

from Speaking in Tongues, Let's Talk About It,
Watson E. Mills, ed., Word Books, Waco, 1973

Glossolalia As a Vocal Phenomenon

WILLIAM J. SAMARIN

GLOSSOLALIA IS A VOCAL PHENOMENON. It is engaged in by humans; it has psychological parameters; it is a result of social factors; and it has cultural meaning. But this is not to say that it is a psychological, social, cultural, or religious phenomenon. These variables are associated with its occurrence, but glossolalia is by nature, of itself, linguistic.

Language is produced by humans; and when people speak, they manifest some state of being that is describable in psychological terms. The use of language also has social correlates and cultural meaning. In addition it is used in ways that are specific to religion. But none of this means that language is social or psychological, for example. This kind of categorization merely labels something that is datum for investigation. It does not say anything about its nature. In fact, unless the linguistic reality of glossolalia is recognized, every categorization and every investigation is misdirected.

Take an example. Christian baptism is a physical act. Water is applied to a candidate's head by either covering it (with the person already partly in water) or sprinkling it on. The candidate is in a certain position. The application of water consists of a certain number of motions (two or three). And so forth. There is, in other words,

WILLIAM J. SAMARIN is Professor of Anthropology and Linguistics at the University of Toronto, and a specialist in African languages and sociolinguistics.

a purely public dimension to this event. It is possible to describe baptism for someone who has never witnessed it. The description would distinguish it from other events that were similar in form, such as kneeling in the bathtub washing one's hair. It is true that kneeling in the bathtub does not have the same meaning as kneeling for baptism, but that meaning is something attributed to the baptism event; it is not inherent to it. This is the reason we cannot say that baptism is a psychological phenomenon. And although it is best known for its religious meaning, there are undoubtedly instances where the same physical event is devoid of religious meaning. One can get dunked for nonreligious reasons.

Therefore, many people who pretend to talk about glossolalia are not talking about it at all. They are talking about glossolalists, those who speak in tongues. Or, they are talking about the religious meaning of the practice of glossolalia. They may be talking about any number of things except what glossolalia really is: a vocal phenomenon.

The nature of this behavior is problematic. Shall we call it charismatic behavior? Are ecstasy and possession necessarily included? What kinds of vocal phenomena qualify for admission into the study?

We must, I say, understand our data and be unambiguous in what we call it. The purpose of this chapter is twofold: (1) to clarify the subject by suggesting a set of terminological coordinates that can be supported by the results of certain empirical studies; (2) to suggest ways in which glossolalia is and is not like natural human language.

DEFINITIONS ¹

The term *glossolalia*, as commonly used, applies both to a particular kind of linguistic event and also to the religious experience with which it is associated. This is for many people by definition a Christian experience because it is identified with the speaking in tongues referred to in the New Testament. Whether or not current experience is an actual repetition of the early phenomenon, as claimed by some glossolalists, is immaterial to linguists, who are more interested in the linguistic phenomenon than in the belief system associated with it.²

The experience is ordinarily defined linguistically as the fact, or belief, that a person under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit utters a language totally unknown to himself. Theoretically, it may be a known language—whether spoken today (such as Zulu, Chinese, Cherokee, or Finnish) or extinct (such as ancient Aramaic, Etruscan, or Egyptian)—or a totally unknown language. Whatever else may be believed about the function of this “miraculous gift,” it is

clear that for the believing glossolalist it authenticates, by giving evidence to, a religious experience.

This circular definition which defines the religious experience linguistically and the linguistic phenomenon religiously embarrasses no one but the objective investigator. Other linguistic phenomena exist which appear to be identical to some forms of Christian glossolalia but do not have a religious content.³

One of the most remarkable cases of nonreligious glossolalia is that of Albert Le Baron, whose self-analysis under this pseudonym was submitted to the American Society for Psychological Research in the last century by William James. Le Baron reported that he got messages in English from what he called his "psychic automatism" and that he and his psychic automatism were even able to carry on conversations with each other. One Sunday morning, during such a conversation in his hotel room, another language replaced English. Because he transcribed many of the messages he received on subsequent occasions, together with the translations given by the same psychic automatism, we can compare Le Baron's glossolalia with samples obtained from Americans today. They are, in my opinion, so similar that we must accept both as manifestations of the same linguistic phenomenon.

