

it stands to reason that there will be a certain commonality across languages. Now if one is going to claim that glossolalia is indicative of dissociation ultimately on the basis of its linguistic form, then logically the claim should be extended to other types of pseudolanguage which show the same linguistic form. Given the normality of pseudolanguage and the apparent linguistic reasons for its structure, such an explanation seems quite unwarranted. The linguistic characteristics of glossolalia may be due to 'neurophysiologic processes', but these processes are obviously found in a normal, not an altered mental state as Goodman claims.

In the preceding paragraphs, I have been quite critical of the attempt to define glossolalia as the artifact of hyperaroused dissociation. This, however should not be taken to mean that glossolalia can never be uttered in this state. It is hard to deny the hyperaroused state of some individuals while uttering glossolalia, nor can one deny the fact that there sometimes may be some evidence (assuming the validity of the defining somatic characteristics) of dissociation. It may well be the case that hyperaroused dissociation is concurrent with glossolalia for some individuals or even some cultural groups. But to say that glossolalia can be uttered in a trance is very different from saying that glossolalia necessarily implies this condition. While the attempt to find an underlying systematic explanation for behavior is commendable, we already have too many studies which sacrifice observational adequacy when it stands in the way of confirming hypotheses. Unfortunately, we have here a classic example of an ethnography in which a particular type of behavior is forced into a procrustean mold. One can only conclude that in this description, the importance of studying dissociation apparently got in the way of studying glossolalia.

Glossolalia already has suffered its share of distorted treatments from many different vantage points. To the distorted understandings of glossolalia which have come from the studies of theologians, psychologists, sociologists, etc., we can now add a representative from the ethnographers. We should expect better studies from ethnographers, but this is not the case in this particular instance.

REFERENCES

- Samarin, W. (1972). *Tongues of men and angels*. New York: Macmillan.
 — (1972). Variation and variables in religious glossolalia. *LinS* 1. 121-30.

Reviewed by WALT WOLFRAM
 Federal City College and
 Center for Applied Linguistics
 Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

(Received 13 February, 1973)

WILLIAM J. SAMARIN, *Tongues of men and angels: the religious language of pentecostalism*. New York: Macmillan, 1972. Pp. xv + 277.

There are many reasons why the linguist will find it profitable to engage in the

study of abnormal forms of linguistic behavior. The standard reason is that by studying what is anomalous, one may thereby obtain a clearer understanding of what is central to 'normal' linguistic behaviour. Another is that these behaviours are generally a primary concern of fields other than linguistics (psychiatry, psychology, anthropology) – fields in which the contribution of the linguist is increasingly recognized as of considerable potential value. And not least is the fact that these behaviours are precisely those which attract the eccentric questioner after a public lecture, whose remarks it is embarrassing to be unable to answer.

This book provides a fascinating account of what is probably the most widespread form of aberrant linguistic behaviour: glossolalia. Samarin takes this phenomenon – often glossed loosely as 'speaking in tongues' (the book's title reflects a traditional translation out of St Paul) – and provides a well-documented account of its historical, social, cultural, psychological and linguistic facets. It is more complete than any other introduction to this subject; more important, it is also the first really objective survey to appear. Hundreds of books have been written on glossolalia; but as far as I know none before this have anchored themselves to a systematic descriptive statement about the formal properties of glossolalic utterance. This is the main motivation for the present book: to answer the question, 'What *exactly* is glossolalic speech?', and then, 'Why is it used?'

Samarin's first chapter reviews the present use of glossolalia in the various Christian denominations, and gives some historical background about its early use. The phenomenon is primarily associated with twentieth-century pentecostalism, but in its various 'neopentecostal' forms, it may be found throughout an extremely broad spectrum of contemporary Christianity. Estimates vary as to the number of glossolalists in the world, but the calculation produces an answer in terms of millions rather than thousands. It is the widely spread occurrence of the behaviour, cross-cutting sex, age, socio-economic group and personality type, that makes Samarin begin his study by being sharply critical of traditional psychological attitudes, which assumed that glossolalia was a symptom of some sub-normal state – theories range from those associating it with a lower-class background or intellectual sub-normality to those which relate it to some biochemical or neurological condition. Chapter 2 reviews a number of studies carried out over the past hundred years, showing how glossolalia cannot be explained solely in terms of an automatic or involuntary behaviour, a reflex of an abnormal state of consciousness, or an index of emotional release, deprivation, or regression. He concludes that many of the studies are biased and methodologically unsound, at least part of the reason being a failure to state clearly what is to count as glossolalia in any research project.

