**THE GLOSSOLALIC UTTERANCE
WHAT DOES IT ALL MEAN?**

by

IRENE ANN SMOLIK, B.A., M.A. (Sociology)

**A thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfilment of
the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy**

Department of Sociology and Anthropology

Carleton University

Ottawa, Ontario

November 28, 2003

© 2003, Irene Ann Smolik

National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

ISBN: 0-612-89895-4

Our file Notre référence

ISBN: 0-612-89895-4

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this dissertation.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de ce manuscrit.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the dissertation.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Canada

ABSTRACT

This research project on *glossolalia* (a phenomenon known as tongue-speaking), considers the nature and essence of this phenomenon. It attempts to impart a partial character of glossolalia to the reader, through in-depth long interviews that highlight the fact that glossolalia is a polysemic and polyvalent process; one with *powerful* effect upon the glossolalist.

Evidence collected reveals that glossolalia involves a [spiritual] energy, which resides within each person. Glossolalia *is* a power or energy that results in spontaneous and intended behaviours that *transmute* the human organism to a higher level of consciousness. The dissertation reveals that tongue-speaking consists of both intelligible and unintelligible utterances; both verbal and nonverbal; and that glossolalia has a range of meaningful expressions that have powerful effect upon individual *self*, as it interpenetrates a higher *Self* - the 'other' ["God"] or cosmic energy.

The project develops a typology, coming out of the long-interviews depicting real distinctions in glossolalic expression. These are useful for analyzes and indicative of the complex experience of glossolalia. The researcher argues for the complexification of what traditionally has been classified as "incoherent babbling" or "regressive speech." The consequential effect of glossolalic expression and concomitant expressiveness does not support the distinction between "religious experience" and all other experience that engages the *lifeworld* of the human organism.

The duality of existence is non-existent (except to *will* or *ego*). Utilizing interdisciplinary findings from neuroscience and the social sciences, this project contributes to a heterophenomenological analysis of *all* experience, via the transpersonal method of *intuitive inquiry*. This method privileges the voice of the glossolalic-researcher. In this project, the social scientist also experiences glossolalia and reports from both inside and outside the experience.

There are "mysteries" of the human mindbrain, which glossolalia and the transpersonal researcher can help science explore. While it is argued that it is the interpretation of culture that explains experience for the percipient or glossolalist, the transpersonal researcher can work from "within" the experience and dialogue with all scientific endeavors. In other words, this project reveals no incommensurability of paradigms. Rather, all endeavor is viewed as part of a process of humankind's evolution to a higher level of human consciousness. This, argues the researcher, is a *spiritual transmutation*, one which can be scientifically "talked" about and experienced.

Acknowledgements

This dissertation project is the result of an *ongoingness of spiritual transmutation* within the researcher. It is the beginning of more dreams to come. However, in recognition of several persons who have provided support to this particular human experiencer/percipient, I would like to formally thank and acknowledge the following persons:

Thank you to:

Emeritus Professor, Dr. Charles Laughlin, Jr., Carleton University, who never doubted my ability to complete the project and believed in its efficacy.

Professor J. Rick Ponting, University of Calgary, who believed in my intelligence, setting me upon this monumental journey to “return to school.”

Madame Denyse Michaud, who gave me a beautiful place to complete this project. You are an angel.

To the special people who embraced this project – sincere thank you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	iii
Acknowledgments	iv
Table of Contents	v
List of Tables	vii
List of Figures	viii
 CHAPTER ONE: GLOSSOLALIA AS [SPIRITUAL] EXPERIENCING	 1
Introduction	1
Nature of an Experience: The Research Problematic	3
Experience	9
Soul or Self?	10
Glossolalia	11
Contributions of this Research Project	12
Theoretical Presuppositions	17
Key Concepts	25
Conclusion	33
 CHAPTER TWO: HISTORICAL REVIEW	 45
Overview	45
Seventeenth Century	48
The Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century	50
The Twentieth Century	54
Pentecostalism in Canada	61
 CHAPTER THREE: GLOSSOLALIA RESEARCH	 68
Overview	68
Review of Glossolalia Literature	69
Research Note	97
Conclusion	98
 CHAPTER FOUR: METHODOLOGY A RITUAL OF PROTOCOLS	 100
Overview	100
Transpersonal Methodology and Intuitive Inquiry	110
Research Caveats	114
Researcher Characteristics	117
Strengths and Weakness of Transpersonal Research	124
Selecting and Focusing Inquiry: The Research Question	126
Collecting the Data	132
What does it All Mean? The Interview Process	137

The Long Interview and Number of Respondents	141
Incubating, Analyzing, Synthesizing Data	147
Conclusion	149
 CHAPTER FIVE: FORM, CONTENT, AND CONTEXT	152
Introduction	152
Form	152
Content	153
Context	154
Summary of Research Project Sample	156
Respondent Characteristics	156
Conclusion	166
 CHAPTER SIX: RESEARCH FINDINGS	168
Overview	168
A Note of Typology in the Social Sciences	169
Typology of Tongue-speaking	173
Vocal Glossolalic Utterance	173
Subvocal Utterance	189
Animal (or creature-like) Utterance	190
Anemos Utterance	191
Glossolalia as Experienced by Glossolalists Studied: Glossolalia Exhumed	192
Selected Examples of Concomitant Experiences of The Glossolalist	200
Conclusion	218
 CHAPTER SEVEN: AN INTERPRETATION OF GLOSSOLALIA	221
Introduction	221
What is glossolalia?	224
Cultural Consonance, Dissonance, Neutrality	239
Interpretation of Glossolalia	254
Pentarchy of Expressive Attributes	274
Conclusion	289
 CHAPTER EIGHT: QUO VADIS?	293
Existence as Experience	297
Consequences of Glossolalia: the Dialogical Self	304
Identity and Personal Transformation	313
The Practice of Glossolalia: Prayer Changes Things	314
Conclusion: Honourable Closure	318
 APPENDIXES	328
 GLOSSARY	338
 BIBLIOGRAPHY	344

LIST OF TABLES

Table 5.1	Age, Marital Status, Church Attendance, and Religion, as Reported on the preliminary questionnaire for all Respondents	159
Table 5.2	Age, Mother-Tongue, years of Education, and SES for all Respondents	162
Table 5.3	Age, Years speaking in tongues, Frequency of tongues, and Place First Experience of tongues occurred for Respondents	164
Table 5.4	Ethnicity, Number of Siblings, Number of Children and the Birth Order of all Respondents	166

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 4.1	Phases of Intuitive Inquiry	130
Figure 6.1	Typology of Glossolalic Utterances	173
Figure 6.2	Concomitant Experiential Aspects of Glossolalic Behavior	194
Figure 7.1	Pentarchy of Expressive Attributes making up the body-mind-spirit complex of <i>H.s.s.</i>	276

CHAPTER ONE

GLOSSOLALIA AS [SPIRITUAL] EXPERIENCING

Introduction

The line of reasoning, though not haphazard, is serendipitous
– taking advantage, as need arises, of biological evidence
here, logical argument there and pure speculation where
nothing else suffices.
Humphrey, 1992: xvi

This dissertation attempts to impart a partial *character* of *glossolalia* (tongue-speaking) to the reader. The research project seeks to debunk tongue-speaking as anything less than a polysemic and polyvalent exploration into the personal *self*, a *Spirit*-world, their interpenetrating, and the *experience* of both. The respondents interviewed provide evidence to the fact that glossolalia potentially contributes to the raising of individual consciousness (awareness), through a *process* referred to as *spiritual transmutation*.

Through a phenomenological “pilot” study, into the *experiential* nature of tongue-speaking, this project seeks to “get at” the *essence* of tongue-speaking. This research project peers into the *lived* experiences of the glossolalist through personal stories related via in-depth interviews with the researcher. Since the researcher is herself a glossolalist, she takes these recounted experiences to that which is already known and understood about glossolalia within the social scientific literature; the researcher’s own lived experience of tongue-speaking informs all aspects of this project.

Sociologically, this research project is an exploratory engagement of the nature of a specific *religious/spiritual* experience and seeks to establish “new ground” through the development of a *natural typology* of glossolalia (and elucidation of concomitant expressiveness).

Given the exploratory nature of this project, the researcher must state that her conclusions are *provisional*. She invites a “testing” and subsequently, a validating of all her findings and musings through further phenomenological research (which will contribute to *communal confirmation* or *sympathetic resonance*); inviting dialogue with other researchers studying the phenomenon of tongue-speaking (and other researchers studying spiritual experiences). Specifically, the call is also for comparative studies that will use the typology of glossolalia developed and “test” its usefulness for sociological analysis and understanding of [other forms of spiritual] experiencing. The researcher hopes that future researchers will examine and “test” the method of *intuitive inquiry* upon the plethora of *gnostic* experiences encountered in multiple venues around the world.

Individuals in the twenty-first century live out their personal and communal existence in an increasingly complex social environment. Teske (2001) argues that spiritual life does not escape the socio-historical and evolutionary embodied contingencies by which it is constituted (2001: 94). To be human and social entails interacting with other minds, in bodies, in a socio-historical field. It is a reciprocal experience, whether one consciously recognizes (in

terms of awareness) and reflectively examines this or not. It is necessary that our *self* understand the embodiment of this inherent "spirituality."

While scholars such as Teske (2001), Joseph (2001), and Ashbrook (1989), attempt to make theology or religious systems coherent with science, this researcher would like to return first, to *experience*, in order to examine the glossolalist as a *dialogical self* in dialectical relation to *spirit*, 'Other' (*Spirit*), society, and the universe.

Nature of an Experience: The Research Problematic

Both "religious" and "experiencing" are Western concepts that need to be privileged in the study of [religious] phenomena. Returning to Schleiermacher (1768-1834), we can weave an intellectual trend that finds its way through subsequent *discourse* on religion, namely, an invitation to return to experience.

In Schleiermacher's theory, religious experiences arise out of a feeling and intuition that an individual develops toward the universe. This response is *sui generis*, deeply rooted in individual consciousness and is a universal experience in all cultures (Schleiermacher, 1958). He writes that "the Whole" must be found chiefly in our minds and transferred to corporeal nature. It appears that the mind produces and sustains religion by operating on persons "as a world and as in a world." (Schleiermacher, 1958: 71) Today, neuroscience and anthropology suggest that the basis for religious experiencing resides in our mindbrain (see the work of Persinger, 1987; d'Aquili, 1993; d'Aquili and Newberg, 1993; Laughlin, 1995; Winkelman, 2000).

Although Schleiermacher wrote during the eighteenth and early nineteenth century, compare what a twentieth-century neuropsychologist writes.

The capacity to have the God Experience is a consequence of the human brain's construction. If the temporal lobe had developed in some other way, the God Experience would not have occurred.... my hypothesis is that the God Experience is a phenomenon that is associated with the construction of the temporal lobe.

All of us, by virtue of our primate heritage, have this capacity. Some of us may regress to it, others may enhance it, and still others may be embarrassed by its presence. Like the propensity to walk and to talk, it is a potential in each of us. We may just know it by different names. (Persinger, 1987:14)

Georg Simmel (1858-1918) sees religion as a product of human consciousness. Simmel sees processes within the individual that require the human [the individual's soul] to find meaning, in and about the external, empirical world. For Simmel, there is an inherent "religiosity" within the individual; this may or may not turn to religion. Simmel deals with the structural meaning of religion as a social and psychic phenomenon. Sounding much like a present-day neuropsychologist, he writes: "Not until religion sets the fundamental tone for life can life's single elements once more interrelate harmoniously with each other and with the whole." (Simmel, 1997:137) This impulse of the 'soul' is one that guides the life of the individual, but which may not necessitate a turn to religion.

This dissertation employs an implicit theoretical engagement with six key nineteenth-century scholars: Wilhelm Dilthey (1833-1911), Henri Bergson (1859-1941), Émile Durkheim (1858-1917), Georg Simmel (1858-1918),

William James (1842-1910), and Carl Gustav Jung (1875-1961). Wilfred Cantwell Smith (1997) asserts that in every generation there are 'seers' who strive to raise the consciousness of unenlightened men and women. Furthermore, he contends that we run the risk of intellectual, social, and cultural error if we do not attend to the voices that point to the ideal of transcendence. It is an error, he notes also, not to examine our own inherited cultural concepts and intellectual knowledge (Smith, 1997). The task is always to *experience* and not intellectually obfuscate what is historically known.

Absent from most previous discussion and research on glossolalia, is a "gnostic knowing" or "gnostic verification"¹ of the actual experience of glossolalia through the *lived experiencing* of glossolalia by the researcher. Past research has not always considered the findings and implications coming from within other disciplines such as theobiology², consciousness studies, neuroscience, and biogenetic structuralism. This dissertation advances the thesis that theories such as biogenetic structuralism combined with advances in the understanding of alternative phases of consciousness, and transpersonal experiences, as *apprehended* by social scientists, moves the discussion of glossolalia intellectually forward.

¹ The transpersonal psychologist, Ken Wilbur, attempted to bring transpersonal science to sociology. The "*direct* (as opposed to textual) investigation" of *anomalous* experiences (religious or spiritual experiencing) involves the methodological problem of *direct* apprehension of knowledge from human experiences regarded as "mystical" or "non-ordinary."

² Quoting Rayburn and Richmond: "**Theobiology, the interfacing of** theology and biology (standing for all earth and social sciences), has been proposed as a theory, field, and discipline to get deeper understanding and meaning from the revealed knowledge of God and God's universe (including the environment, the animals, and plants)." (2002: 1789)

The method of *transpersonal experience* honours the experience and furnishes a highly powered microscopic lens to examine tongue-speaking.³ It may be that covertly, the researcher seeks to debunk the “myth” of glossolalia as anything less than a polyvalent and polysemic discovery of an individual’s search for cosmic and self-identity. Glossolalia appears to be one *potential* point-of-entry into the personal, phenomenal process of self-convergence and unity. At the same time, the researcher recognizes that the findings coming out of this exploratory project challenge the hegemonic paradigms in orthodox theology and science.

Humankind’s search for “self-fulfilment and meaning” in life are intrinsic to living encounters in the material world (i.e., “reality”). The aforementioned scholars understood the human desire for unity and wholeness. In this research project this quest for “oneness” and “wholeness” is conceived of, and seen, as a “spiritual impulse.” The dissertation findings reveal that Christian charismatic glossolalia, circumscribed in the Christian charismatic terminology of “The Baptism of the Holy Spirit,” is an energy not unlike Bergson’s *élan vital* or the *sui generis* energy or force in Durkheim’s theory.

The twentieth century brought forward the Cartesian positivism that denied “subjectivism” even to the very “subject” qua “object” social science studies. Reviewing early scholarship however, shows that this indeed was not always the norm.

Since the middle of the eighteenth century, explanations of religion have become a preoccupation for thinking men and women in the Western world as never before in the history of Western thought (Thrower, 1999:3). In a lecture delivered in Japan, the late historian of religion, Wilfred Cantwell Smith, ventured a forthright statement on the future task in any consideration about religion: "Our inescapable task, however, is to think about it, responsibly, insofar as we are able to affect it." (Smith, 1997: 66)

While an historical account of the development of religion, as well as a response to the question, "What is religion?" cannot be given its due in this dissertation, it is noted that theories of religion and definitions of religion are as multifarious as their proponents and antagonists. This also holds true for the subject at hand – the glossolalist and *glossolalia*.