The term *glossolalia* is useful in talking about certain kinds of linguistic behavior, even though it be qualified as religious or nonreligious and as Christian or non-Christian. But its scope should not be so general that the term fails to function meaningfully. For instance, it should not include *xenoglossia*, the demonstration of knowledge of a language not learned in the normal ways. Xenoglossia is contained in the Christian definition of glossolalia because of the experience on Pentecost reported in the Book of Acts, but the term itself is not in vogue among modern glossolalists. Xenoglossia has been reported among Muslims in India where certain individuals are said to have recited portions of the Koran in its original language, Arabic, without having previously learned them. Xenoglossia has been frequently reported, however, in nonreligious contexts.

Other forms of verbal behavior should also be excluded from the scope of glossolalia. The following definition, taken from a textbook on psychology, is too comprehensive for our purposes: ". . . the entranced submission to some obsessive gibberish under the illusion of being inspired by mystical 'tongues,' which are thought to come from heaven."⁴ The definition of glossolalia as creations of language by the insane, in which the patient utters sounds which he feels to be full of meaning but which he can seldom repeat when asked to do so, is also beyond the bounds of our understanding of the term. If the utterances referred to by these writers prove to be systematically

similar to those encountered in Christian glossolalia, we would have to recognize them as being glossolalic. But the criteria implied in these definitions, that the utterances are unintelligible and attributed to a divine source, are not rigorous enough.

The following definition of glossolalia is sufficiently limiting to be useful in a linguistic study of the phenomenon: a vocal act believed by the speaker to be language and showing rudimentary language-like structure but no consistent word-meaning correspondence recognizable by either speaker or hearer. Three necessary features are specified: (1) a sound system that is a patterning of sound which is generally typical of real languages and which distinguishes them from gibberish; (2) meaninglessness; and (3) value as language to the speaker. Because we should exclude apparently pseudoglossolalic utterances which occur in play, we should perhaps sharpen our definition by adding "or a language surrogate."

The omission of a description of characteristic emotional and psychological states from the definition of glossolalia is deliberate. Such a word as emotion is too vague to use as a technical term, for it is difficult to determine precisely when a person is indeed emotional. There is even the danger that if the expected emotional characteristics are lacking in a tongue-speaker we will attribute them to him falsely simply on the basis of his utterances. Glossolalia does in fact occur when people are not highly excited. The Pentecostal stereotype no longer fits most Pentecostal gatherings, and practitioners in the modern charismatic movement deliberately play down overt emotionalism.

XENOGLOSSIA

If glossolalia were identical with xenoglossia, it would not be of special interest to the linguist unless, of course, the glossolalic language were extinct, in which case the utterances could be used as a source of information about that language. The linguist might be interested in how the person acquired knowledge of the language, but this would be in the domain of psychology and would involve extrasensory perception.

Xenoglossia and glossolalia are not identical. A *glossa*⁵ is never a natural language, and it resembles a natural language only in very limited ways.

Since the linguist, however, is sometimes called upon to authenticate alleged cases of xenoglossia, a few general remarks as to whether it actually takes place, and if so how it is identified, are in order.

Since all evidence leads to the conclusion that human language is learned behavior, the phenomenon of xenoglossia is often regarded

as miraculous. However, scientists explain xenoglossia in terms of psychic or parapsychological phenomena or cryptomnesia.

Parapsychological (psychic) phenomena are studied when perception does not appear to be mediated in the usual way. Such a "gift" may take several forms. A paragnost, for example, is said to be able to locate a lost person or object after having observed something with which the missing entity had been in contact. It is claimed that this kind of information transcends properties that we now call physical. But although they are called psychic, they are not necessarily supernatural. Xenoglossia falls into this category.

The parapsychologist's chief concern is to prove (1) that a xenoglossist is indeed speaking a known language, and (2) that the person has never known this language and has had no contact with it. For example, the London Society for Physical Research tested in the following way two Englishmen who claimed to speak Temne, a tongue spoken in Sierra Leone which they claimed never to have learned. They were sent to the School for Oriental and African Languages to speak in the presence of a native Temne. The native categorically rejected that the Englishmen spoke his language. I have listened to a lengthy recording of the speech and am convinced it is a true example of glossolalia.

