field research convinces me that there would be no substantive linguistic difference between a glossolalic prayer in a phonetics laboratory and one uttered in the presence of a group of cobelievers.

⁶ Other samples of glossolalia are to be found in Jaquith (1967), Motley (1967), Wolfram (1966), and Samarin (1972).

Love is the light of the darkness! The home of the poor is the palace of love! All the light is love! All the earth shall be light! All the darkness shall be light! All the light shall be darkness! The love of all things shall be the light of all things! Pure light! "

Text 2. Non-religious improvised song in what the creator believed to be a "Celestial language" (transcribed phonetically by Samarin from an uncopyrighted phonograph recording: the speaker appears to be a native speaker of English): syer, čeřomoye, čeřomaye akomi, eřačeřomayeki, iyačabřamayaye yakoyeř yičimiyana přamaye, yičapokoyat-samayar yeyo, yeyo, tseřamayapřakožř, yičikimayanatsoye, yakařamaye, pōpřamayeř, kcčer, kočerače, yikičimayanoko, yakařamayastaffer, yikamayayoko, činayatsimi . . . .

Text 3. Non-religious glossolalia of a young married woman in trance, recorded by the participants on their own volition at a seance of a group of intimate friends who have "discovered" the occult through reading and experimentation. The group believes that some Outside Power is speaking through her. She is a native speaker of English who has studied French in high school and has heard a little German. The questions in English are put by another member of the group; the transcription is a broad phonetic one: "Can you [i.e., the Power] speak in English?" náýç! dufteyn dlów wivər kórst. "Are you speaking in German?" nóyn, hólɔx dyówn dvest dəbərnd, kæst.

Text 4. A prayer in tongues by a male speaker. One of 18 glossolalic prayers uttered spontaneously in a small group of neo-Pentecostals, "going round the circle", several praying more than once. Recorded at the request of the local Episcopalian parish priest on behalf of the author. To be read as in "Standard American English", (e.g. "i" as in *see*), with tongue-tip flapped and trilled "r" indicated. Numbers separate the sentence-like intonational units: (1) řářiyatolatolastōřanda, iypíyřtosteriyōsta patálatō. (2) nódey, třáskiy, tətəřářya tatařanda, láskow tíyə [six syllables unintelligible] mánda təlíyřtoləkəlbšyotřəməhatō. (3) íyřtōřō třásnəntəkíyətəřtəláte. (4) nontřésteyíyřtek, řapakíyəstəndřítow, řándow tēkiya řákliyas břówřta pakíyowta.

REFERENCES

- BODINE, ANN (1968). The phonological system of a five-year-old mongoloid. Unpublished paper, Summer Workshop on Language, Society, and the Child, University of California, Berkeley.
- BURLING, ROBBINS (1970). *Man's Many Voices* (New York).
- ENTWISLE, DORIS R. (1966). *Word-Associations of Young Children* (Baltimore, Md.).
- DREVER, JAMES (1958). *Dictionary of Psychology* (Harmondsworth, Middlesex).

- ERVIN-TRIPP, SUSAN (1969). Commentary. In L. G. Kelly (ed.), *Description and Measurement of Bilingualism: An international seminar, University of Moncton, June 6-14, 1967* (Toronto).
- GERLACH, LUTHER P. and HINE, VIRGINIA H. (1970). *People, Power, Change* (New York).
- GOODMAN, FELICITAS D. (1969). Glossolalia: speaking in tongues in four cultural settings. *Confinia Psychiatrica*, 12, 113.
- GREEN, EUGENE (1969). Phonological and grammatical aspects of jargon in an aphasic patient: a case study. *Language and Speech* 12, 103.
- HAYDEN, REBECCA E. (1950). The relative frequency of phonemes in general American English. *Word*, 6, 217.
- HORTON, WADE H. (ed.) (1966). *The Glossolalia Phenomenon* (Cleveland, Tenn.).
- JAKOBSON, ROMAN (1966). *Selected Writings, Vol. 4, Slavic Epic Studies* (The Hague).
- JAKOBSON, ROMAN (1968). *Child Language, Aphasia and Phonological Universals* (The Hague).
- JAKUTH, JAMES R. (1967). Towards a typology of formal communicative behavior: glossolalia. *Anthropol. Ling.*, 9, 1.
- LUCHSINGER, RICHARD and ARNOLD, G. E. (1965). *Voice-Speech-Language, Clinical Communication: its Physiology and Pathology* (Belmont, Calif.).
- MALMBERG, BERTIL (1967). *Structural Linguistics and Human Communication* (Berlin, etc.).
- MOTLEY, MICHAEL (1967). *Glossolalia: Analysis of Selected Aspects of Phonology and Morphology*. Unpublished M.A. thesis, The University of Texas (Austin).
- NICHOL, JOHN THOMAS (1966). *Pentecostalism* (New York).
- SAMARIN, W. J. (1968). The linguisticity of glossolalia. *Hartford Quart.* [Hartford Seminary Foundation], 8, 49.
- SAMARIN, W. J. (1969a). The forms and functions of nonsense language. *Linguistics*, 50, 70.
- SAMARIN, W. J. (1969b). Glossolalia as learned behavior. *Can J. Theol.*, 15, 60.
- SAMARIN, W. J. (1970). Language in resocialization. *Pract. Anthropol.*, 17, 269.
- SAMARIN, W. J. (1971). Salient and substantive pidginization. In Dell Hymes (ed.) *Pidginization and Creolization of Language* (Cambridge).
- SAMARIN, W. J. (1972). *Tongues of Men and Angels: the Religious Language of Pentecostalism* (New York).
- SAMARIN, W. J. (1971). Evolution in glossolalic private language. *Anthrop. Ling.*, 13.
- SAMARIN, W. J. (1972). Variation and variables in religious glossolalia. *Lang. in Soc.*, 1, 121.
- SLOBIN, DAN I. and WELSH, CHARLES A. (1968). Elicited imitations as a research tool in developmental psycholinguistics. Language-Behavior Research Laboratory, Working Paper, No. 10, University of California, Berkeley.
- WEIR, RUTH H. (1962). *Language in the Crib* (The Hague).
- WEIR, RUTH H. (1966). Some questions on the child's learning of phonology. In Frank Smith and George A. Miller (eds.), *The Genesis of Language* (Cambridge, Mass.).
- WOLFRAM, WALTER A. (1966). *The Sociolinguistics of Glossolalia*. Unpublished M.A. thesis, Hartford Seminary Foundation (Hartford, Conn.).