The crux of the empirical matter is that "religious experiencing" is a fact (Durkheim, 1995/1912; Simmel, 1997; MacMurray, 1946; Webb, 1945; Whitehead, 1965a/1926; Berger, 1990/1967). The ontological primacy of religion is the individual within community (*macro*). The ontological primacy of religiosity (or 'religiousness' or 'spiritualness') is the individual in isolation, but "in the world" (*micro*). The researcher's epistemology necessitates privileging the encountering of an "overwhelmingness" or [*religious*] *experiencing* of the individual in communal (public) and personal (private) life. It is also about the experience of individuals in their particular conceptual and perceptual *lived*

³ Braud and Anderson (1998: xxvii) write, "Ideally, a comprehensive definition of human experience also anticipates the inclusion of appreciation, humility, and wonder as intrinsic

experience. Put another way, the primacy of gaining a fuller understanding of a particular experience called “religious”, in this case through the behaviour of glossolalia (tongue-speaking), entails observing and interviewing individuals within their cultural community. The researcher concurs with MacMurray who sees the “field” of religion as follows: “In all cases the field is a field of normal, universal, and uninterpreted human experience.” (MacMurray, 1946: 16)

While a fuller exposition of this intellectual trend to examine experience will not be advanced here, it must be noted that early social scientific scholarship sees religious phenomena in an empirical (often-inductive) way. Scholars of the nineteenth and early twentieth-century value the lived experience of individuals who encounter “religion,” “spiritualism,” “mysticism,” “psi phenomenon,” and “shamanism.” They do not ignore experience as a fact of consciousness and as reality (Dilthey, 1944/1911; Durkheim, 1995/1912; Simmel, 1997; James, 1958; Jung, 1938, 1973/1964; Whitehead, 1965a/1926).

During the twentieth-century social scientists began struggling for a better understanding of experience, and getting at this from the “inside” out. In particular, the early sixties saw a move toward a *transpersonal* understanding of human experiencing, challenging traditional methodology in the social sciences (see the work in transpersonal psychology and anthropology by Charles Tart, 1978, 1986; Maslow, 1976; Campbell, 1981; Laughlin, 1988, 1994, 1995; Laughlin, et al., 1979; Walsh, 1993; Walsh and Vaughan, 1993;

Waldron, 1998; Braud and Anderson, 1998; Winkelman, 2000; Winkelman, 2002).

Experience

Experience is regarded as an encounter involving all that is both inter-, intra-, and *transpersonal*; as well as all that is inter-, intra-, and *transpsychic*. The individual engages experience in a dynamic social field comprised of all components of an individual's socio-historical and cultural milieu.⁴

All [spiritual] life occurs in a dynamic and open-system. The embodiment of this spiritual life or spiritual impulse, is the *self (soul)*, which may or may not turn to religion. It is the emergent self that is capable of self-transcendence. "Both our self-transcendence and the self-limitations that require it are made possible by our neuropsychology (Teske 1996a). Nevertheless, the very neuropsychological characteristics that make spirituality possible, provide limits that *individuals* cannot alone transcend (Teske 1996b)." (Teske, 2001: 95)

Persinger, referring to the opposition against the objective explanation for why people believe in God writes:⁵

⁴ The researcher takes this (plural noun) term and uses it literally. What we experience ("that which rises up to meet us") is something encountered, undergone, lived through in our *Lebenswelt* or lifeworld. It is a *direct* experience of perceiving the social field or "world." Note the following: "The worldview of most of us on the planet is both shaped by and active in informing our individual life-world – that is, each person's world of immediate experience." (Laughlin, 1992:1)

⁵ Note again that this researcher believes that there is inherently, no "objective" research in the definitions given by positivist science. Rather, all research is guided by suppositions which, whether explicit or not, guide the activities of the scientific enterprise. It is, like any mundane experience, guided by the worldview of the researcher in his/her particular academic discipline.

First, the subject matter is extremely sensitive. Since behavioral scientists (the individuals best trained in this approach to religion) are themselves human beings, the God Problem involves their own existence as well. It is hard to maintain an analytical insulation between objective and personal significance, especially when the results may indict one's own existence.

The second major reason is that scholars who have written about the God Problem have maintained, often in a contrived manner, a distinction between religious phenomenon and all other forms of human behavior. Writers who demand this dichotomy have a clear commitment to the status quo. Their compulsion to write stems from the same source as their God Experiences. (1987: ix)

Soul or Self

Usage of the term "self," is actually quite recent and concomitant with the historical origins of the mind/body split.

Until the 16th and 17th centuries the soul, not the self, was the term used to refer to identity. . . .

In early Christianity the concept of self referred to the personality, the outward indications and attributes of the individual, whereas the soul (heart) referred to inner spiritual/psychological affective experience, an emotional (loving, hateful, prideful, resistant, contemptuous) relationship with others, the world, and sometimes with divinity. . . .

By the later medieval period, when the first signs and symptoms of modern individualism began to appear, the appropriate term of reference for identity became a contentious issue, as reference to one's own person gradually changed from a preference for use of the word *soul* to a preference for the word *self*. This change of terminology was indicative of the, by now, long history of the migration of self-awareness from heart to head, from an inner subjectivity (soul) to an outer disposition (the self-construct as actor and expressive, social representative), and toward an increasing distrust and avoidance of the affections in favor of abstract thought and the order of reason, culminating in the split between mind and body of the modern individual inherited from Platonism and Christianity. (Lind, 2001: 37)

The ultimate result is that cultural conditioning "determined an egocentric interpretation and evaluation of experience." (Lind, 2001: 38) Lind cogently writes: "The resulting mutually exclusive part-selves cannot be reunited

through the very processes that create and maintain their separation and mutual conflict, that is, by a head-consciousness seeking perfection or transcendence, rather than reintegration, but only by something like a reversal of these tendencies (Lind, 2000).” (Lind, 2001: 38) The researcher also believes that it is reintegration of that which is meant to be whole (psychic unity of subconscious or nonconsciousness and consciousness) through which individuals can once more become *soul-full beings*. Until the organism experiences further evolution of its primary organic *self*, the individual will continue to *transcend* experiences as compared to *moving* into the future as a *wholistic being*. Continued processes within *spiritual transmutation* are necessary to overcome the tensions between “soul” and “self.”

Glossolalia

Writing in the early years of the twentieth century, George Barton Cutten wrote that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to find a more useless gift such as glossolalia (Cutten, 1927:10). He comments that such a phenomenon would decrease in its manifest importance, “as knowledge accumulates, and as natural inhibition and control develop.” Subsequent history and research challenge Cutten’s thesis.

Glossolalia has not been the norm for most [recorded Western] Christian worship.⁶ Rather, “it has been more characteristic of sect-type groups, such

⁶Tongues in early Eastern Christianity (referring here to Greek and Orthodox Christianity) continued the traditions of the Church fathers. “The East developed a mystical, individualistic, otherworldly, introverted Christianity. In this tradition the individual gifts of the Spirit flourished. The door was never closed to experiences like tongues.” (Kelsey, 1965: 42) While there is evidence of tongue-speaking among Orthodox clergy and Russian priests, it likely continued

as the Jansenists, the Mormons, the Shakers, and the members of the Catholic Apostolic Church.” (Malony and Lovekin, 1985: 5) “Nowhere has glossolalia occupied such a central role as in twentieth century Pentecostalism” (Williams, 1981: 48). Moving into the twenty-first century, it appears that even “classical Pentecostalism” is being re-shaped and, as Harvey Cox writes, Pentecostal spirituality is reshaping religion (Cox, 2001/1995).⁷ Pentecostalism and fundamentalism is changing traditional societies such as the Alaska native culture of Southeast Alaska (Tlingit and Haida).⁸

Contributions of This Research Study

Historically considered, persons have and continue to engage in tongue-speaking. With the emergence of the Pentecostal movement during the twentieth century and its global expansion, especially into areas formerly dominated by Catholic, Muslim, and indigenous faiths, there is an increasing body of research on a movement where adherents evidence such “irrational” behaviour as tongue-speaking. Tongue-speaking is now an established fact (see Cutten, 1927; Kelsey, 1968; Kildahl, 1972; Goodman, 1972a; Christie-Murray, 1978; Bradfield, 1979; Williams, 1981; Fletcher, 1985; Malony and

within the tradition of Greek monasticism without attracting much notice. It is evident in such Pentecostal churches as The Free Apostolic Church of Pentecost” of Greece (see Lindermayer, 1998). Pentecostalism was carried into Greece during the first three decades of the twentieth century by Greek immigrants who converted to Pentecostalism in the United States (these immigrants met Pentecostals, Fundamentalists, and evangelical Protestants in the American mid-west and California) (Lindermayer, 2001: 1).

⁷ What this researcher sees happening is that the form and context of “worship” (hence, religion) is changing.

Lovekin, 1985; Mol, 1985; Chaika, 1990; Mumford, 1996; Cox, 2001/1995; Corten, 1997; Henderson, 1997; Smolik, 1998; Dombrowski, 2001).⁹

According to some literature, the history of this phenomenon dates glossolalia as evident prior to the period of Christianity (Cutten, 1927: 2). Kildahl (1972: 11) notes that "ecstatic utterances of a divinely inspired nature are mentioned in early Egyptian writings." A few scholars appear to have difficulty comparing ecstatic utterances of the pre-Christian era to the glossolalia of the *Pentecostal* experience recorded in the New Testament (see Henderson, 1997). Glossolalia is present in cross-cultural ethnographic studies (Goodman, 1972a, 1972b; Bourguignon, 1973, 1989; During, 1997; Hale, 1997). Goodman cogently writes: "Largely ignorant of the ethnographic literature, the majority of the authors of Christian theological discussions are convinced of the uniqueness of the behavior in the Christian church." (1972a: xvi).

"Pentecostalism has mostly been studied in its psychological and anthropological aspects and even as a social problem." (Corten, 1997: 312) Despite accurate numbers on adherents within it, Pentecostalism is growing (Christie-Murray, 1978; Williams, 1981; Malony and Lovekin, 1985; Wuthnow, 1987; Poloma and Pendleton, 1989; Stoll, 1990; Cox, 2001/1995; Corten, 1997; Coleman, 1998; Crowley, 1998; Swift, 1998). This is especially true in

⁹ See here Kirk Dombrowski's insightful book, *Against Culture: Development, Politics, and Religion in Indian Alaska*. His "ethnography of a problem" raises "practical and theoretical implications for the understanding of indigenous cultural and political processes."

Canada, where Catholic and Protestant church affiliation has decreased but Pentecostal sects have shown significant increases as reported through recent Canadian censuses. Toronto, Ontario is the home of what is now called the "Toronto Blessing;" it is considered the latest wave of the Pentecostal/Charismatic/Third Wave/Latter Rain movement – a "revival" that began at the Toronto Airport Christian Fellowship in January 1994 (Poloma and Hoelter, 1998).

Despite the plethora of research into Pentecostalism, little new theory emerges from the past approaches to studying glossolalia. "Theorists have attempted to explain glossolalia in terms of abnormal pathological states, social disorganization, economic deprivation and cultural conditioning [theories]." (Williams, 1981: 151)

Given the interdisciplinary nature of this research project, the results are commensurable with cross-cultural and interdisciplinary research. Since the project focuses on the *activity* of glossolalia *per se*, it yields information about human universals. That is, because the researcher can live through (qua experience) the glossolalic event, she can take these findings to the literature and scientific data to see how each can inform the other. It is a dialectic engagement of symbolic representations (cognitive-linguistic) with embodied experience. The researcher engages many moments of "bracketing" information; but also, there is a process of looking for what is both similar and

⁹ "Fact" is used here to mean something that exists and is empirically verifiable. I also invoke Durkheim's concept of "social fact" and the William James (1958) lectures discussing facts of

unique to each respondent's experience, considering experiences "in the field," and through personal experiencing and reflection upon glossolalic expression. Reflection is on going with the literature reviewed.

Unique to this project is the researcher's experiencing of glossolalia as a part of the data collected. Utilizing the methodology of *intuitive inquiry*, on-going experiences enlivened and enriched the emergent research findings. The researcher is able to move deeper into glossolalic expressiveness because she allows the data (the utterances and concomitant experiences) to "show-up" and "speak to her." While honouring the Christian charismatic glossolalists' explanations and descriptions, she honours scientific endeavor as well. Moving back and forth enlightens both spheres and the researcher, while looking critically at both, finds no formidable barriers to bridging "science and religion."

The unique contribution is not only methodological, it is theoretical. We are, in 2003, in a unique position in history to reflect and review scientific accomplishments. Science and consciousness, and science and "the spiritual" do not need to be polarized or antagonistic to one another. This project reveals that dialogue can occur between all academic disciplines and human experiencing of that regarded as "sacred."

With regards to scientific findings and comparisons, the project is also exceptional. Consider the following critique, made in light of "a neuro-

phenomenology of human consciousness" (in the work of Laughlin, McManus, d'Aquili, 1990; d'Aquili, 1993):

Western science and ordinary consciousness are called to account. One result is the neglect of Western religion. . . . I would hope they would continue their interpretive work by reengaging a Western theological mind-set, discerning in it a mature stage of consciousness as well. (Ashbrook, 1993: 244)

The researcher believes that this project makes a nascent start in answering this critique. It is time to re-engage Western Judeo-Christian tradition with the lens of scientific intuitive phenomenological science. Laughlin et al. (1990) note: "We advocated combining anthropology, the neurosciences, and contemplation as the most productive way to explore and model consciousness."

A further contribution of this project, is that it honours the experience of glossolalia by attempting to find meaning *within* the experience by deeply understanding and practicing it. Maslow points out that meanings must be deeply understood and experienced (Maslow, 1976:35). This research project goes beyond a simple description of an experience, with its activities of categorizing emergent and re-emergent themes and patterns (e.g., ethnography). It goes beyond the reasons for the "practice" of tongue-speaking. The transpersonal experience of glossolalia by the researcher puts glossolalia "under the lens;" by so doing, it is revealed that glossolalia embeds

cultural universals of the mindbrain (there is "more" than meets intellectual observation on this phenomenon).¹⁰

Theoretical Presuppositions

It is incumbent upon the social scientific researcher to make her assumptions, biases, values, beliefs, and experiences transparent to the "audience." In the very act of so doing, it contributes to a dialectical process present within each person, one that continues long after the reading of this text. This process is occurring at several levels; it is inter-, intra-, and transpsychic and inter-, intra-, and *transpersonal*.¹¹ The actual components of this dialectical process are complex. Indeed, it is the dialectical complexity of our *existence* on this planet that encourages an approach acknowledging complexity.¹² Evidence from this research project points a finger to glossolalic complexification. The process of glossolalia is part of a transmuting of individual and collective consciousness.

¹⁰ To reiterate, the phenomenon of glossolalia "speaks" through its expression, as well as the respondents' articulated responses to research questions. This "speaking" is furthered by the processes engaged in data analysis.

¹¹ The researcher initiates a dialectic with the audience (the reader of this text) at several levels: (1) the cognitive level; (2) the "bodily-felt-relating" to the presentation of this material and in the physical presence of this being heard, the mutual reciprocal "bodily-felt-relating" between audience and speaker; and (3) an intrapsychic dialectic that assumes a neurophysiological stimulus-response as well as the conscious, cognitive dialogue that occurs and may extend past reading of this text. The dialectical process initiated is seen as a continuation of all past cognitive processing of the individual's *mindbrain*; it is one that is contributing to the collective universal consciousness of *Homo sapien sapiens*.

¹² Concomitant with the concept of complexity, is the concept of simplicity. Findings emerging out of the new field of complexity theory show that complex adaptive systems seek organization (Arden, 1998: 24). The base of any complex system, however, is a "basin" of simplicity (this researcher looks for what is similar [along with a consideration of that which is dissimilar]; in this regards she is a monistic researcher).