While many scholars are wary of parapsychological interpretations of xenoglossia, most accept *cryptomnesia*, or "hidden memory," as a valid explanation. In this phenomenon, conscious thoughts considered to be original are in reality only memories. In a clear case of cryptomnesia it can be demonstrated that a person did know or could very well have known what he now claims not to have known previously. Cryptomnesia often offers a better explanation than does parapsychology. Here is an example. In one of his dreams, the eminent American anthropologist Robert H. Lowie conversed with someone who told him of a story by Edgar Allan Poe entitled "Daughter of Calixtus." In this story the daughter demanded that her father give her 1124 times as much money as he made. On awakening, Lowie was puzzled because he realized that Poe had never written such a story and he did not know who Calixtus was. Lowie's wife told him that there were two popes of this name who lived in the twelfth century, so he consulted a reference book which informed him that there was a Pope Calixtus whose pontificate lasted only five years, from 1119 to 1124. Lowie commented: "The coincidence in the numbers is obvious, but I am at a loss as to how it can be explained." ⁶

Most cases of xenoglossia are reported by uncritical people who are predisposed to believe in them. Generally only hearsay evidence is given; bona fide firsthand witnesses are rare. References to xeno-

glossia in the writings of Christian charismatists cannot be taken as scientifically valid evidence of the incidence of this phenomenon. They are valuable only as illustrations of the beliefs of glossolalists.

An interesting feature of these reports is that they are often set in a frame consisting of the following elements: Person A utters a glossolalic discourse which is identified by person B as being his own language, whereupon some witness to the event (including either A or B) takes it as a God-given sign for some kind of decision. This stereotypic oral transmission of purported history must be considered folkloristic.

It is particularly noteworthy that when an utterance is identified as being in a known language its content is referred to only indirectly; there is, as far as I know, no example of the translation that would be expected if the witness really knew the language. Only with glossolalia is there "interpretation."

Further, the person who claims to have heard another speak in an unlearned language must be judged competent or incompetent to identify languages. An incompetent witness is not necessarily a fraud. It is possible in good conscience to mistake a glossa for a natural language. This often happens when the whole event is interpreted in terms of some small part of it. For example, if a person thought he heard some Swahili words in a discourse, he would tend to "hear" many more words as Swahili.

An ambiguous situation arises when glossolalic discourse is composed of various linguistic materials. Sometimes they include snatches or even whole sections in a language unknown at the level of consciousness but recalled cryptomnesically and mixed in with the cryptomnesic portions.

In summary, although some Christian charismatists claim that xenoglossia is a part of the tongue-speaking experience, they would be unable to provide a case that would stand up to rigorous scientific investigation. At the most it would prove to be cryptomnesic.

GLOSSOLALIA

There remain thousands of reported cases of unintelligible verbal utterances which must be examined to determine if they represent unknown languages. Could they possibly be specimens of the four to seven thousand languages spoken on earth which have not yet been studied? And if they cannot be categorized as human languages, how can they be described from a linguistic standpoint?

Glossas are not normal human languages. Even though we are discovering new languages every year, glossas cannot be classed with them. First, to "discover" languages is to speak metaphorically; we simply learn that language A and language B are two different

languages instead of one. We learn that speakers cannot understand each other even though the languages are obviously related (such as some forms of Spanish and Portuguese). Because of the increasing precision with which languages can now be differentiated, the number of known languages in the world has grown. Of course, many parts of the world have not yet been fully explored, and we must suppose that their inhabitants are using hitherto unknown languages.

Second, it is almost certain that whatever languages are "discovered" will resemble those already known. Thus, the "new" languages of the Indians living in the jungles of South America are not startlingly different from those linguists have already studied; and their discovery does not change our fundamental understanding of the structure and use of human language.

There is, therefore, no justification whatsoever for hoping that future language discoveries will enable us to identify glossas. The science of languages has developed sufficiently so that we can safely assert that glossas are not normal human languages even though they may reveal some of their characteristics.