Samarin's first chapters concentrate on this question of definition. His own definition of glossolalia runs: 'A meaningless but phonologically structured human utterance believed by the speaker to be a real language but bearing no

systematic resemblance to any natural language, living or dead' (2). This is to be contrasted with the traditional functional definitions, such as the one cited in his introduction, 'speech attributed to the Holy Spirit in languages unknown to the speaker and incomprehensible without divinely inspired interpretation'. Terminological points to note: *glossolalia* refers to speech; the corresponding term for written language is *glossographia*. Both have to be distinguished from *xenoglossia*, which is the genuine speaking of real language unknown to the speaker, and *cryptomnesia*, the appearance in the conscious mind of a previously learned but forgotten linguistic ability.

Chapter 3 looks at the way glossolalia is acquired. Samarin's data for this include the responses given by glossolalists to a 71-item questionnaire (printed as an Appendix) covering all aspects of the glossolalic process. His discussion deals with why people want to speak in tongues; how they view the process in relation to baptism, Scripture, and other theological prerequisites; whether their acquisition was spontaneous, slowly learned or systematically taught; and what kind of social setting and accompanying ritual they consider appropriate. One thing that is not often realized is that for most people, glossolalia does not come easily, and improves greatly with practice; glossolalists are also often highly critical of their own or each others' performance.

This leads on to the heart of the book, a linguistic description of what is involved in glossolalia. Chapter 4 describes the patterns of form and meaning found in various samples; Chapter 5 contrasts the generalized conclusions arrived at with language, and (Chapter 6) with other forms of communication. Glossolalia does 'sound like' language. There are recognizable, transcribable sounds, and apparent paragraphs, sentences, phrases and words; there are well-defined prosodic patterns. Samarin devotes some space to a discussion of the broad phonetic structure of the text. (In fact, he talks about its 'phonology' throughout (cf. above), but this is hardly appropriate, as it is precisely the systematicness and distinctiveness of the sound patterns which is in question.) Vowel, consonant and syllable patterns are related to the norm speech styles of the users; particular attention is paid to non-segmental characteristics, though not as much as in Goodman (1972). It is concluded that glossolalia is very different from natural language: it displays a different frequency of sounds, a much reduced inventory, a simple syllable structure, and a marked degree of syllable repetition. There are certain similarities with the phonology of various natural languages, but these are superficial and hardly surprising, as Saussure was one of the first to point out. (It is not widely known – Samarin does not give it separate mention – that Saussure was the linguist used by Thomas Flournoy in his study of the glossolalia of 'Helen Smith' at the turn of the century. The event is nicely reported by Lepschy (1973).) In grammar, Samarin points to the absence of predictable syntactic or morphological rules, and the impossibility of identifying sentence or word meanings in any systematic kind of way. Various simple

tests can be carried out to show the absence of any basic rule-governed system (e.g. glossolalists are unable to repeat stretches of their own glossolalia with any accuracy). It is possible to distinguish phonetic varieties of glossolalia, in terms of their prosodic and paralinguistic characteristics, and also in terms of the regional accent background of the speakers. Moreover, glossolalists do show some consistency in distinguishing varieties and interpreting them. ('Interpretation' here refers to the possibility of the whole utterance meaning something, not the sentence-like parts.) But apart from this, the formal similarity to natural language is non-existent.

Two basic questions are posed by this description, one formal, one functional. The formal question arises out of the fact that glossolalia does 'sound like' natural language. Is this largely or wholly derivative – 'interference' from the L1, as it were – or is there some more fundamental underlying process, whereby glossolalia in any language would display broadly similar characteristics? Samarin recognizes the existence of the question of glossolalic universals, but apart from some footnotes in Chapter 4, his discussion does not take in this issue. This was simply because his description was based on the speech of those whose primary language was English. His general experience of the phenomenon in other languages makes him lean towards a universalist hypothesis (77), and this is the conclusion of Goodman's cross-cultural study involving four languages (1972). It is worth pointing out, though, that the more one can establish universal characteristics of glossolalia on empirical grounds, the more one will have to take seriously an explanation in terms of psychosomatic or other states. Samarin is critical of Goodman's position, that glossolalia is an artifact of a hyperaroused mental state (33–4); in the light of the evidence of her new book, which came out too late for Samarin to be able to include it in his survey, a fuller discussion of this point now seems to be required.

The second half of the book is almost entirely devoted to the functional question, 'What is the purpose of this sincere but unintelligible noise?' Samarin's approach is to place glossolalic utterance in perspective, by asking whether comparable vocalization is used elsewhere in society; and he shows very clearly that quite a wide range of phenomena are involved. He makes a classification of meaningless vocalization into 'communicative' and 'non-communicative': the former subsumes preternatural (e.g. magical incantations, shaman spirit language, some nursery rhymes) and non-preternatural (e.g. argots, baby-talk, twin-languages); the latter he divides (rather arbitrarily, I feel) into contrived (e.g. in poetry, advertising) and non-contrived (e.g. in be-bop jazz, refrains, child language games). This menagerie of vocalizations has been very little studied, and it could be extended: Samarin might have made more of the artificial forms adopted by professional comedians representing social or regional stereotypes, for instance. By this approach, we are made to see glossolalia as a particular variety of anomalous linguistic behaviour, sharing certain characteristics with