In considering a *dialectical* [interpretive] approach to religion, we consider the relations in a society between religion and the "units" of social organization (i.e., child, adult, family, a local group, tribe, community, region, and nation). The broad context of these relationships is one in which there is "a continual, inevitable, pull and counter-pull between forces of integration and differentiation, needing and opposing one another, as order and progress both need and oppose one another." (Mol, 1982; d'Aquili and Mol, 1990). In this research project, the context in which this interplay of relations takes place, is the *social field*. In a social field we experience time and space, through the mindbrain, as well as, "meaning" and "place."¹³

The *context* of the social field is part of an evolutionary process. The simplest definition of this here is that evolution is "a process of change in a certain direction," which is better described as an *unfolding*. This unfolding *is* all that is phylogenetic. It is a process in which the universe is a progression of interrelated phenomena; it is mind, brain, material, and spiritual substance. This unfolding occurs in the dialectical environment of an individual's reality.

In this project, the researcher speaks as both researcher and as one who works from "within" the experience as well – the researcher is a glossolalist. The researcher experiences the glossolalic utterance and considers

¹³ Teske notes: "Julian Jaynes (1976) and others (see, for example, Hermans, Kempen, and van Loon 1992) argue that our very consciousness of self is constituted and organized metaphorically as space." (2001: 94) Whenever we *think* we use concepts and these concepts are all processed neural sequences within our brain. They are something which we do not fully understand, but we know that an integrated and intricate process is at work – of which the "whole," is in the *form* of an *idea* (all of this taking place in the structure of the "triune

glossolalia to be "more;" glossolalia is dialectic. Glossolalia, for this transpersonal researcher and sociologist, is an energy-flow transmuting the entire organism.

In their work, *Brain, Symbol and Experience: Toward a Neurophenomenology of Human Consciousness*, Laughlin, McManus and d'Aquili write: "One reason why consciousness defies easy definition is that the term labels a functional complex and not a discrete 'thing' or quality." (1992/1990: 77) It also refers to the immediacy of direct experience, with all its richness and ever changing fluidity (Laughlin et al., 1992/1990: 77). In their characterization of consciousness, three loci of data must be considered: *experience, neurobiology, and behaviour*.

The first *a priori* assumption in this research project, is that at all times and in any *social field*, the individual experiences *consciousness*; the concept "consciousness" is considered an *experiential* term.¹⁴ "It is well to recall that the term *consciousness* derives from the Latin *conscius*, a root that means roughly 'experience with knowledge'." (Laughlin et al., 1992/1990: 82)

Speaking in tongues is considered an *alternative phase* of consciousness. D'Aquili writes, regarding religious experiencing: "An altered phase of consciousness, *in and of itself*, represents neither pathology nor increased mental health.... It is high time that psychiatry and psychology stop identifying

brain"). These processes engage all experiences, consciously or unconsciously recognized of the person *experiencing/encountering* the social field.

¹⁴ Consciousness "entrains" elements of previous processes in the social field to an increasing degree of complexity (see Hawkins, 2002/1995: 252-253; Shearer, Laughlin, McManus, 1983; Newberg and d'Aquili, 1994; Laughlin, 1995).

altered phases of consciousness, as such, as pathological." (1993: 259; see Hine, 1969; Samarin, 1972b; Mumford, 1996)¹⁵

The brain is the organ of behaviour; it is made up of structures, which are "organizations of cells, minimally including neurons and glial and endocrine cells" (Laughlin et al., 1992/1990: 49). The brain is a part of the human nervous system and it is "one vast community of cells organized hierarchically into networks, specializing in various functions and developing at their own rate." (Laughlin et al., 1992/1990: 139)¹⁶

The researcher's approach makes explicit that she is both a humanistic and monistic *being*; a being who is consciously engaging a social scientific way to examine one particular type of human experience.¹⁷

The research assumes a non-dualistic approach. That is, any mind-body dualism or head-heart dualism is rejected. It is suggested "there developed in consequence two distinct kinds of mental representation, involving very

¹⁵ It should also be noted that d'Aquili writes: "Alternate phases of consciousness may or may not represent pathology. Insofar as they are correlated with increased fragmentation of the personality, they certainly do represent pathology." (d'Aquili, 1993: 258). However, one must always be aware of how a given culture determines "pathology" and how it treats such "pathology." (see the clinical case study by Alfonso Martínez-Taboas, 1999)

¹⁶ A note regarding neuroanatomy. This is the structure of the nervous system and itself is divided into the central nervous system (CNS) and the peripheral nervous system (PNS). These "systems" are connected and function together. The brain and spinal cord make up the central nervous system, with the brain containing about 100 billion nerve cells (neurons) and trillions of "support cells" called glia. (<http://faculty.washington.edu/chudler/nsdivide.html> [July 3, 2002]. The peripheral nervous system is made up of three parts: the somatic nervous system, the autonomic nervous system and the enteric nervous system (the third part is not usually discussed but is important as it is a meshwork of nerve fibers that innervate the viscera – gastrointestinal tract, pancreas, gall bladder).

¹⁷ The simplest meaning here of these terms is that the researcher engages living existence as one centered upon human interests and values but one that does not reject supernaturalism. It *does* stress an individual's dignity, worth and ability or capacity for self-actualization, individuation, or self-realization through a *transcendence* that includes both

different styles of information processing. While one path led to the qualia of subjective feelings and first-person knowledge of the self, the other led to the intentional objects of cognition and objective knowledge of the external physical world . . . 'quality against quantity' . . ." (Humphrey, 1992). Bergson (1944/1911) cogently notes that within the evolution of mankind from lower forms of life, intellect and instinct became bifurcated. This opposing and yet complimentary bifurcation in the mind explains *Homo faber* double consciousness; there is intellect, which turns to one direction and intuition which pursues another direction, yet throughout these processes, there is a vital creative surge -- an immediate flux -- the *élan vital* (Bergson, 1944/1911; see also d'Aquili and Mol, 1990).

This research approach also assumes that *mind* is something more than *brain*. The brain is seen as one part of the "congealed matter" of *Homo sapiens*; the brain is an organ that has structure and function, but there is also the recognition that the heart is an organ and that both (mindbrain and heart) make up [the thoughts in] mind (see Pearsall, 1998). Duality is avoided by using the term *mindbrain*.¹⁸ The term "experience" is also something inclusive, part of that which all organic life encounters in its living existence; it is defined by Laughlin this way: "We mean by experience 'that which arises before the subject' in consciousness (see Dilthey 1976; Husserl 1977). This

reason and intuition (see Laughlin, 1995; Bergson, 1944/1911). It is an approach that looks for human universals and not simply differences between human experience and culture.

¹⁸ This is through personal communication with Professor Charles Laughlin, June 2002 as well as seeking this term on the Internet. Hans Elvesjö (2001) discusses *Holistic Consciousness* and uses this term (see article on-line: <http://home.swipnet.se/~w-22081/consciou.htm>).

includes perception, thought, imagination, intuition, affect and sensation."

(1992: 12). Experience is a function of intentional and spontaneous dialogue and constructs a phenomenological world (see Laughlin and d'Aquili, 1974; Laughlin, 1995). Perception is a direct experience.

Experience also has structure, most often controlled by the ego: "It is our empirical ego that experiences, and the nature of our ego usually controls the nature of our experience. This is a general statement referring to the average person and to experience as we generally think of it." (Laughlin, McManus and d'Aquili, 1992/1990: 243-244)¹⁹

The researcher joins d'Aquili and Mol in the tendency "to discern the world in terms of a dialectic between wholeness and change to represent one of the foci of profound interpenetrating of subjectivity and objectivity." (1990: 3) The subjectivity of the human brain is to breakdown into fragments and snap-shots that which is whole. As H.s.s. evolved and developed language, the symbols developed fragmented the whole of what began as an idea in our mindbrain.²⁰

Bergson writes:

¹⁹ Experiencing occurs in the *sensorium* of the mindbrain. "The sensorium is the functional space within the nervous system wherein the phenomenal aspects of the cognized environment are constituted and portrayed in moment-by-moment experience." (Laughlin et al., 1992/1990: 106) Of course the living experience of our human existence, is made up of all the sensory and cognitive processes of the body, occurring in interaction with the "world," our social field. All this experiencing occurs in an "hierarchical complexity" at many levels (see d'Aquili and Mol, 1990). To examine anything scientifically, is also to be experiencing and it is "to do" empirical science (see also Rubinstein, Laughlin, and McManus, 1984).

²⁰ It is like the puzzles done in childhood. The researcher means here, literally, the gift of the 1000 piece-puzzle received as a child at Christmas. There was the whole, beautiful scene on the cover of the box, but upon opening the box, there were 1000 tiny pieces that had to be put together in order to create the scene on the box's cover. We now have the 3-D puzzle, reminding one of the holographic aspects of brain.

...if we consider only those typical cases in which the complete triumph of intelligence and of instinct is seen, we find this essential difference between them: instinct perfected is a faculty of using and even of constructing organized instruments; intelligence perfected is the faculty of making and using organized instruments. (1944/1911: 155)

There is also an underlying "mechanism" to all experience and this process involves neural substrates of the mindbrain. *Neurognosis* is "the initial organization of a neural network. . . . It is the neurognostic structure of experience that accounts for universal attributes of mind (and much of what is generally called 'culture') studied cross-culturally." (Laughlin, McManus, and d'Aquili, 1992/1990: 44)²¹

Implicit in the dissertation's discussion, is a consideration of *systems*, with the physical body being viewed as, itself, a system, which is a system within the cosmos of systems (the individual being the "point of intersection" -- existing as a microcosm within the macrocosm). It is in the social field and the larger cosmos/universe, where the sum of the whole is greater than its parts. Within the physical body there are systems and subsystems, all structured, functioning, and moving toward *unity* and *equilibrium* (see d'Aquili and Mol, 1990; d'Aquili and Newberg, 1993; Arden, 1998). There is also the assumption of a dynamic interaction and interchange occurring at all levels of the processing, conscious mind-brain-body within the social field. The

²¹ "In physiology, including neurophysiology, structure and function are seen as two ways of talking about the same organization." (Laughlin et al., 1992/1990: 51) *Neurognosis*, as implicated in this paper, refers to structure and function concomitantly. This is the case when the researcher speaks of the experiencing of phenomenon in an individual's social field. She refers to all the "networks of living cells" functioning within their structure ("systems") to process incoming and outgoing stimulus. *Language*, as a system of symbols, is also a structure and functions in ways that produce "meaning." (see Blasius, 1976/1973: 107-122)

generally broad systems implied are sociocultural, intrapsychic, biophysical, and transpersonal (see Arden, 1998), or, as will be referred to in chapter seven, there is a pentarchy of [spiritual] expressive "systems" (these are attributes that are used to understand the complex *whole* of glossolalia). The anthropologist Michael Winkelman notes: "The dependence of consciousness on both the brain and the socially constructed experiences requires a systems approach to articulate their interrelations." (2000:11; see d'Aquili and Mol, 1990)

The discussion of glossolalia assumes a biogenetic structuralism approach (Laughlin and d'Aquili, 1974; Laughlin, McManus, and d'Aquili, 1992/1990; d'Aquili, 1993; d'Aquili and Newberg, 1993); it is to see "the importance of a credible neurophenomenology of human consciousness, especially for the meaning and significance of religious experience" (d'Aquili, 1993:253; see Persinger, 1987; Teske, 2001; Lind, 2001). Neuroscience is now verifying "that the ability of a species to be social at all, and to indulge in social behaviors, is itself neuroagnostically structured." (d'Aquili, 1993: 253)

According to Williams the most salient ingredient in the glossolalia of Pentecostal groups is this belief system (1981: 153). While one may analyze glossolalia in its psychological, sociological, linguistic, and cultural terms, there is still a dimension missing. Neither lexical nor intonational analysis is the *sine qua non* of glossolalia. Everything the respondents experience and describe is evidence pointing to a transcendent (and it will be argued, immanent) dimension. This external process is the semiotics of glossolalia, pointing to an

alternative phase of consciousness. Biogenetic structuralism helps to explain these glossolalic processes.

Key Concepts

Many terms used throughout the dissertation may be unfamiliar to the reader. Since not all terms are addressed within the discussions, the reader can consult the glossary for clarification of relevant terms.

Transmute

This term is used literally. To transmute means “to change or alter in form, appearance, or nature and especially to a higher form.” (Merriam-Webster, 1994: 1255) Coming out of the transpersonal experiencing of glossolalia, and the experience of the respondents’ interviewed, it appears that glossolalic expression is an inherent process of energy, a process that potentially *transmutes* human consciousness to a higher level; one which this researcher believes is affecting universal cosmic consciousness.

The raising of individual consciousness (*transmutation*) is concomitant with physical, neurobiological changes within the cellular systems of the human organism. Concomitant effects are physical and psychic integration and healing. It is the human organism and human consciousness that delimit the extent of energy transformation; that is, the person’s level of intuitive and cognitive awareness, apprehension, and gnostic knowing are evidence of the extent of energy transformation. The inherent energy raising potentiality within the human organism is considered to be infinite and just as much a “mystery” as that of the cosmos.

Transpersonal experience

"*Transpersonal experiences* may be defined as experiences in which the sense of identity or self extends beyond (*trans*) the individual or personal to encompass wider aspects of humankind, life, psyche or cosmos." (Walsh and Vaughan, 1993: 203) While perhaps difficult to define, experience, in this project, is a phenomenological process. It is structured within human consciousness and consists of "day-to-day" perception and awareness, as well as a wide-range of alternative phases of consciousness. Drawing on the work of Laughlin et al., (1979, 1983, 1992, 1995), d'Aquili (1983), and Grof (1998), experience is structural (i.e., neurophysical, cognitive), behavioral, and phenomenological. Experience is an ongoing (not static) event in human consciousness (Grof, 1975; 1998) and biogenetic structuralism (Laughlin and d'Aquili, 1974; Laughlin et al., 1992/1990) combined with advances in neuroscience (d'Aquili, 1993), require recognizing a sophisticated explanation of human experience.

Neurognosis

In order to avoid the methodological dualism of mind-body, Laughlin and d'Aquili suggest the concept of *neurognosis*. This is a term "coined to label the inherent, rudimentary knowledge available to cognition in the initial organization of the fetal and infant nervous system." (Laughlin, 1995) The complex structure mediating consciousness resides in the cerebral cortex. The entire network of the vast "neuronal models" are called an individual's *cognized environment* (Laughlin, 1995). The *operational environment* includes

the "real nature of that individual as an organism and the individual's external environment." (Laughlin, 1995) Both the cognized environment and the operational environment are *neurognostic* (i.e., the initial organization and the development of these neural models are neurognostic and they mature in *somatosensory interaction* with the world). The use of the term "environment" in the dissertation implies this complex of cognized and operational environment; it also implies that the internal/external distinction is a *bounded* one, by which is meant that these terms are themselves *categories* applied by the mindbrain. The researcher uses the term environment as a type of shorthand - one that is meant to communicate the dynamic interplay between the cognized and operational environment.

Structure and Function

What is generally referred to as "religion" is also seen as having a "system."

The concept of religion belongs to the same class as the concept of philosophy. It refers first of all to an attitude, common to socially interrelated individuals as a constituent element of their lives. And because this attitude intimately interrelates and systematically unites the individuals who share it, the concept of religion refers also to a system which joins the religious individuals as members of a whole. (Dilthey, 1954:42)

The different aspects of worldview relate to "the differentiation of the inner life, which has been called its structure." (Dilthey, 1954:41)

A dialectical interpretation of human development must consider the temporal sequence of inner-biological, individual-psychological, cultural-sociological, and outer-physical progression (see Riegel, 1976). In the

dialectic of glossolalia these sequences must also be considered and the researcher circumscribes these within the context of the pentarchy of expressiveness (see chapter seven [see also Arden, 1998]). However, it is the concept of neurognosis that forms the basin for these systems. Laughlin notes the following.