If glossic utterances are not natural languages, they represent a verbal activity which is continuous with only a few other verbal phenomena. There are only weak parallels in certain forms of aphasia (loss or impairment of the power to use or understand speech), in sleep-talking, in child speech, and among the mentally ill. If glossolalia occurred as a characteristic of a certain kind of human behavior or state of being which comprehended more than being "filled with the Spirit," we should have heard of it. This is not to say, however, that glossolalia is a strictly Christian phenomenon. One nonreligious case has already been mentioned. Here are three more.

The first is that of a medium, a certain Helen Smith (a fictitious name) whose remarkable case was thoroughly studied over a period of several years by the psychologist Theodore Flournoy at the end of the last century.⁷ In addition to speaking and writing in two "languages," using non-Roman characters of her own invention, while in a trance state, she also produced utterances in circumstances too involved to describe here which, if we understand the investigator's description of them, were glossolalic.

The two other cases are from my own experience. One adult man in his fifties informed me that on one occasion when he was sixteen years old he burst out in a fit of anger at an older brother who had habitually taunted him. He remembers that, while speaking, he had no idea that he was not talking a language known to him (English, Yiddish, and classical Hebrew). It was only after he had stopped that

he realized that he did not know what he had said. The experience was so bizarre that he wondered at the time if he had spoken a language of a preincarnation. Another man, now in his sixties, commonly uses glossolalia in a jocular way when, he says, he cannot express himself as he would like. The two examples he gave illustrated an apology and a burst of anger. Both were remarkably like other samples of glossolalia I have heard.

A spoken phenomenon. Our present understanding of glossolalia is based on the impressions of people who have heard glossas and on phonological analysis of tape-recorded prayers. Firsthand reports are usually extremely subjective, but they do give us valuable supplementary information. Many more descriptive studies are obviously needed. Rapid advance in our knowledge of glossolalia cross-culturally is deterred by the difficulty of obtaining samples.

We must depend on tape recordings for our analyses of glossas since glossolalia is primarily an extemporaneous, unreflected, and spoken phenomenon; it is seldom written down. From the Christian point of view there is no reason why glossolalia may *not* be written; to record it would be completely compatible with the notion of Scripture as inspired word. I do not think that it is the absence of any mention of written glossolalia in the Bible that prevents a Christian glossolalist from transcribing his discourse. Most probably it is the very nature of the glossolalic phenomenon that has discouraged writing it down.

Only two cases of written glossolalia are known to me. That of Le Baron is the more important. He claims to have written down many messages and poems received from his psychic automatism. Only a small part of them have been published. The second case is that of a German Pentecostalist who dictated a few glossolalic phrases to a psychologist investigator at the beginning of this century.⁸ Although we do not know as much as we should like to about the way in which the glossic utterances were transcribed in either case, we must assume that the speakers slowed their utterances sufficiently to be recorded or that they or the writer recalled what had been said. The second possibility is not likely because glossolalists are not able to repeat or even remember their utterances.

Meaningless. A glossa is always meaningless in the linguistic sense. That is, there are no consistent correlations between units of speech and experience. Glossolalists do not deny this but insist, nevertheless, that a glossa has meaning because it *is* a language and because it can be interpreted into familiar languages. These interpretations are often strikingly longer or shorter than the glossic utterance; they are never translations in the strict sense of the term.⁹ The glossolalist believes, however, that the interpretation is

as much a charism or "gift" from God as his own glossic utterance.

It cannot be denied that glossolalia might convey some linguistic meaning. Repeated segments of tongue-speech could eventually be associated with specific concepts and even acquire meaning. This hypothesis suggested itself to me when I was comparing transcriptions of glossic texts with the original tape recordings and when it was brought to my attention that a Pentecostal preacher, known only as Pastor Paul, claimed that in his own glossas the word *ea* meant "Jesus."¹⁰ In time many other words might acquire meanings.

Other kinds of meaning are also possible. Certain glossic words might remind the speaker of particular objects or of experiences. Once when I was trying to generate a glossic utterance I said *kashaski wishom*, which is a name my family used for a sweet, rich dish made of rice and raisins. It stood for or had the meaning of something I enjoyed as a lad. Why it should arise in my consciousness on precisely that occasion is a psychological matter beyond the scope of this study, but this was the principal concern of Pfister's investigation of Simon's glossolalia.