other anomalous forms, and requiring an analysis of its functional basis in conventional sociolinguistic terms. Chapters 7–12 then take up various aspects of glossolalic function – as a means of private prayer, public message (including prophecy), healing, exorcism, self-development, social integration (cf. phatic communion), aesthetic and emotional expression. The force of Samarin's argument is to demonstrate the wide range of normal sociolinguistic functions that glossolalia can be used to express, and to conclude, thereby, that the behaviour is not aberrant, but merely anomalous (228). Chapter 10 examines its psychological functions, as a symbolization of change of belief-state, as a pleasurable activity, as a means of emotional expression, and of therapy. Chapter 11 identifies various sociological functions: glossolalia identifies a speaker as a member of a particular group; it defines his role in relation to others within the social hierarchy; it changes the nature of the social event – making it more religious, or less, if glossolalia is not used when its use was expected. Glossolalia, Samarin concludes, is highly codified (226); it is a component of a personal, affective religion, 'a linguistic symbol of the sacred' (231). 'Producing tongues is not strange; it is belief about this pseudolanguage that is. Strange, that is, from the point of view of society in general' (228).

Samarin's approach is thus the conventional anthropological one: to get behind what people say, and to discover what they really mean – and 'mean' here is defined in terms of sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic categories. The formal oddity of glossolalia's surface structure is thus put in perspective. In this respect, the book is extremely successful. Part of its value is the way in which it suggests hypotheses for future work in this area. From what both Samarin and Goodman say, the prosodic characteristics of glossolalic utterances stand out as a means of identifying their various functions. Neither of them, however, spend as much time analysing the utterances *linguistically* as one might expect. The remarks about prosody in Samarin are largely impressionistic; in Goodman, they are too narrowly phonetic. One wants a description somewhere in between. Again, if pitch is one of the means of making a glossolalic interpretation more precise, I wonder whether it would be easier to arrive at an agreed interpretation in the case of someone with a tone-language background; could the terms of the interpretation be made more specific? And as a third example, the readiness with which people identify glossolalia as a particular foreign language is itself an interesting phenomenon: why should the most 'popular' languages cited be 'oriental' and 'romance' (as cited by Samarin, 108)? What do the informants mean when they use such labels? Would there be similar reactions from speakers of other languages? At this point, Samarin makes an appropriate reference to the unreliability of witnesses in identifying languages in Poe's *The murders in the Rue Morgue*. But given enough informants, some interesting information about group stereotypes may emerge.

This book can be recommended both as a stimulant for the interested scholar

and as a non-technical calumative for the merely curious. Taken along with Goodman, the average lecturer should have no difficulty in handling eccentric questions on this topic in the future.

REFERENCES

- Goodman, Felicitas D. (1972). *Speaking in tongues: a cross-cultural study of glossolalia*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Lepschy, G. (1973). 'Saussure e gli spiriti'.

Reviewed by DAVID CRYSTAL
Department of Linguistic Science
University of Reading
Whiteknights, Reading, England

(Received 27 March, 1973)

COURTNEY B. CAZDEN, *Child language and education*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1972. Pp. vi + 314.

It is inevitable at the present time that a book bearing the title *Child language and education* and written 'for anyone, researcher and teacher, who seeks to improve children's communicative adequacy through education' (1) should be read in the first instance for the light it throws on the debate concerning the concepts of 'linguistic deprivation' and 'cultural deprivation'. It is necessary for any writer making recommendations concerning children's language nowadays to resolve ambiguities in these issues and clear up misunderstandings; this Cazden does with admirable clarity, though this is not the sole aim of the book.

The book has the following plan. After the Introduction there is one chapter on the nature of language. Then follows a group of four chapters dealing with language development, divided into syntax, sounds and meanings, development processes, and environmental assistance. Another group of chapters deals with language differences and language use: dialects and bilingualism, communication styles, and the role of language in cognition. The final chapter contains some thoughts on oral language education. There is also an Appendix which describes methods of analysing child language, both from spontaneous speech and from tests.

The linguistic theory expounded in the book and underlying most of the research discussed is that of Chomsky. Cazden points out that most of what we have learned about child language in recent years has been 'due largely to the powerful analyses of language that his work stimulated' (5). Cazden's concept of communicative adequacy is, in fact, at some distance removed from Chomsky's work. Chomsky's concept of linguistic competence, which severed language from its social context, is replaced by Hymes's wider notion of communicative competence which includes, besides knowledge of language, 'knowledge of the social world and of rules for using language in that world so that speech is appropriate as well as grammatical and creative within both linguistic and socio-linguistic rules' (3). Cazden distinguishes communicative adequacy from Hymes's