For the distinction between the cognized and operational environments is not suggested as a euphemism for mind versus body, but rather emphasizes the fact that the structures that produce the cognized environment are themselves part of the operational environment. Consciousness and its structures are wholly of and within the body, and nowhere but the body. Or, put another way, the cognized environment is how the operational environment models itself within organisms that have brains. ...Both the cognized environment and the operational environments are aspects of a single transcendental mystery, and thus cannot be reduced from one to the other. Biogenetic structuralism takes the view that because we are confronted with the profound mystery of "mindbrain" (as Earl Count likes to call it), the widest possible scope of inquiry is appropriate for its study. (Laughlin, 1995:7)

Ontology and Epistemology

F3:16

F3: . . . But you know one thing I firmly believe we are spirit with human bodies, we are not the other way around.

I: Well Teilhard de Chardin, the philosopher said, "We are not human beings having spiritual experiences. We are spiritual beings having human experiences."

F3: Yes. That's right and we are so much more. And that's why, when you say to me, "What, why are all these things important? Why is the spiritual side of things important?" It's everything. [pause] It's everything – it's what I am. So that's basically why, you know, it's who I am. I'm more spirit than I am human. [she laughs] Really, because when you think – we're spirits a lot longer than we're human. You know we're human for 80 years if we're lucky. You know, 85 if we're lucky, or, but you know, but for eternity, we'll be spirits. Our spiritual beings go on.

The metaphysical assumption is that *Homo sapien sapiens* is a living being with *spirit* embedded and therefore, the human organism has *spiritual*

potential. It is well established that Neanderthals and other *H. sapiens* of the Middle Palaeolithic and Upper Palaeolithic period engaged in complex ritual (Joseph, 2001; see also Arden, 1998; Lind, 2001; Massey, 2002;). Neuroscience shows us that the brain is “structured” or some would say “hard-wired” for the “God-experience” or religious experience (see Persinger, 1987; Ashbrook, 1989; Teske, 2001; Lind, 2002).

The ontological primacy is the individual (the human organism) and his/her experiencing. Yet at all times the individual resides in a larger environment than its congealed body (this is called the social field, environment, and universe). The organism is *being*; a being composed of all organic and inorganic substances (visible and invisible).

The human organism is imbued with special attributes.

The distinction between living and non-living nature (which was still much discussed in the last [nineteenth] century) is today better considered as the difference between organismic and extra-organismic nature. There are no basic differences between forms, materials, forces and functions in these two spheres of nature. However, organismic matter has certain special features and another kind of order which have to be interpreted in a holistic, figurative sense. It is usually easy to decide whether a structure is organismic by reference to certain characteristics; any or all of these special properties are unlikely to be found in an extra-organismic system. (Blasius, 1976/1973:28).

According to Blasius (1976/1973) these special attributes relate to cellular organization; chemical constitution; energy transformation; relations with the environment; phylogenetic evolution; excitability; a capacity for regulation; and last but not least, animation. In terms of scientific biology, the flow of energy is the most important principle (see Blasius, 1976/1973: 36-48).

It is within the human organism itself, where the "*mystery*" of cosmic life resides. The agency of change, or, that which produces glossolalia and concomitant effects, is potentiality residing within the body-organism. This is its "spiritual impulse," and this potentiality seeks its larger part within and outside its being. In order to "know" itself, it must find itself within and then its movement, its expansion "outward," is into the larger universe.

Neurological and physical changes occur as the spiritual impulse is "released." The mechanism or "moment" of this "release" is that which is conscious, nonconscious, and cognitive recognition of its spiritual *self/spirit* (lower-case "s"). Movement (*energy flow*) occurs in a dynamic open-system when (small "s") *spirit* rises up to meet (upper case "S") *Spirit*. Within this moment, it is proposed that there is a process of spiritual and cellular *transmutation* (via imprinting and impression) of the human organism and all that is consciousness. *Only the physical organism or human personality delimits transmutation.*

Change or creation is a *continuous* process (ongoing); it is without beginning ("alpha") or end ("omega"). In Christianity, three points are involved in creation and these are represented by the Trinity (*God, Jesus Christ, and the Holy Ghost*). (Hawkins, 2002/1995:314)²²

The direction of change or the 'goal' of spiritual charismatic glossolalic experience, is to become "one;" to "rest" and be "filled" with God and thereby

“empowered” through “the Spirit” as evidenced in spiritual discernment.

This is expressed by the charismatic Christian as pressing “into the deeper things of God,” and the phrase, “spiritual things are spiritually discerned.” The process of change within the Christian is attributed to a [“Christian”] process, which is explained through terms such as “salvation,” and “sanctification.” These terms are the outer garments/cosmology, of that which is an inward to outward and outward to inward movement of energy; these descriptions and terms are its cultural *cosmology* – the interpretation of [Christian] experience.

The ontology and epistemology of this project assume the following.

... in a completely natural environment living creatures are a rhythmic and polar part of the changing phenomena of their environment. All activities such as their behavior in sleep and waking, in rest and in movement, appear as a rhythmic interaction with their environment in the widest sense. As the “renewal of the similar”, rhythmic life is to be contrasted with tempo and periodicity, “repetition of the same”. Life remains inexplicable and unquantifiable in physical terms most fundamentally; it is to be viewed not as the effect of a cause, but as a mystery. (Blasius, 1976/1973: 68)

Similar to Blasius (1976/1973) and others (see Davis-Floyd and Arvidson, 1997; Laughlin, 1997b; Braud and Anderson, 1998), this research project supports the view that: “The analytical procedure must be supplemented by a figurative, intuitive apprehension of living phenomena” (this is its epistemology).

But nature knows no fun; she is always true, serious, stern. She is always right; faults and errors are always man's. She scorns the

²² “In Sanskrit, the three aspects of origination of all that can be experienced are called *Rajas*, *Tamas*, and *Satva*. These are symbolized by the Hindu deities *Shiva*, *Vishnu*, and *Brahma*.” (Hawkins, 2002/1995: 314)

inadequate; she surrenders and reveals her secrets to the competent, genuine and pure.

The intellect does not reach up to her; man must be capable of elevating himself to the heights of reason in order to sense the godhead that manifests herself in those archetypal phenomena which derive from her and behind which she stands. But the godhead is active in the living, not in the dead; her essence lies in evolving and metamorphosing, not in what once was and is now rigid. Therefore, in her tendency to the divine, reason concerns herself only with the evolving, the living; the intellect with that which was, the static, in order to make use of it.

(Johann Wolfgang von Goethe quoted in Blasius [1976/1973: x])

Universe

In this dissertation, the findings from physics, such as *morphogenetic fields*, *phase space*, *nonduality*, *nonlinearity*, *entrainment*, *energy fields*, *attractor fields* and *strange attractors*, are implied. These are contributing dimensions in what is experienced and felt by this transpersonal researcher as *energy* within (immanent) and surrounding the human organism (transcendent); this energy has the potential to initiate processes, which result in *spiritual transmutation* of the organismic self. The mechanisms inherent in glossolalic expressiveness include natural (organismic, organic) and non-natural (non-organismic, inorganic) processes. There are many dimensions believed to exist in what is termed "universe" or "cosmos." For the purposes of this dissertation, the following 'working definition' of the term "universe" is used.

Universe is all that, which is “enfolded, implicit, unmanifest potential beyond which is the formless, infinite matrix of both form and nonform-which is omnipotent, omniscient, and omnipresent.” (Hawkins, 2002/1995:319)²³

Conclusion

This research project into the character, hence, essence of glossolalia, with the resultant sense that it is a process potentially transmuting *H.s.s.* mindbrain and body, has seriously challenged the researcher’s verbal explicit reasoning skill. It has pushed her observational and cognitive skills at the same time as she has experienced intuitive “leaps.” The challenge of the relation between creativity and validation are explicitly recognized.

Throughout the project, hosts of tensions were experienced. Some of the following terms describe the tension.

- Autonomy
- Creativity
- Self-determination
- Total absorption
- Scientific “requirements”
- Phenomenological experience
- Experiential truth
- Reliability and validity – “how to” create a circle of “sympathetic resonance”

What follows is a rather lengthy description of the researcher’s own personal experience with glossolalic utterances, *prior* to beginning the research process. At the time of this description, the researcher was *practicing* glossolalia monthly. During the research endeavor, glossolalic

²³ As the researcher experiences this [cognitively acknowledged through automatic writing], it is “vapour” and “non-vapour.” The organism is also viewed as non-organism.

utterances and contemplation became on going, and the researcher began using tongues frequently throughout the day.

The researcher's early experience: One Ritual Experience of Glossolalia

Context: In my apartment, on February 21, 2000, I was driven by a desire to pray and allow myself to speak in tongues.²⁴ I had previously not spoken in tongues for a long period of time. Instead, I had been contemplating the use of tongues, recognizing my own personal feelings and belief that "tongues" was an extremely sacred manifestation which I felt the organized Church, especially charismatic churches, were "secularizing" and debasing. In other words, this was a period of religious reflection for me, and a need for serious worship, with intense ritual. During this time, I recognized impatience with what I call "ad-lib" worship. My need was for worship which was steeped in orthodox liturgy and had, as its focus, contemplative and ritualistic practices, undisturbed by lists of happenings in the weekly life of the parish (e.g., "Let's hear about Wednesday's Bible studies from..." "We invite you to Friday's potluck..." This sort of intrusion into my worship attitude disturbed my reverential and referential framework).

Researcher's Experience

On this particular occasion, I knelt beside my bed and as I mentioned, had a strong desire to pray and allow speaking in tongues. I was both apprehensive and cautious. The following depiction comes from the notes I made almost immediately after the experiencing.

After silently praying requests and recognizing areas of thankfulness in my life, I sign myself with the sign of the cross -- forehead, stomach, left shoulder, and then right shoulder. I begin

²⁴ In one sense what follows is, in the Levi-Straussian sense, allowing glossolalia to "think through me" (see Given, 1992: 21).

breathing very self-consciously, and at times inconsistently. I begin to center myself by repeating a name a few times -- "Jesus, Jesus, Jesus." After repeating this referent name, I wait reverentially and expectantly. I repeat a short prayer for a particular answer to a concern, then repeat a name representing this request. I wait... Suddenly, slowly at first, word sounds appear syllables start and I am in a glossolalic utterance. Then, compulsively, I take my hands and bring them prayerfully to my face -- fingers and palms together, thumbs crossed in a position which divides my face in half. I rest my hands on my nose. As if blessing others, I take my right hand, extend it straight out, palm facing the left side of the room, and extend it in a straight downward fashion, until it almost touches the bed, then, I bring it back into position and do the same motion with the left hand. It "seems" as if I am "cutting through something". The thought comes to mind of Moses and the crossing of the Red Sea. I stop doing this and begin more glossolalic vocalizations, when suddenly, the pitch changes. My eyes are closed and I see colours: purple, blue and then it fades and I see swirling light and grey colours and a ball of light appears, then it goes away. I begin to sing a melodious and sweet sound, quite quietly but very beautiful. This begins to change to a chanting vocalization -- it is rhythmic and slow. After a few moments, more "tongues" -- vocalizations which I "recognize" as my "speaking in tongues" in my "vocabulary of sounds". At times during this period, I become breathless and my chest heaves. I have to stop and "catch my breath", at which point breathing resumes normally, and the vocalizations and breathless pattern persists for a short time. A great sense of joy overcomes me and I know I am "finishing" this experiencing. I end with expressing repetitiously -- "ah-mun, ah-mun..." and I cross my torso in the sign of the cross.

This period was followed by a short intense period of ideas, words, and thoughts that I had to compulsively write down. I had grabbed the first piece of paper on my table, which I turned over later and which happened to be an article by Prince (1979) on "Religious Experience and Psychosis." (This was not a synchronous event, was it?)

William James points well to the researcher's experience.

. . . There is a state of mind, known to religious men [sic], but to no others, in which the will to assert ourselves and hold our own has been displaced by a willingness to close our mouths and be as nothing in the floods and waterspouts of God. In this state of mind, what we most dreaded has become the habitation of our safety, and the hour of our moral death has turned into our spiritual birthday. The time for tension in our soul is over, and that of happy relaxation, of calm deep breathing, of an eternal present, with no discordant future to be anxious about has

arrived. Fear is not held in abeyance as it is by mere morality, it is positively expunged and washed away. (James, 1958: 53)

What follows is the researcher's early analysis on her experience. Maslow (1976) speaks of such moments just described, as "peak experiences." Williams (1981) adds another dimension to a consideration of the glossolalic experience, and that is the belief system that forms the conceptual setting in which the experience occurs.

Researcher's early analysis

According to Williams, the most salient ingredient in the glossolalia of Pentecostal groups is this belief system (1981: 153). While I agree that one may analyze glossolalia in its psychological, sociological, linguistic, and cultural terms, there is still a dimension missing. Neither lexical nor intonational analysis is the sine qua non of glossolalia. Everything I have described in my example is evidence and points to a transcendent dimension. This I call a semiotics of glossolalia, pointing to an altered state of consciousness. This is, to some extent explained in biogenetic structural terms.

While I would agree that I am experiencing an altered state of consciousness during my own glossolalic event, I am not in a trance or mystical state such as suggested by Goodman (1972a) and Malony and Lovekin (1985) respectively. That is not to say these do not happen,

but rather, they are not the manifestation of my experience.²⁵³⁷

Goodman's analysis concludes that there is a "surprising cross-cultural agreement" in that "the individual utterance, or the identifiable units within the utterance, showed a threshold of onset, a brief rising gradient of intensity, a peak, and a final, often precipitous decay." (1972: 7) This "onset, rise, and decay" is noted in my own glossolalic utterances. Goodman also attributes to glossolalia a specific mental state with neurophysiological processes present. Unlike some of her accounts, there is no "effort" required establishing, maintaining, or stopping my vocal behaviour, which Goodman calls a "speech automatism." However, I do believe that my glossolalic intonations act as a "driver" to induce other levels of cortical and subcortical responses (e.g., visualizing colours and singing are late developments in my own experience.)²⁶

My sense of glossolalic utterances is that it does allow a cognitive union. d'Aquili (1983: 266) writes: "...the total union of self and other, or, as it is expressed in the Christian tradition, the union of the self with God." It becomes, for me, a powerful ritual, which "is

²⁵ Goodman (1969, 1972a), in her initial research, compared four field settings in which she examined glossolalia. Three groups spoke English and consisted of a Streams of Power congregation in the Caribbean, a mid-western tent revival (Ohio); a main-line Protestant Church in Texas, and the fourth, a Brazilian movement in the Umbanda religion. Her cross-cultural work then continued with a congregation in Mexico City – *Apostolicos*, an off-shoot of the Pentecostal movement in Mexico (Goodman did her research in the summers of 1968, 1969, and 1970).

²⁶ I do not, as yet, have an understanding of the neurophysiology that would allow me to know whether these manifestations are a higher-level cortical response. However, it has always

always performed to solve a problem presented by and to the verbal analytic consciousness.” (d’Aquili, 1983: 266) Such involves ergotropic excitation. Noting my description presented earlier, it appears evident that the kinetic, motor behaviour is representative of a “repetitive motor activity with visual, auditory, or other sensory stimulus feedback” and this strongly drives the ergotropic system. The rhythmic cadences, the chanting vocalizations, and the singing all “drive” me to a deeper level of consciousness. “The rhythmicity of the prayer or chant, by its very rhythmicity, drives the ergotropic system independent of the meaning of words.” (d’Aquili, 1983:266) This excited neural activity spills over into the trophotropic system, “resulting in the same end state as meditation but from the opposite starting point.” (d’Aquili, 1983: 266) Simply put, these processes produce the aesthetic-cognitive effect of not only a union (with a greater power, force, or consciousness) but a sense of harmony of myself with the universe (see d’Aquili, 1983).