General emotive or affective meaning is also associated with glossic speech. The impression given by the whole or a portion of a glossolalia might be prophetic, pleading, commanding, or denunciatory. Some short glossic units, termed breath-groups, have many of the characteristics of a private prayer. They are capable of evoking a considerable variety of meanings.

A glossa is not necessarily gibberish, even if it is meaningless. The principal linguistic feature distinguishing it from gibberish is the remarkable number of phonological units at various levels. Starting with the highest level, one finds macrosegments (comparable to sentences), microsegments (comparable to words), syllables, and sound units (comparable to phonemes). The microsegments are separated from each other by pauses of greater or lesser duration and are characterized by certain configurations consisting of stress and pitch.

Since microsegments are isolable, it is possible to compare them with each other and to describe their distribution with respect to the other segments within the macrosegment.¹¹ In other words, glossic syllables are not simply spewed out haphazardly; each glossa represents a kind of microsegmental syntax similar to that of natural languages.

Glossic word units are difficult to separate from the macrosegment. In the absence of clues given by meaning, a person transcribing a glossic text is left to subtle phonological cues, and his segmentation of the whole sound continuum into small units will be guided

in considerable part by the prejudices that he brings to the task. A single text will very likely have as many different transcriptions as there are people who attempt the task. Furthermore, we cannot assume that the speaker of the text is any better qualified to segment it even though some stretches of the text are meaningful to him.

Repetitious. Glossas differ from natural languages because they are simple and repetitious. Linguistically speaking, they contain a smaller number of linguistic units and a much higher incidence of some of them. One sample text illustrates both of these features. It has as consonants only p, t, k, m, n, s, and y; as vowels only i, a, and a variant of a. Since i and a are the only two significant vowels, it has altogether only nine basic sounds. Moreover, only the following syllables occur:

a	ta	—	ma	na	sa	ya
i	ti	ki	—	ni	si	—

The absence of the syllables ka, mi, and yi in the inventory is not significant in itself because languages commonly fail to utilize all their resources.

Glossic speech is repetitious at all levels. Whole macrosegments recur as do selected syllables and their constituent sounds. As might be expected, a preference for certain sounds gives to a glossa its exotic flavor.

GLOSSAS COMPARED WITH EACH OTHER

The foregoing comments treat only the characteristics that one might find by studying one glossa at a time as if it were a sample of a real language. When glossas are compared with each other, other features emerge.¹²

Asymmetrical sound grids. Asymmetry is revealed by the frequent absence of sounds where one might expect them in an articulatory chart. A text may display the following consonant pattern:

—	t	k
m	n	—
—	s	—

In other words, one stop, one nasal, and two fricatives are missing. They might be: p, ng of sing, f, and x (like "ch" of German *ach*). Such asymmetries occur in natural languages, but one does not find them with such regularity, and to the same degree, as one does in glossolalia.

Simple syllable structure. Although there is no reason why some glossas could not have phonologically complex syllables, glossas generally have a simple syllable structure. The most common vowels used in glossas are i and a. They not only occur in all inventories

(other vowels may or may not), but they are also of higher frequency in any single glossa.

COMPARED WITH THE SPEAKERS' NATIVE LANGUAGES

When a glossa is compared with the native language of its speaker, it is seen to be both derivative and innovative. Both its inventory of sounds and its sentence melodies are derived from the speaker's first language. In other words, a glossolalist's "accent" gives clues to his native tongue. We find, for example, that if the voiceless stops are aspirated (that is, are followed by a slight puff of air), as with the first sound of Paul, his everyday language is probably English. We would expect this sound to be unaspirated in the glossa of a French-speaking glossolalist because voiceless stops in that language are always unaspirated. Moreover, since varieties of languages are differentiated in their sound patterns, we expect to find the same features to be carried over into the glossas. If the vowel (æ) occurred in the glossas of residents of various parts of the United States, we would expect it to be typical of those areas. A southern glossolalist might say (æ) as in *dad* and one from western Massachusetts ("æ") as in *man*.

Innovating features are the simplification of syllable structure, the increase in the frequency of some sounds, and borrowing from languages other than English. I have already mentioned the first two features in viewing glossas as if they were independent languages. These traits certainly make them look strikingly different from English. Borrowing from other languages occurs when the speaker has had contact with a language other than the one he normally speaks. This has been proven by investigating the biography of the tongue-speaker. We have to allow both for cases of cryptomnesic recall and for the creation of really novel sounds. Speakers often report involuntary motor events in connection with their first experience in glossolalia.