If one views glossolalia as a “ritual” of a phylogenetic origin and processual, then a primitive “babbling” is compatible with the complexity of thought produced at the end of my glossolalic experiencing. There is the transformation of complex neural structures, along with all of life’s day-to-day perceptions processed in the brain. The ultimate end of the experience is often a *gestalt* and a “peace that passes all

been “easy” to utter sounds, but singing and visualizing colours and light are new expressions in my own experiencing.

understanding.” Unlike Goodman’s analysis (1972: 128) my own kinetic behaviour is observed by my cognitive attentiveness, driven by the desire to have a meaningful experience.

There is no direct translation of the glossolalic “tongues” I produce and experience. However, I mentioned the pictures, colours, and alternative sounds and ideas that flow through my mind. This I believe, in some sense, is ‘a translation’ -- at the very least, it is transformative (with all the neural, physiological, chemical, emotional, and cognitive changes this implies).

In sum, the best description for the researcher’s personal process in glossolalic expression is that she is encountering an *expanding elliptical experiential field*; there is a zigzagging between non-rational, rational, and trans-rational perceptions.

This dissertation makes use of a variety of scientific literatures. The sources of information used are threefold:

1. Literature from the academic disciplines of psychology, anthropology, sociology, philosophy, religion, neuroscience, and other scientific writings (such as books and journals on mind and behaviour);
2. Informant interviews and field observation in a Christian charismatic church; and,
3. The researcher’s own experiences in glossolalic expressiveness throughout the process of data gathering, analysis, and writing of the dissertation.

In order to “set the stage” for the research project, Chapter Two discusses the socio-historical story of glossolalia. This is set within the history of the rise of Pentecostalism within North America. After discussing the last few hundred years of Pentecostal spirituality, Chapter Three goes on to discuss the social scientific literature assessing glossolalia. Recognizing the types of “paradigms” and methodology used to investigate the phenomenon of tongue-speaking, and sensing a gap in the social scientific discourse, the dissertation proceeds to give a comprehensive discussion on the phenomenological methodology known as *intuitive inquiry*.

Chapter Four is an in-depth review of the methodology used in the research project. This chapter orients the reader to an *intuitive* understanding of tongue-speaking, with *sympathetic resonance* being viewed as a new and key empirical tool for validating qualitative phenomenological research findings.

Chapter Five adumbrates the *form*, *content*, and *context* of the project by highlighting respondent characteristics. It is felt that the reader can better appreciate the interview data and subsequent findings, through understanding something of the external characteristics of the respondents. The reader is asked to refer back to chapter five or the appendices to glimpse something of the person being interviewed. The respondent characteristics highlighted are those gathered from the answers provided to demographic questions asked on a closed-ended questionnaire. The concepts of form, content, and context are important to the dissertation’s discussion regarding *meaning*; therefore, these

words are given a brief consideration prior to presenting the demographic data on respondents interviewed.

Chapter Six presents the research findings. By presenting copious quotes from the long-interviews with glossolalists, the reader is given an “inside” glimpse into the world of the glossolalist. The reader is asked to approach this chapter in an attitude of humility, using the technique of “bracketing,” to simply “listen” to the text (the data) and feel what the respondent is saying and experiencing. The researcher provides a *natural typology* of glossolalic utterances, essentially debunking the idea that glossolalia is anything less than a complexity of systems mutually constituting one another within the body and mindbrain of the human organism.

Chapter Seven presents an interpretation of glossolalic expressiveness. The chapter’s contribution is in highlighting the pentarchy of spiritual expressiveness. By viewing glossolalia as a *complex* engaging organic and non-organic domains, glossolalia is seen as a *mechanism*, this potentially raises individual and collective consciousness.

The final chapter proposes “*quo vadis?*” Since the data is suggestive of a process of organismic *spiritual transmutation*, an attempt is made to offer support for this theoretical position. The presentation of material attempts to honour respondent’s cosmological and descriptive accounts of their experiences and to honour the scientific endeavour of the researcher and the research process.

Without a return to the individual or *micro* aspects of experiencing, it is unlikely that significant theorizing can occur at the *macro* level. This researcher believes that we need an intimate understanding of experience from “inside” the experience, in order to advance the social understanding of spiritual experiences in society. It is hoped that future research will continue to examine glossolalia as one way of learning more about human consciousness and “anomalous” human experiencing.

Throughout the dissertation the researcher is explicitly aware that she is taking “license” regarding the presentation of research data. Numerous interview quotations are used, since these are the *facts* providing an understanding of the *meaning* and *process* behind glossolalia. Essentially, without the supporting documentation of these glossolalists’ accounts it is difficult to give evidence to the consciousness-raising mechanism within this experience. Furthermore, the accounts are an attempt to provide support for that which is no longer simply transcendent, but an immanent dimension – potentiality or energy residing within each human organism.

Perhaps not as explicit, but definitely a part of this intuitive research process, is the researcher’s active intuitive and cognitive engagement with glossolalia (a dialectic). This dialectic occurs at several levels: a comparison to, and lived engagement, with the respondent’s account of tongue-speaking; with the researcher’s own ongoing experiencing; there is a dialectic being engaged at various points in the ethnographic experience within the charismatic church; and there is a dialectic between the glossolalia *lived-*

through (experience) and the opinions and findings in the academy, and the literature surveying glossolalia. The social scientific communal challenge is to dialogue with other researchers investigating glossolalic expressiveness; researchers who directly experience glossolalia.

The explicit interdisciplinary, interpretive, and phenomenological approach to glossolalia within this transpersonal sociological project is challenging to orthodox sociology and anthropology. It may be that some readers will find it difficult to identify these researches, their methods and their conclusions as being within the bounds of either discipline. Yet juxtaposing this approach and its findings with more orthodox literatures pertaining to glossolalia and related phenomena may well produce a synthesis that expands the purview and constraints of these older and more established disciplines. These challenges certainly appear to lead to a fruitful evaluation of some of the strengths and weaknesses of this transpersonal approach; some of these come up during the analysis of data and will again be reviewed in the final chapter of the dissertation.

In sum, the research problematic is the *apprehension* of the *inside* experience and meaning of glossolalia. This is attempted through direct experiencing of glossolalia by the researcher and through the rich interpretive and descriptive accounts of nineteen Christian charismatic glossolalists and one spontaneous glossolalist. Essentially, the research says that if you want to know something about tongue-speaking, you must use methods that allow glossolalia to “show up;” it requires the researcher to experience tongue-

speaking (in this pilot study, this is the experiencing of Christian charismatic glossolalia).

Quotations from various sources (such as field notes, literature from the social sciences and humanities, and the researcher's own experiencing) are interspersed within the academic discussion on glossolalia. It is hoped that this creative license does not detract from the academic enterprise, but rather, that glossolalia will come alive to the reader.

CHAPTER TWO

HISTORICAL REVIEW

Overview

Initially, an understanding of the tradition of glossolalia in religion is necessary. Although it has been characteristic of certain forms of Judaism and Islam, it has been most noteworthy in the Christian tradition where it has been a significant aspect of religious practice since the first century A.D.
Malony & Lovekin, 1985: 4

When examining the phenomenon of *glossolalia*, a concomitant and complicated social, political, historical story emerges. Although tongue-speaking appears almost dormant in recorded European history from the Apostolic Period until the Renaissance, there are references cited which put into question any absence from the early years of Christianity until the Renaissance.

George Barton Cutten (1927) cites works of the early Church Fathers and Saints that point to the use of glossolalia. Cutten cites evidence from Irenaeus (130-202 A.D.), Montanus (c. 156 A.D.), Tertullian (160-220 A.D.), and Origen (185-254 A.D.). Görres (writing in 1862) cites Ange Clarenus who received the knowledge of the Greek language in 1300, and St. Dominick, who received the German language; as well, Saint Vincent Ferrier, St. Antony of Padua, St. Francis Xavier and others are mentioned in Görres account (cited in Cutten, 1927). Many of these incidences could rightfully be called *xenoglossia*, though scholarship is divided about the veracity of many of these accounts. According to Cutten, St. Pachomius (292-348 A.D.), St. Hildegard (1098-1179 A.D.) and St. Louis Bertrand (1526-1581 A.D.) also spoke in tongues. From the account, these again appear as examples of *xenoglossia*, but are recorded as “gifts of

tongues, of prophecy, and of miracles" (Cutten, 1927: 32-47; see Christie-Murray, 1978: 34-41). Despite limited evidence regarding glossolalia, historical references from the second century through to the Reformation (1517) exist, but are ambiguous and difficult to assess. Today glossolalia is most often considered in the context of its contemporary current upsurge in what is often called the Pentecostal or Charismatic movement (Williams, 1981; Poloma, 1982; Poloma and Hoelter, 1998; Corten, 1997)

The following historical review of glossolalia is necessitated, to some extent, by the fact that many of the co-researchers in this study manifest glossolalia with the varied psychic and somatic experiences found in some of the historical accounts presented. Many of the co-researchers interviewed, came into *charismatic glossolalia* during the rise of the neo-Pentecostal or charismatic "renewal" (during the 1970s and 1980s). Given the demographic characteristics of the co-researchers, presented in chapter four, the review contextualizes the research study. As noted previously, the *form*, *content*, and *context* of tongue-speaking is critical to a more wholistic understanding of glossolalia.¹

The focus is upon the later Judeo-Christian [Western] expression of glossolalia. It must be recognized that glossolalia *per se* is not restricted to Christian experience (Cutten, 1927; Kildahl, 1972; Goodman, 1972a; Nida and Smalley, 1974[1959]; Christie-Murray, 1978; Janzen, 1979; Williams, 1981;

¹ One of the arguments of this researcher is that the charismatic movement is evolving and that its' form is changing. The co-researchers in this study are a unique "sample" of what is occurring within Canada. Not only is the form of the charismatic movement changing, but the form, content, and context of Christianity as a whole is evolving and Protestantism and its' theology are being challenged.

47

Mueller, 1989; Chaika, 1990; Turner, 1996; During, 1997; Bowen, 2002).² For example, the Sufi of Islam continued a tradition of "God's unintelligible speech" (Christie-Murray, 1978: 10). Glossolalia is also not restricted to Protestantism or the Pentecostal or Charismatic Movement.³ Many societies have wedded Pentecostal spiritual belief with their own native cultures (see Goodman, 1969, 1972a; Bourguignon, 1973, 1989; Turner, 1996; Hale, 1997; Dombrowski, 2001). David Christie-Murray writes: "whereas every Christian in many Pentecostalist denominations is expected to speak in tongues at least once, as a sign of his [sic] baptism with the Holy Spirit, the gift in the other cultures is limited – to individuals, shamans and mediums." (1978: ix) During the twentieth century, the phenomenon appeared in Father Divine's sect in the United States (Williams, 1981: 47) and it is not uncommon for those practicing Spiritualism to break out in tongues (see Samarin, 1972b).⁴

What follows is a brief history of Pentecostal glossolalia. It is against this backdrop that the reader will see the emic and etic tensions that develop both among individuals and groups that practice tongue-speaking. This brief chronicle concerning glossolalic outbursts in the last few centuries moves into what has come to be designated as Neo-Pentecostalism (called the "third force" in

² "Plato extolled 'four kinds of irrational experience, the divine madness of love, prophecy, Dionysian ecstasy, and poetic intuition,' and both Plutarch and Virgil recorded phenomena similar to glossolalia." (Kildahl, 1972: 11) It must be recognized that in the expressions of these recorded incidences of glossolalia, there is a blurring of glossolalia, xenoglossia and prophecy.

³ The term "Protestant" comes from the early period of the Reformation. It originally referred to a group of German princes and cities presenting a defense of freedom of conscience against the Diet of Spires in 1529. This was an edict intended to suppress the Lutheran movement, and this prompted the Lutheran princes to present a formal protest, thus receiving the name of "Protestants." (González, 1985: 43)

⁴ One of the co-researchers in this study reports that a sibling who practices Wicca speaks in tongues.

Christendom, by Henry van Dusen [Samarin, 1972b]), The Charismatic Renewal,⁵ or Latter Rain. The focus is the expression of tongues within various sects over the last four hundred years.⁶

Seventeenth Century

In seventeenth century Europe, Protestants and Catholics tended to regard tongues as a sign of devil-possession (Christie-Murray, 1978: 47). Before Protestants began arriving in North America, Protestants in France began practicing tongues. Apparently the Camisards were the first Protestants to use tongues widely.⁷

In 1685 the Edict of Nantes, which had given French Protestants freedom of worship, was revoked by Louis XIV (Cutten, 1927; Christie-Murray, 1978). *Camisards*, as these French Huguenots in the Cevennes were called, rose in revolt and amazing experiences began to appear among these persecuted people.⁸

Their importance to the history of glossolalia arises from the remarkable, though limited, talking in tongues which accompanied their struggle, inspired, perhaps, with other mystical experiences they had, by the strain imposed by constant hunting and harrying and the threat of torture and hideous execution if they were caught. Some of the 'French Prophets'

⁵ According to the scholar Margaret Poloma, the term *Pentecostal* refers to an increasingly diverse movement (the reader will see this throughout the brief historical review), and that the distinctions (neo-Pentecostal, Charismatic, or Third Wave adherents) are "somewhat arbitrary heuristic labels." (From a draft for a chapter in "Christian Millenarianism: Themes and Perspectives," edited by Stephen Hunt, New York University Press).

⁶ A full treatment of the development of the various sects must be eschewed. However, the reader is referred to the bibliography where several books appear containing further information on the history of Protestantism and Pentecostalism.

⁷ These Protestants were called 'Camisards,' apparently a term coming from the white shirts (*camis*) which they wore as a uniform. (Christie-Murray, 1978: 47)

⁸ The fierce persecution by De Baviille, the Intendant of Languedoc, sent by his own estimate, "ten thousand to the stake, the galleys, or the wheel." Many of these were the young, "the little prophets." (Cutten, 1927: 59-60)

later went to England and Germany and became the spiritual ancestors of later glossolalic movements. (Christie-Murray, 1978: 47)

What is remarkable about these “Cevennot prophets” is their extreme youth; most of those who prophesied, spoke in tongues, and spoke in foreign languages, were children -- three and twelve years of age and there are even reports that some were infants (Cutten, 1927; Christie-Murray, 1978).

Out this period came the Protestant Reformed Church of France, and the French writer Voltaire, “who defended the Protestant cause, not because he felt any sympathy for it, but rather because he considered intolerance to be both absurd and immoral.” (González, 1985: 148)

Jansenists

In France, glossolalia is also reported among a group of believers called “Jansenists” (1731). Similar to the Camisards, Jansenists believed “that their organs of speech were controlled by a superior power. Sometimes they retained full consciousness and remembered all the details when the paroxysms were over, but at other times there was total amnesia.” (Cutten, 1927: 67)⁹

According to Christie-Murray,

Catholic teaching that tongues were normally a sign of devil-possession limited their appearance before the Reformation....It is surprising that when the Reformation opened the Scriptures to the public and movements began to try to recapture the purity of

⁹ Initially a doctrine on “grace and predestination,” the writings of Cornelius Jansenius (1640) became more a movement of zealous religious reform in France (González, 1985: 168). The brilliant philosopher Blaise Pascal was converted to Jansenism, and one of its ablest defenders. “For him this was a profound religious experience that left its mark on the rest of his life.” (González, 1985: 168) Eventually, Jansenism, which began having little to do with reforming zeal or profound religiosity, turned into a political and intellectual movement, disappeared, not because it had been condemned and persecuted, but because it had become amorphous (González, 1985: 169).

doctrine and practice of the primitive Church, tongue-speaking was not encouraged more....But after the Reformation Catholic tongues continued sporadically and considerable Protestant glossolalic sects were to spring up from time to time. (1978: 41)

The Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century

The Camisards found spiritual descendants in England, in a group popularly known as the Shakers (Christie-Murray, 1978: 51). Persecution drove Ann Lee (1736-84) to North America in 1774; here she founded the first American Shaker settlement in 1776.

Shakers

The charismatic, psychical and spiritualist aspects of the Shaker faith expressed itself in clairvoyance, telepathy, prophecies, glossolalic singing, dancing and possession by departed spirits (Christie-Murray, 1978: 52). Beginning in 1837, there was intense revival of charismatic expression in the Shaker Church where "Shakers lost their native speech for hours or days, talking either in an unknown tongue or mongrel English, or sang but could not talk in English. The gift came unexpectedly, usually during worship but sometimes in ordinary activities." (Christie-Murray 1978: 54) Eventually, the Shaker view of glossolalia altered from "being a special sign from God to be utilized by all true believers" to being regarded, in 1841, as "useless unless interpreted." The Shakers disappeared as a sect in 1866 (Christie-Murray, 1978: 54).

Irvingism and Mormonism

When glossolalia began appearing in London under the leadership of Edward Irving (1792-1834), the Presbyterian minister was expelled from the ministry (1833). The result was formation of a new sect known as the Catholic

Apostolic Church, led by Irving. Cutten writes that “while Irvingism was on everyone’s tongue between the years 1831-34, and in the third decade of the last [nineteenth] century the name of Irving seemed likely to rank among the immortals, the mention of his name carries with it little intelligence today.” (Cutten, 1927: 87)¹⁰

Irving died in 1834 but the sect continued the practice of tongue-speaking for about forty years; the sect eventually went out of existence (Kildahl, 1972: 17). It is proposed Irving died, “of a broken heart, for however mistaken his views and policy, he was a deeply sincere and devout Christian. He did not even have the satisfaction of the gift of tongues for himself, though he sought it.” (Christie-Murray, 1978: 57)¹¹

At this time in America, Joseph Smith (1805-44) had founded the Church of Jesus Christ of Later Day Saints (the Mormons) in New York, in 1830. After the unfortunate mob lynching of Smith, the movement was taken to Utah under the leadership of Brigham Young.¹² The belief in gifts of the Spirit was one of the Mormon articles of faith (Kildahl, 1972: 17). According to J. H. Beadle, emphasis was placed on “the gifts of tongues, prophecy, revelation, visions, healing, interpretation of tongues, etc.” (cited in Kildahl, 1972: 17-18). The Mormon

¹⁰ Irving transformed a humble chapel in London (Caledonian Church, Hatton Garden London) into a beautiful building in Regent Square (Cutten, 1927: 87). Irving had a strong “mystic”-like personality and was a friend of Thomas Carlyle. Irving’s writings “were mostly upon apocalyptic and mystical subjects and to see the church more spiritual.” (Cutten, 1927: 89). When Irving heard about the spiritual “outpourings” in Wales, he desired it for his congregation. Finally, this appearance of glossolalia arrived in Irving’s congregation, in 1831.

¹¹ The question of “why” someone desiring tongues might not speak in tongues, is “addressed” by various co-researcher accounts, later in the dissertation.

¹² During the nineteenth century in the religious life of the United States, there are some remarkable events. One of these is the development of several movements which some, like

practice of glossolalia was organized upon the call from a Mormon leader; one individual would speak in tongues and another would interpret. By 1870, Mormons had given up the practice of glossolalia (Christie-Murray, 1978: 61).

The eighteenth century saw a great deal of religious activity and fervor in the developing Thirteen Colonies. Political events in England, along with two major events in the colonies significantly affected North American religion. These two events are known as "the Holiness Movement" and "the Pentecostal Movement." It must be remembered that at this time expansion of the western frontier was occurring and this made for complex social, political, and religious conflicts within the expanding colonies.¹³

In Europe the Reformation had effected new faiths; specifically Lutheran, Mennonite, Anabaptist and Calvinist sects, among others, were formed. The Catholic Church and the Anglican Church, however, were still holders of many adherents in both England and the Continent. Eventually, these "mainline" churches were challenged by the global expansion of the Holiness and Pentecostal movements.

During the nineteenth century in North America, Protestantism began to respond to the urban challenge by adapting "the old camp meetings to the new

González (1985) would call "new religions". The largest of these were the Mormons, Jehovah's Witnesses, and Christian Science. (González, 1985: 258)

¹³ The struggle for the independence of the Thirteen Colonies from Britain with the War of Independence, 1775-1783, profoundly impacted North American religion (González, 1985: 240). Rationalist ideology ("natural religion") eventually became institutionalized in two originally independent movements that were soon intertwined: Unitarianism and Universalism (González, 1985: 240). Out of this movement, the Anglicans who remained in the United States became the Protestant Episcopal Church (1783); American Methodism was also organized as a Church (1784) apart from both Anglicanism and British Methodism. At this time the Baptist churches were also growing rapidly.

situation, and 'revivals' became an important element of the urban religious scene." (González, 1985: 254) The revivals of individuals such as Dwight L. Moody and Charles Finney during the nineteenth century fed Pentecostalism, which already had been established by the Holiness movement. (Mol, 1985: 144) Soon "revivals" became part of the American urban landscape (González, 1985:254) and the Pentecostal movement became what some commentators have called a "Pentecostal explosion." With the missiology and proselytizing efforts of many churches during the nineteenth and early twentieth century, Pentecostalism and its burgeoning counterpart, neo-Pentecostalism, spread around the globe.

Christie-Murray reports that "a volume could be written cataloguing minor instances of glossolalia during the nineteenth century" (1978: 64). He goes on to cite 'typical' examples in Morzin, Haute-Savoie, Germany, Russia, Armenia, England, the Unicois mountains in North Carolina, Switzerland, Estonia, New England, Maine and Connecticut. Christie-Murray writes: "Christianity, however, ceased to have a monopoly of tongues in the western world during this period. Modern Spiritualism came into existence at about the same time and made claims to *xenolalia* (paranormal communication in recognized foreign languages) by spirits, which by comparison reduced Christian wonders to triviality." (Christie-Murray, 1978: 67)

In 1841 and 1843, after Christian revivalist campaigns in Norway and Sweden, tongues, trance, singing and preaching "under the influence of the Spirit" occurred. Reminiscent of "the little prophets," in the Scandinavian

countries glossolalia affected mostly the young, even children as young as four years of age (Cutten, 1927; Kildahl, 1972; Christie-Murray, 1978). In England and the United States it appeared mostly in adults (Kildahl, 1972: 17)

In sum, during the period of 1685 to 1800 glossolalia is seen manifesting more among the minorities in the Christian church (Christie-Murray, 1978: 54). From 1800 through to the twenty-first century, however, glossolalia is a continuously manifested phenomenon within sects and major denominations.

The Twentieth Century

An important moment in the history of Judeo-Christian religion is the twentieth century religious movement of Pentecostalism. Important to this discussion on the history of glossolalia are the linkages between the Holiness Movement and what is [often] regarded as classical Pentecostalism and neo-Pentecostalism.

The Holiness Movement

The ancestor to the Pentecostal movement in the United States, is the Holiness Movement (Bradfield, 1979:2; Kildahl, 1972; Samarin, 1972a; Poloma, 1982). By the time of the American Civil War, the fervor of the Second Great Awakening (1820-60) in American religion had quieted the “fires of Methodist revivalism.” John Wesley, the founder of Methodism, is the spiritual and intellectual father of Methodist theology. The Holiness movement came out of the Methodist’s doctrine of perfection (Fletcher, 1985; Poloma, 1982).

The Holiness movement began as a reforming movement within the Methodist Church after the Civil War (1861-1865). Mainline churches of the day

rejected the concepts held by those caught up in “reform;” namely, that “the Bible was to be interpreted literally, each man must strive for a condition of moral perfection, and each man needed to experience a conversion experience and a second blessing.” (Bradfield, 1979: 2) Those taking up the reform position, began separating from the mainline churches and forming their own sects. Revivalist techniques drew millions of people into this movement (Bradfield, 1979: 2).

It is important to understand that this new movement differed from orthodox Protestantism: (1) it was fundamentalist, which meant that it held to a literal translation of the Bible and a denial of Darwin’s theories; (2) it insisted on the necessity of individual conversion, by contrast with the doctrine of Christian nurture which taught that a child raised according to Christian ideals would *ipso facto* be a Christian; and (3) it emphasized the moral perfection of the individual as the mission of the church, rather than social reforms (Kildahl, 1972: 19).

The Protestants, originally so-called because they protested the political and social abuses and excesses of the Catholic Church, were again, in this moment of history, “protesting;” but this time it is against orthodox Protestantism. This development has phenomenal consequences upon religion worldwide.

The United States and modern Pentecostalism

In tracing the beginning of Pentecostalism and tongues in America, most historical accounts begin with Charles Parham, a Methodist/Holiness evangelist in Topeka, Kansas (Cutten, 1927; Kildahl, 1972; Christie-Murray, 1978; Bradfield, 1979; Poloma, 1982; Malony and Lovekin, 1985; Fletcher, 1985; Mol, 1985). It must be remembered however, that various Pentecostal groups were springing

up in many parts of the United States, England, and countries as far away as Armenia and India.

Charles F. Parham was a former Methodist minister who opened a Bible college in Topeka, Kansas, 1900. Twelve of the forty male and female students were ministers who Parham asked to make an informal study of the subject of baptism in the Holy Ghost (Kelsey, 1964: 61). Concluding that the biblical evidence for the Holy Spirit was speaking in other tongues, the group began to wait, pray, and meditate; “. . . and the baptism of the Holy Spirit came upon them, first one and then upon several, and they spoke in tongues.” (Kelsey, 1964: 62) It is reported that at a watch-night service on December 31, 1900, Parham ‘laid hands’ on a student named Agnes N. Ozman; it is claimed that she spoke in Chinese for three days, subsequently unable to speak English and the ability to write only Chinese characters (Williams, 1981: 50). Parham preached a series of revivals, spreading the Pentecostal message throughout Kansas and Missouri (Poloma, 1982: 7).

One of Parham’s students was a black minister, the Reverend W. J. Seymour. Under Parham’s influence, Seymour, who had accepted the Holiness doctrine of a “second blessing,” experienced a “third experience” -- “the baptism of the Holy Spirit evidenced by speaking in tongues.” Seymour soon started the Azusa Street Los Angeles Mission, which had considerable impact upon the

Pentecostal movement (Christie-Murray, 1978: 93). For three years Azusa Street was the center of [North American] Pentecostalism (Kildahl, 1972).¹⁴

The story of Seymour's start with the Pentecostal experience of tongues is indicative of the Pentecostal method and fervor that would cross the American continent, up through Canada and around the globe.

Seymour came to Los Angeles to be associate pastor of a small Nazarene mission in the Holiners tradition, but his 'Pentecostal' teaching lead to ejection from the pastorate. However, he continued to conduct services in people's homes and at gatherings many began to speak with tongues. Growing congregations made it necessary to find a building to accommodate them. This is how they came to be in a former Methodist church at 312 Azusa St., an address which became internationally known as the cradle of the Pentecostal movement in America. (Williams, 1981: 49)

Of importance, regarding the students in Parham's Topeka Bible college "finding" glossolalia, is "that for the first time the concept of being baptized (or filled) with the Holy Spirit was linked to an outward sign, that of speaking in tongues. (Synan 1971, p. 95)" (Poloma, 1982: 7)

From the Azusa Street revival, this faith and related phenomenon spread throughout the United States -- Ohio, Indiana, Pennsylvania, Maine, into the south, California, Texas, and north to Canada (see Poloma, 1982: 8; Kildahl, 1972: 18-19; Christie-Murray, 1978: 96). Azusa Street exerted its influence to Pentecostals in Chicago, New York and Little Rock, Winnipeg, London,

¹⁴ Two important streams of the Pentecostal movement met in Los Angeles during the Azusa Street revival. An Armenian group, who immigrated from Kara Karla to Los Angeles in 1900, were practicing their faith and tongue-speaking in isolation when one of their members (Demo Shakarian and his friend) walked into the church at 312 Azusa Street (Kildahl, 1972). During the 1960s the name of Shakarian became well known to Pentecostals across the United States. The founder of the FGBMFI is Demos Shakarian, the grandson of the Demos Shakarian who came to

Sunderland, Amsterdam, Oslo, Calcutta, Allahabad, and Mukti (Christie-Murray, 1978: 97).¹⁵ One should not speak about the emergence of Pentecostalism without turning also to Europe and the rest of the globe, since the phenomenon spread far and wide (Williams, 1981: 66; see Hocken, 1986). While the Azusa Street revival was spreading Pentecostalism across North America, a revival was occurring in Wales, India, and Australia (Cutten, 1927; Christie-Murray, 1978; Williams, 1981; Burgess, 1984; Hocken, 1986).

During the middle to later twentieth century, Pentecostalism took hold in the Caribbean and Latin American countries and Africa (see Glazier, 1980; Corten, 1997).¹⁶ In countries where Pentecostalism took hold, however, the movement frequently experienced opposition (see Manning, 1980; Poloma, 1982).

The Charismatic and Neo-Pentecostal Movement

"After the Pentecostal Movement was institutionalized in new church denominations in the first half of the twentieth century it emerged again in 1960 as the Charismatic movement within main-line Christian denominations, both Protestant and Roman Catholic." (Fletcher, 1985: 10; see Kelsey, 1964; Kildahl, 1972; Poloma, 1982) The movement of this Pentecostal experience, with

Los Angeles from Armenia. Through the well-kept Shakarian family records, it is documented they were likely the first to speak in tongues in Armenia in 1880.

¹⁵ Although the revival on Azusa Street only lasted three years, it was attended by persons from all over the world, who would establish Pentecostal groups upon returning home (Kildahl, 1972: 19)

¹⁶ "In Jamaica, as in other parts of the Caribbean, there are religious sects (derisively called 'pocomania' by outsiders) that are supposed to practice glossolalia at the height of emotion or possession." (Samarin, 1972b: 11) Samarin reports that many groups have modified glossolalia "to fit the existing pattern" of that group, in particular, Samarin states "these are the various Christian or Christo-pagan sects that have, for the most part, sprung from mission churches, Protestant or Catholic." (1972b: 11)

tongue-speaking, into mainline churches is also referred to as the neo-Pentecostal movement.

Neo-Pentecostalism has four seminal sources: the influence of David du Plessis;¹⁷ the Full Gospel Businessmen's Fellowship International (FGBMFI); the Van Nuys California Awakening; and the Roman Catholic Renewal (Hollenweger, 1972: 4 as cited in Poloma, 1982: 11). The importance of the FGBMFI (1951) is that "it marked a successful outreach of Pentecostals to non-Pentecostals that did not result in a new denomination, but rather in a strengthening of existing classical Pentecostal churches and a spreading of the "full gospel" to other institutional denominations." (Poloma, 1982: 14)

Although Parham had an anti-organizational bias, Pentecostalism soon discovered the need for becoming an institution (Poloma, 1982: 10). This resulted in a confederation of local Pentecostal churches in 1914, known as the Assemblies of God. During the early years of Pentecostalism's history there was much misunderstanding and theological dispute between the sect and other religious/sectarian groups. "Fundamentalists," who initially "closed the door to fellowship with Pentecostals," accepted them into a non-Pentecostal church body, the National Association of Evangelicals, in 1943.

After the institutionalization of the Pentecostal movement into various new churches, it emerged in a "new" form, in 1960, as already mentioned -- referred to as the Charismatic or the neo-Pentecostal movement. While a full discussion

¹⁷ David du Plessis was a black minister who brought the Azusa Street message back to South Africa, becoming executive secretary of the Pentecostal Fellowships of South Africa. Attempting to bridge the gap between the Pentecostal and traditional churches, du Plessis sought to work

comparing and contrasting Pentecostalism and Neo-Pentecostalism is eschewed, it must be noted that despite a common emphasis on "the power of the Holy Spirit," many differences exist among charismatics (see Poloma, 1982: 16-18).