GLOSSAS AS ARTIFICIAL LANGUAGES

We have seen that glossas are not natural languages and that they are unlike natural languages in significant ways even though they share certain features. This similarity and dissimilarity might be explained by the hypothesis that the speaker is subconsciously motivated to produce a new language. To do this he must make it as different from his own as he possibly can. Since his only resources are the linguistic habits he already has, he is as limited to them as a painter who works with only three colors. This limitation need not deaden his creativity; rather it might stimulate it. The linguistic creations of some glossolalists are often remarkable. The languages

created by the medium Helen Smith, for instance, represent a truly virtuoso performance.

There are, however, very few similarities between the production of glossas and the purposeful creation of artificial languages in other contexts,¹³ for glossas are produced extemporaneously and rapidly, using only the vocal channel. The creation of utterances which will constitute a meaningful language is a laborious process. The fact that glossolalia exists at all gives evidence of man's linguistic capacities.

IMPLICATIONS FOR RELIGIOUS STUDIES

The point I have been trying to make is that there is a vocal phenomenon that is different both from natural language and from other forms of anomalous speech. Wherever one finds it, he can be sure that it is the same thing. *What* he finds, however, must be determined linguistically. Because in a certain religion a shaman speaks unintelligibly, believing that the spirits are speaking through him, does not mean that he is engaged in glossolalia. That is, not unless by glossolalia one wants to mean anything and everything unintelligible attributed to nonhuman sources.

It is important to study the use of sound and speech in religion. As a sociolinguist, I am personally committed to this field of study. But surely, there are many different kinds of vocal phenomena that we are confronted with. And one of them is the kind of pseudo-language I have described.

From a purely linguistic point of view, an implication of this assertion is that the vocal phenomenon, that is, glossolalic speech, is independent of other factors that are not linguistic ones. Dissociation, for example, may accompany certain kinds of vocal acts, but they do not define those acts. Not, at least, on an a priori basis. One would have to prove that dissociation and X go together.

This leads me to say that the charismatic experience is independent of glossolalia. That is, they are both independent. You could have one without the other. By *charismatic experience* I mean the kind of religious life—its goals, its activities, its results—we call Pentecostal. Pentecost is possible without tongues.

I am not talking about what went on at the beginning of the Christian era. I do not know, for sure, what happened, nor does anybody else. We can only guess. I am talking about the movement that emphasizes a certain quality of Christian life. There have been many such movements, and most of them have not been characterized by speaking in tongues. Of course, speaking in tongues was absent because the participants in these movements did not believe that they *had* to speak in tongues. But that is precisely the point. People

speaking in tongues—that is, produce pseudolanguage—because they feel they have to. But whether they do or don't, it does not influence the quality of their Christian experience.

Glossolalia is not necessary to the charismatic movement. People only believe that it is. They are like Catholics who believe that they can't have the same blessing when they have Mass in English (or any other vernacular) as when they have it in Latin. Maybe they really *don't* get the same experience, but that is because they believe this. Latin is not necessary to, does not produce, the blessing. It is exactly the same thing with glossolalia: It does not produce anything that is not found in nonglossolalist Christianity.

What makes the difference is the movement. There *is* a difference between the quality of Christian life within and without this and similar movements. This is there for people to see. People do see in others what they would like for themselves. So they open themselves to the work of God in their lives, and they are "filled." This is the conclusion I have had to come to after seven years of intensive study of glossolalia in the charismatic movement.¹⁴ I have learned from and come to agree with people who express this kind of testimony:

The ultimate test of any movement is a closer walk of trust and joy with Christ. It is the power to witness for Him in a way that makes the unbeliever say: "I don't fully understand the logic of this message—but I *want* what that person has!" It is the power to really live by God's promises—taking no thought for the morrow; being liberated to run risks that one would never have run before; being liberated to love people one would never have been able to before; being liberated to expect the impossible—and watch it occur again and again. It's the difference between a life lived always on the edge of caution and a life lived in boldness and dynamic commitment. When I see this, I know that the believer has experienced a real filling of the Holy Spirit, *whether that person has ever uttered a word in tongues or not*. When I don't see it, then though that person "speak with the tongues of men and angels," I seriously wonder how real his or her "experience" has been.¹⁵