In 1972 Kildahl reported the following: "While the lower economic strata of society have traditionally filled the ranks of Holiness sects and Pentecostal churches, the current movement is among the wealthier, most highly educated congregations of the Baptist, Presbyterian, Lutheran, Methodist, Episcopal, and Congregationalist churches (now United Church of Christ). These glossolalists tend to be discreet about their practice." (1972: 21)

While the charismatic movement is now a transdenominational movement, it needs to be emphasized that the Catholic Charismatic Renewal has an emphasis somewhat different from classical Pentecostalism (Fletcher, 1985: 13; Poloma, 1982: 16). "The Catholic Charismatic Renewal is firmly rooted in the Catholic Church and its history (Ranaghan & Ranaghan 1971), just as neo-Pentecostalism is rooted in its own denominationalism" (Poloma, 1982: 16). There is also no definitive Protestant theology; rather, "the different denominations have attempted to integrate the Pentecostal experience into their denominational theology." (Poloma, 1982: 16) The Catholics however, especially after Vatican II, have embraced the "baptism in the Holy Spirit," and have extensive theological discourse, courses, and publications regarding this

with the World Council of Churches. The Assemblies of God subsequently dismissed him from his position and du Plessis continued with his ecumenical work.

"contemporary grace in the light of the Catholic tradition" (see DeGrandis, 1987; Martin, 1998).

The basic theology of "the works of the Holy Spirit" between Pentecostals and neo-Pentecostals differs. Neo-Pentecostals are less likely to hold that "Spirit Baptism" is necessarily accompanied by speaking in tongues and view other spiritual gifts, such as healing or prophecy as possible evidence of Spirit Baptism (Poloma, 1982: 16). Doctrinally, the "Statement of Faith of the Pentecostal/Charismatic Churches of North America" links glossolalia to Spirit baptism.

Neo-Pentecostal Note

The following quote serves to highlight an important indigenous character of the neo-Pentecostal movement. "Pentecostal prayer groups would spread by a prominent person in a mainline church receiving the Baptism. The individual would start a prayer group and ask others to join. Thus, small and hidden clusters of neo-Pentecostals grew up almost unnoticed in the major mainline churches." (Bradfield, 1979: 6)

Pentecostalism in Canada

Pentecostalism in Canada had its seminal start on November 17, 1906, in a small store at 651 Queen Street East, Toronto.

Suddenly Mrs. Hebden, against her own will, began to speak in tongues. She had been praying for healing power and the ouster of demons but instead found herself speaking an unknown language. This had an electrifying effect on her audience. Very soon the store became too small for their meetings and had to be extended to three times its length. Still it was not large enough for people who came from all over the city every night to witness the outpouring of the Holy Spirit and very soon new missions were established in Toronto (Frodsham 1976, 53-4) (cited in Mol, 1985: 144)

Soon this “tidal wave,” “prairie fire,” or “Pentecostal explosion” would affect other parts of Canada. Mr. A.H. Argue, a real estate agent from Winnipeg, received the baptism of the Holy Spirit and brought what he called “a prairie fire” back to Manitoba from Chicago City in 1907. By the twentieth century, Pentecostalism and the charismatic movement had impacted Canadian religion.

During the latter twentieth century, Pentecostalism in Canada grew consistently faster than the population (Mol, 1985: 145). Considering the influences of “secularism,” in the decade between 1981 and 1991, the numbers of persons identifying themselves as “Pentecostal” on the Canadian census increased from 338,790 in 1981 to 436,435 in 1991 (Statistics Canada, catalogue no. 93-319-XPB) Those identifying with “Other Protestant” religion also increased during this period, from 1,169,545 in 1981 to 2,127,190 in 1991. However, a new picture is beginning to emerge in Canadian religion. In the latest census, 2001, numbers of Canadians self-identifying as “Pentecostal” has decreased; while 436,435 identified themselves as belonging to the Pentecostal denomination in 1991, by 2001 that number decreased to 369,475 (Statistics Canada, catalogue:96F0030XIE2001015). Of interest, those self-identifying as “Christian,” “Apostolic,” “Born-again Christian,” and “Evangelical” are increasing; from 353,040 in 1991 to 780,450 in 2001.¹⁸

¹⁸ Implications as to what this might mean for religion and to religious experiencing in Canada is not explicitly discussed in the dissertation; however, this is a 121.1 percentage change between 1991-2001. In the 2001 census, this was one of the largest percentage increases among the major religious groups in Canada. Canada is still, however, predominantly Roman Catholic (the largest religious group) and Protestant. Mostly due to immigration trends, the religious milieu has

In considering the overall decline of mainline Protestantism (traditionally represented primarily by the Anglican, Lutheran, Presbyterian, and United Church in Canada), these changes and increases in other Protestant sects and denominations are noteworthy; as is the substantial increase in the number of individuals expressing themselves as having “no religious affiliation.” In 2001, sixteen per cent of the population (almost 4.8 million people) reported having no religion.¹⁹

According to Hans Mol (1985), Pentecostals think of themselves primarily as a movement rather than an organization. “Denominational cohesion is (or certainly was) rather unimportant to them and there are many independent splinter groups such as the Apostolic Faith Assembly, the Apostolic Church of Pentecost, the Holy Rollers, and the Free Gospel Assembly which are regarded as Pentecostal.” (Mol, 1985: 145)

One of the larger international Pentecostal churches in the world, the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel, has strong links to Canada through its founder, Aimee Semple McPherson (1890-1944). “At the age of seventeen she was converted by Robert Semple, a boilermaker, who had shortly before been baptized by the Holy Spirit at the Hebden’s mission in Toronto. A few months later Aimee also received the Holy Spirit.” (Mol, 1985: 146)

While the story of Aimee Semple McPherson (nee Aimee Kennedy born on a farm in Ingersoll, Ontario) is a fascinating one, the reader might be intrigued

shifted so that the number of Canadians who reported their religion as Islam, Hinduism, Sikhism and Buddhism has increased substantially.

with the following description of her seeking the baptism in the Holy Spirit --
behaviour which is not unknown to those who desiring "Baptism of [in] the Holy Spirit" with the sign of tongues.

From Monday until Friday, as the snow fell, Aimee prayed to be emptied of self and filled with the Power promised from Heaven. She prayed for the baptism of the Holy Spirit, the true evidence of which she understood to be the gift of tongues.... On Friday Aimee waited upon the Lord until midnight. Saturday morning she rose before anyone in the house was awake, crept downstairs to the parlor, and took up her vigil kneeling.... It was there she heard God's voice: "Now child, cease your striving and your begging; just begin to praise me, and in simple childlike faith, receive ye the Holy Ghost."... The cords of her throat began to twitch. Her lungs filled and began to heave. Her chin quivered, shook violently, and then her tongue began to move in her mouth, first up and down, then sideways. Vowels came howling and then a distinct syllable, and another, stammering, until they glowed in a sentence Aimee could not understand. This led to another slowly formed sentence, and several more that followed, each more swiftly.... (Epstein, 1993:52-54)

By the time of her death in 1944, Aimee Semple McPherson had established a church of international reputation. By 1993, there were 25,577 Foursquare churches worldwide in 74 countries, with a total of almost a million and seven hundred thousand members (Epstein, 1995: 440).²⁰

Glossolalia's historical ebb and flow, reveals that it is an experience of significant import to individuals and social institutions (whether as independent religious bodies or affiliates of larger church-denominations). This occurs in spite of social and political persecution. Unique social, cultural, political and economic forces have often converged to effect the "fate" and development of groups

¹⁹ According to Statistics Canada "Prior to 1971, fewer than 1% of the Canadian population reported having no religion. In 2001, that percentage increased to 16% of the population, or just under 4.8 million, compared with 3.3 million a decade earlier." (Catalogue:96F0030XIE2001015)

²⁰ According to another estimate, the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel has 2,863,232 adherents (www.Adherents.com, 2000). MacLean's, November 29, 1999 reported that 84.9 per cent of the population of North America is Christian: "of the Christian religions, Roman

promoting glossolalic expression. At the present, while the researcher has no absolute figures to state the numbers engaging glossolalia, what can be stated with certainty is that the phenomenon is “alive and well” in North America and around the globe. Part of the spread of glossolalic expression is Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

The “Toronto Blessing” and the “Third Wave”

What is now called the “Toronto Blessing,” is considered the latest “renewal” or part of the “third wave” of the Pentecostal or Charismatic movement (Poloma and Hoelter, 1998: 258). It is considered one stream of a worldwide revival that is often traced to Latin American origins (Poloma and Hoelter, 1998: 270). In Toronto, it is primarily related to the crusades of a former South African evangelist, Rodney Howard-Browne. Howard-Browne is considered the founder of the “laughing movement.”

Poloma and Hoelter sum up the crux of the “third wave” movement, as evidenced in Toronto, in this way.

The ‘third wave’ has been spearheaded by the voice of John Wimber whose Association of Vineyard Churches is one of the forces at work in ‘reinventing American Protestantism’ (Miller 1997). Wimber (1987) provided a voice for others in seeking to downplay the role of healing evangelists and healing crusades that was characteristic of the 1950s healing movement, emphasizing instead that the power to heal was available to all Christians. This democratization of spiritual healing, taking it out of the hands of a few and placing it in the reach of the masses is the stance on healing taken by leaders of the ‘Toronto Blessing’ renewal. (1998: 259)

In 1995, the Association of Vineyard Fellowships ousted The Toronto Airport Christian Fellowship (then known as the Toronto Airport Vineyard Church). It continually attracts a diverse group of other Pentecostal and charismatic-oriented Christians from across Canada, the United States, Britain, Germany, and other countries around the globe. Catching public and media attention at the Toronto Airport Christian Fellowship, are the somatic manifestations in the services.

The somatic manifestations – shaking, laughing, jerking, crying, and even occasional ‘animal sounds’ – are in evidence throughout the ritual but increase and intensify during the time of individual prayer...Although some of the manifestations, most notably glossolalia and resting in the spirit, have been part of the P/c [Pentecostal or Charismatic] movement throughout this century, the diversity and intensity of the somatic manifestations appear to be heightened during this phase of the movement. One person may be convulsing with laughter, another shaking uncontrollably, a third screaming as if in deep pain, still another sobbing quietly, while still others quietly lay on the floor seemingly in the deepest peaceful rest. (Poloma and Hoelter, 1998: 257)

Due to the tremendous social impact of the Holiness/Pentecostal movement upon traditional life and values in America at the turn of the twentieth century, individuals outside of the movement began to notice the strange and “new” religious behaviour of those catching “reform.” Most noteworthy in the developing charismatic religious fervour, was the behaviour of glossolalia – a key expression of Pentecostalism.

As speaking in tongues manifested itself within the Holiness tradition, the movement split over the issue. While the Holiness movement accepted the activity of “the Spirit” it was disturbed about the phenomenon of tongue-speaking. As more and more sects separated from their Holiness roots or as individuals left

more established churches, sects of "Pentecostal Christians" arose across America; it was not long before this phenomenon entered the purview of journalists and academics.

In the decade of the sixties, interest in glossolalia increased, mainly due to an upsurge of the behavior outside of the Pentecostal movement in various main-line denominations. The result was a number of publications ranging from the journalistic to the theological, anthropological, and psychiatric approach. (Goodman, 1972a: xviii)

Undoubtedly, the twentieth century religious milieu of North America was changing. During the second half of the twentieth century scholars within religion, anthropology, and sociology began noticing the spread and growth of charismatic sects and "new religious movements;" more shocking to some perhaps, was notice of "the sociology of the paranormal." (see Greeley, 1975; Fox, 1992; Hunt, 2000) It is within this rapidly changing social milieu that the perplexing charismatic expression of glossolalia begins to flourish and to enter the purview of social scientists.

CHAPTER THREE

GLOSSOLALIA RESEARCH

Overview

The literature on glossolalia is relatively scant. It also reflects the absence of any kind of working definition, and too often richness of invention substitutes for careful observation.
Goodman, 1972a: xv

Prior to a book written by George Barton Cutten (1927), specific treatises on glossolalia were primarily available in French and German (i.e., E. Lombard [1910] *De la Glossolalia chez les premiers chrétiens et des phénomènes similaires*, and E. Mosiman [1911] *Das Zungenreden, geschichtlich und psychologisch untersucht*, respectively).¹ Cutten's work is an historical and psychological consideration of "speaking with tongues," and it is with him that most literature reviews on glossolalia begin. Without a doubt, Cutten's work is a seminal piece on glossolalia.

In writing and doing research on the expression of glossolalia in A.D. 2003, one sees a plethora of research and writing on the subject of "Pentecostalism," and with it, dissertations on "Pentecostal glossolalia," "religious glossolalia," and "Christian glossolalia." It is important to note that these researches span a diverse number of disciplines.

¹ There were a few articles written on the subject but nothing that Cutten felt covered the field adequately. There were histories written about the Christian Church (in England and the United States); the Protestants in France; and some of the various "new religions" arising in

Review of Glossolalia Literature

In reviewing the extant research and writing on glossolalia, the twenty-first century researcher is confronted with a diversity of literatures -- the field of theology, linguistics, sociolinguistics, psychology, medical psychology, sociology, anthropology, psychiatry, neuroscience -- along with numerous articles written by individuals within the charismatic movement and Pentecostal churches;² all converge upon and confront the self-conscious researcher. Williams (1981) recognizes the need to extend the scope of investigations and to consider the manner in which the investigations are conducted (1981: 125). This remark is all the more cogent given the rich findings from this particular research project.

The typology of tongues elucidated, alongside concomitant glossolalic manifestations observed within a small charismatic Christian group (as well as manifest expressions uncovered during in-depth interviewing), reveal a need for interdisciplinary dialogue between all scientific disciplines. There is a call for further sociological and anthropological examination of this *natural phenomenon*; in this research project, *charismatic glossolalia* is a regularly engaged behaviour among this group of practicing charismatic Christian glossolalists.

America (e.g., Mormons and Shakers); most of the other works were theological or reports from missionaries or reports on spiritualism (Society for Psychical Research).

² Little work considers or synthesizes the complementary findings from neuroscience, quantum cosmology, quantum physics, cognitive psychology, genetics, molecular biology, and many other disciplines.

The findings also point to a need for future research to “test” alternative ways of *knowing* (that is *gnostic verification* of spiritual experience); there is a need for researchers to *experience* that which the charismatic Christian glossolalist experiences (see here Wilbur, 1983). Such *transpersonal* research will establish *communal confirmation* or, that which is referred to in transpersonal methodology, a circle of *sympathetic resonance*.

There are several excellent works reviewing the seminal literature on glossolalia and these, as noted previously, come from various disciplines (Cutten, 1927; Kelsey, 1964; Samarin, 1972a; Goodman, 1972; Christie-Murray, 1978; Williams, 1981; Poloma, 1982; Malony and Lovekin, 1985). The number of M.A. theses from 1900 (e.g., Shumway, 1919; Dai, 1932 among others) through to the present, which explore glossolalia and Pentecostalism in North America and Europe, is impressive. The scholarly literature in most fields, however, has centered on the researcher’s central discipline and the discipline’s assumptions. For example, in the sociology of religion, some of the recent work focuses on the charismatic movement and its emphasis on healing, health, wealth, and prosperity doctrine, and prophecy (see Poloma, 1982, 1998, 1999; Poloma and Hoelter, 1998; Hunt, 1998). In medical psychology, the dispute on glossolalia centers around issues of “thought disorder,” psychopathology, and mental illness, as it relates to “talk” such as

glossolalia (see Szasz, 1993; Bentall and Pilgrim, 1993; Leff, 1993; Grady and Loewenthal, 1997).³

Prior to the 1980 charismatic renewal in North America, most comment on tongue-speaking was adverse (see Williams, 1981; most notably the work of Cutten, 1927 and Kildahl, 1974). Virginia Hine cogently notes: "Future studies of it [glossolalia] might usefully include an examination of possible bias on the part of non-glossolalic observers." (1969: 218) Samarin reiterates this bias, adding that nothing has been said about the linguistic notions of people who are looking upon the glossolalia scene (1979: 102-103).