NOTES

1. Unless otherwise indicated, all technical terms found in this study are in rather general use. My only neologism is *glossa*, which will be defined later. The terms *glossolalists* and *charismatists*, when talking about religious glossolalia, are synonymous although in some contexts the latter term has a broader connotation. Thus, one speaks of "the modern charismatic movement," whose representatives distinguished themselves from the Pentecostalists. Although both groups are glossolalist, charismatics are members of the Catholic church and various Protestant denominations.

2. If he is a socio- or psycholinguist he will, however, be concerned with the motivations that led to glossolalia. For example, he may want to explain why glossolalia is usually associated with religious behavior and more often within the Christian religion than in others.
3. Glossolalists have recognized the existence, or the possibility, of non-Christian non-Spirit-inspired speaking in tongues. This kind of glossolalia they called a "Satanic counterfeit."
4. Richard Luchsinger and G. E. Arnold, *Voice—Speech—Language: Clinical Communicology, Its Physiology and Pathology* (Belmont, Cal.: Wadsworth, 1965), p. 790.
5. This is my neologism. It means: (a) an alleged language, represented by a particular glossolalic discourse; (b) a specimen, either written down or mechanically recorded, of this "language." Since one cannot say a priori that an individual's glossolalic utterances are all of the same type, he may speak several glossas. The adjectival form of glossa will be *glossic*.
6. Robert H. Lowie, "Dreams," *Current Anthropology*, 7 (1966): 380.
7. Theodore Flournoy, *Des Indes à la Planète Mars : Étude sur un Cas de Somnambulisme avec Glossolalie* (Geneva: Charles Eggiman & Co., 1900).
8. Oskar Pfister, "Die Psychologische Enträtselung der Religiösen Glossalie und der Automatischen Kryptographie," *Jahrbuch für Psychoanalytische und Psychopathologische Forschungen*, 3 (1912).
9. We might find some interesting correlations if we could compare a glossic text and the speaker's own interpretation of it. For example, the frequency counts might be more similar than one would expect. Even though a glossic "word" and its interpretation were not found in comparable places in the texts, it would be noteworthy if both of them occurred as many as twenty times in the texts. If several such correlations could be established, we might be justified in assuming that the glossic words had meaning. At present we do not have suitable texts for study of this text.
10. Émile Lombard, *De la glossolalie chez les premiers chrétiens et des phénomènes similaires* (Lausanne: Bridel, 1910), p. 177. Having "discovered" the meaning of *ea*, the speaker said that he tried to say "my Jesus" and "dear Jesus" (in German, of course) while speaking in tongues, and he observed that in each case a different glossic word preceded *ea*. Although unsophisticated linguistic observations such as these cannot be taken at face value, they do provide us with interesting information. What is clearly revealed here, for example, is the naïve view that another language will be like one's own native language. In this glossa a noun *ea* was preceded by its attributive, as it would be in German. Similarly, Helen Smith's Martian and Hindu "languages" were copies of French.
11. The susceptibility of a glossa to analysis is attested by the attempts of Le Baron to identify the relationship of his own glossa to some known language. He appears to have made a complete concordance, or index, of the "words" in his language.
12. No crosslinguistic study of glossolalia has yet been undertaken. There is a probability that glossas evolve the more they are used. On the other hand, it seems that speakers use the same basic inventory of phonological units over a period of weeks, with the exception of sounds of low frequency which may be absent from one or more sample texts. The age, sex, linguistic aptitude of the speaker (as measured by his

control of his own language and/or his ability to learn other languages), emotional stability, and so on are equally significant elements which should be considered in a study of glossolalia.

13. Even the neologisms of schizophrenics are different from those we find in glossolalia, for their emphasis is on esoteric meanings. Their use of phonological changes seems to be minimal.

14. The results of this study, here only briefly summarized, are found in my *Tongues of Men and Angels: The Religious Language of Pentecostalism* (New York: Macmillan, 1972). For specialized articles on glossolalia and about language in religion see the bibliography in *Tongues of Men and Angels*.

15. From private correspondence. Italics added.