This researcher notes that research formats exploring glossolalia, have been cast into several topical categories. Generally, these categories view:

- 1) The personality of the glossolalist;
- 2) Glossolalia as dissociation, trance, and an altered state of consciousness (A.S.C.);⁴
- 3) The glossolalic utterance;
- 4) The function of glossolalia (see Williams, 1981); and,
- 5) Transitional/intermediate experiencing (see Mumford, 1996).

³ The point here is to note that few theses or scholarly work employ an interdisciplinary approach to the study of glossolalia. The researcher believes that the scholarship from fields of neurotheology, shamanism, and other disciplines, which consider the 'mindbrain,' heart, and spirit of humankind, are relevant to the study of glossolalia.

⁴ In her work, the researcher prefers the term *alternative phase of consciousness*. This term, it is felt, better describes the experience where the percipient is cognitively aware of the experience; at the same time, it recognizes that an alternative phase of consciousness can be one in which the percipient *bypasses* consciousness. It is a term that also recognizes advances in theoretical physics and findings in neuroscience.

Overarching *paradigms* of the aforementioned research approaches

are such that glossolalia is regarded as:

- A) Aberrant behaviour;
- B) Extraordinary behaviour;
- C) Anomalous behaviour;
- D) Ritual behaviour (less frequently);
- E) Right-Brain behaviour (in the late twentieth century); and,
- F) *Transmutational [spiritual] experiencing* [being proposed in this research].

This research project aims to appropriate explicit and implicit findings uncovered in the process of long in-depth interviews with tongue-speakers, together with research findings from neuroscience, to expand conceptual frameworks and understanding on glossolalia. Transpersonal research applied to the study of glossolalia sees glossolalic expressiveness as evidence of an evolutionary transformation of human consciousness; it suggests an wholistic, alternative framework. Uncovering the range of glossolalic expression within the *natural* typology of glossolalia, points to tongue-speaking phenomenon as one form of a *transmutational [spiritual] experiencing*. As will be further obvious to the reader, in the presentation of the data in subsequent chapters, it is the cultural domains of the glossolalist, along with the practice and interpretation of glossolalia, which appear to delimit the extent or the use and consequences of continuing in this altered phase of consciousness.

In the following literature review, the essential theoretical approaches to glossolalia are highlighted. The discussion adumbrates key areas that point to a need for a more inclusive, compassionate, and sympathetic understanding of the glossolalic experience.

The Personality of the Glossolalist

Williams reviews the early proponents of this focus: Lombard, Mosiman, Cutten, Vivier, and May (1981: 126). Other researchers who place emphasis on glossolalic personality assessment are: Kildahl (1972); Richardson (1973); Laffal, Monahan, and Richman, (1974); Lovekin and Malony (1977); Niesz and Kronenberger (1978); Smith and Fleck (1981); and Francis and Kay (1995). The emphasis is primarily on features of psychopathology and personality assessment (Mumford, 1996: 21). Hutch writes:

...the bulk of research on tongue-speaking centers on the aberrant behaviour focus and can be placed into two groups. The first is related to the depth-psychological tradition, and is usually expressed in terms of recent theories of American ego-psychology, especially theories of regression and narcissism. The second kind of research is concerned with empirical investigation into kinds of tongue-speaking experiences and whether such experiences serve to integrate the personality. Both types of work stem from assumptions associated with aberrant, or socially useless (and, often, anti-social) behaviour about which consideration of the possible attenuation of mature ego-control is the predominant feature. (1980: 256)

Summarizing earlier writing and opinion on glossolalia, Williams notes that: "Psychological theories of the early part of this [twentieth] century tended to relate the phenomenon of glossolalia with pathological conditions and to classify it as psychotic. The three most often quoted sources are Lombard,

Moisman, and Cutten, and all three regarded glossolalia as a regressive pathological experience.” (1981: 126)

While Lombard, Moisman, and Cutten pay attention to the verbal component of glossolalia, their descriptive typologies go widely unnoticed by future social scientists. A few decades later, Samarin and Goodman do work to elucidate the structure of verbal utterances, but much of their pithy theoretical musings are overlooked in favour of the researcher focussing on their linguistic findings *per se*.⁵

During the early years of the twentieth century, psychopathology and social class are given as explanations for glossolalic expressions. This explanation of glossolalia is challenged during the 1960s when the Pentecostal experience (which was frequently accompanied with charisms), crossed denominational barriers, emerging to become what is referred to as the charismatic or neo-Pentecostal movement.

Reviewing the first half of the twentieth century literature on this phenomenon, Kelsey (1964), an Episcopalian priest who became “deeply interested in analytical psychology, the depth psychology of the late Dr. C. G. Jung of Zürich” (whose own congregants began experiencing tongues), cites some of the following conclusions, that others give, as explanations of glossolalia:

1. That tongues has little meaning and results “from an upthrust of primitive mentality, or from psychological abnormality, or as some people see it, from demon possession” (1964: 137);
2. That ‘Pentecost’ has never been interpreted correctly, “and so it must have been a different experience from the one which seemed to be described;”
3. That it was an experience considered useful in establishing the church but one that is no longer useful (these individuals are “cessationist” or “partial cessationists” – believing that none or only some of the “gifts of the Spirit” are no longer active or necessary); and,
4. There are those who believe that the tongue-speaking experience is a valuable religious experience “in which the Holy Spirit gives the ability to speak a language other than one’s own.” (Kelsey, 1964: 138)

Cutten was one of the early twentieth century proponents of a psychological view on glossolalia (frequently not noted when citing Cutten’s work, is the fact that Cutten himself was also a Baptist minister.)⁶

In addition to excitement and low mentality, one other factor is likely to be present in those who speak in tongues, and that is illiteracy. The illiterate naturally have poor power of expression and a limited vocabulary. When the excessive energy presses for discharge, the appropriate words are not forth coming, and at first primitive cries and later meaningless syllables take their place. When we have, then, these three elements and added to them the power of suggestion and

⁵ Goodman (1972a, 1972b) delves into possible neurophysical correlates and cross-cultural similarities; Samarin himself, it is said, is eventually said to have had an experience of glossolalia.

⁶ Traditionally, Baptists are not provided with doctrine that permits tongue-speaking. Rather, Christianity is unemotional and the experience of Christianity is in diligent Bible-reading and Bible-teaching and not in the works of the Holy Spirit. This is not to say that Baptist adherents do not speak in tongues; however, those that do speak in tongues keep quiet in the church and do not admit to practicing glossolalia within the Baptist church.

expectancy, we can prognosticate speaking with tongues as a result.
(1927: 7)

While compared to ecstasy, frenzy, or hysteria in the ancient world, several writers and researchers on tongue-speaking (for example Kelsey, 1964; Henderson, 1997), believe that the pre-Christian phenomenon it is not the same experience. Morton Kelsey writes:

Actually there is nothing to be found in either Hebrew or Greek antecedents comparable to the experience described by Paul's letters and the Book of Acts as speaking in tongues. And if it is suggested that it could not be a new experience but must have been known and not described, we must consider how unlikely this would have been among people who valued such experiences so highly. (1964: 141)⁷

In a more recent sociolinguistic dissertation, Jeffrey Lynn Hendersen attempts to clarify the "misunderstandings about the ecstatic nature of glossolalia" which have led "modern scholars into misinterpreting the conflict about glossolalia in Corinth." (1997: 157)⁸

Modern social-scientific research demonstrates that glossolalia is not a result of a trance state and is consequently not specifically ecstatic. None of the supposed Graeco-Roman parallels, including Delphic prophecy, actually discuss glossolalia. The phrase *γλωσσιζ λαλειν* was unknown in pre-Pauline Greek. Paul, or an associate, must have introduced this practice to Corinth and coined the phrase "speaking in tongues." (Henderson, 1997: 157)

⁷ The researcher finds this position rather paradoxical, given that Kelsey is a "Jungian analyst" with much regard for the unconscious and its expression.

⁸ Christian writers are often concerned about excluding what might be considered syncretism. The researcher feels that such 'fear' is unwarranted and that it precludes intelligent discussion about such topics. The whole discussion of glossolalia transcends theological discourse, but it is hoped theologians will continue to broach interdisciplinary dialogue on "The Trinity" and the work and presence of "The Holy Spirit."

Samarin writes: "the attempt to explain psychologically is not an impressive one." (1972: 42) Virginia Hine, reviewing the literature available to her in 1969 concludes: "Quite clearly, available evidence requires that an explanation of glossolalia as pathological must be discarded." (1969: 217) "As yet there is no empirical, scientific evidence for this interpretation of glossolalia." (Hine, 1969: 218)

Ultimately, most research studies use learning theory and ego-psychology to explain ("away") glossolalia. These research projects generally examine the following:

1. The relationship between personality and religion;
2. The relationship between personality and Christian ministry;
3. The personality and the experience of glossolalia;
4. Glossolalia as learned behaviour;
5. The personality of the glossolalist as compared to non-glossolalist;
6. Self-actualization of the glossolalist compared to non-glossolalist; and,
7. The non-communicative and affective aspects of glossolalic expression.

Overall, conclusions from such studies do not support the hypothesis that glossolalia is pathological behaviour, nor, that the glossolalist is more neurotic than the non-glossolalic within the general population. There is support for the view that glossolalia can function as a "tension reducing device," thus linking it to psychological health by reducing anxiety, lowering the risk of mental illness and promoting the integration of personality (Francis and Kay 1995:589; see Malony and Lovekin, 1985).

In the extant research looking at glossolalia and pathology, few researchers make use of the self-reported views of the glossolalic, a cogent call made by Francis and Kay (1995:590; see also Samarin, 1972b; 1979). Doing a content and profile analysis of 120 letters received in a public appeal for views on the experience of glossolalia, Stanley, Bartlett, and Moyle conclude: "the experience of glossolalia is not unitary," and it "does not involve an altered state of consciousness." (1978: 269)

Samarin notes that:

People have also tried to account for phenomena that should not have been combined, seeing similarities when these were only superficial. All meaningless speech is not the same, even when the nonlinguistic behavior appears the same. And speech which appears the same can be associated with different kinds of behavior. (1972b: 43)

Kelsey (1964) elucidates "positive" results coming from the glossolalist's experience. Though not a tongue-speaker,⁹ Kelsey "understood" the phenomenon of glossolalia, because of his personal association with tongue-speakers, as well as being well acquainted with leaders in the Charismatic movement of his day (1964: 8). In evaluating tongues, Kelsey writes:

Dr. William Sargant, the distinguished British psychiatrist, has suggested that one can make up his mind about either psychotherapeutic techniques or strange religious practices only on the basis of facts and results. It is certainly true that the final decision on the validity and value of tongues has to come from the results of the experience. (Kelsey, 1964: 218)

⁹ Such as is implied in a quote used by William (1981); Kelsey, by his own admission is not a tongue-speaker.

The above quote is reminiscent of that by William James, “father of American psychology,” and author of the classic book on the psychology of religion. In arguing for the importance of religious experiences and recognizing their effect upon human behaviour, he writes, in *The Varieties of Religious Experience*:

You may remember how I there [the first Gifford Lecture delivered in 1901] argued against the notion that the worth of a thing can be decided by its origin. Our spiritual judgment, I said, our opinion of the significance and value of a human event or condition, must be decided on empirical grounds exclusively. If the *fruits for life* of the state of conversion are good, we ought to idealize and venerate it, even though it be a piece of natural psychology; if not, we ought to make short work with it, no matter what supernatural being may have infused it. (James, 1902/1958: 191)

It appears in the work of James and others, that individuals do experience “fruits” or beneficial and lasting affective and personal effects from [religious or spiritual] experiences. At one level, this becomes empirically observed ‘datum’ and provides evidence, *facts* – the fruits of behaviour are [visible] facts.

Those individuals whom Morton Kelsey knew, observed, and spoke with, felt that glossolalia was indeed, not “pathological nor infantile.” One of Kelsey’s acquaintances, speaking in Jungian terms, writes that “speaking with tongues is one evidence of the Spirit of God working in the unconscious and bringing one to a new wholeness, a new integration of the total psyche, a process which the Church has traditionally called sanctification.” (Kelsey, 1964: 222) This experience of “unity” and “wholeness” and the psychosocial

integration a tongue-speaker can experience is seen in many of the co-researcher verbatim transcript quotes found throughout the dissertation.

It is an often-cited doctoral dissertation by Lincoln Vivier in 1960 that introduced psychological tests applied to the psychological study of the phenomenon of glossolalia (Henderson, 1997: 26). Henderson sums up this "classic" in this way.

Vivier connected this experience with repressive personalities, as well as those who use simpler thought patterns. His work does mark a turning point, since subsequent studies would find it necessary to produce clinical data to support any conclusions. (Henderson, 1997: 27)

In psychological study after Vivier, research focuses on personality assessment and "religious glossolalia." Samarin (1973b) criticized the research. He stated that "an unfortunate inattention to linguistic and cultural facts is responsible for a gross misunderstanding of a persistent human trait: the use of anomalous speech in culturally meaningful ways." (1973b: 121) It is argued in this dissertation that it is an unfortunate and cultural fact that today we ignore, to our peril, an wholistic understanding of the glossolalic experience itself. Having a more inclusive and wholistic framework of glossolalic expressiveness will support a more informed and wholistic understanding of the tongue-speaker's personality, his/her spirituality (lifeworld) and the cultural domain of tongue-speaking group. As this research project reveals, the typology of glossolalia permits a range of spiritual expressiveness to be noted and observed, and permits a more informed view of glossolalia for those who do not have, nor wish to have, the experience of charismatic glossolalia.

Samarin states that the confusion about glossolalia rests in another oft cited article by May (1956).

It is hardly more than a survey of the uses of the term glossolalia (and its equivalent). May provides no linguistic evidence that there is a single linguistic phenomenon, nor does he argue convincingly on nonlinguistic grounds that a single term accurately unifies all his various speech forms. (Samarin, 1973b: 122)

Samarin senses that it is this lack of attention to, not only the “verbal data” of glossolalia, but “to glossolalic *speech acts* and to the system of beliefs that motivate them,” which results in more psychological explanations than cultural ones; “glossolalists have been treated as abnormal.” (Samarin, 1973b: 123) Samarin suggests that it is cultural factors, which elicit speech acts and it is “the system of beliefs that accommodates these deviants as much as ‘normal’ society accommodates its own deviants.” (Samarin, 1973b: 123) It is of course necessary that belief systems and culture enter the discourse; but again, this alone is insufficient in providing researchers with the most comprehensive understanding of tongue-speaking in the twenty-first century.

Kelsey had previously noted: “Tongues *can* occur in a highly charged atmosphere, *but it can also occur in quiet surroundings, and the unleashing of emotionalism is simply not a necessary part of speaking in tongues.*” (Kelsey, 1968/1964: 145 [italics in original quote])

It is important to understand that glossolalia is also viewed in the literature to be a *learned* behaviour within a particular (sub)-cultural setting. Unlike Goodman’s extensive cross-cultural analysis, which concludes that glossolalia is produced in a trance state, researchers writing after Kelsey (1964) and

Samarin (1969a, 1969b; 1972a, 1972b; 1973a, 1973b; 1979) most often reject the idea that glossolalia is an artifact of dissociative states or that it is an altered state of consciousness. These authors frequently state that glossolalia can lead into a trance state and be produced in trance, but that this is not the usual experience for the charismatic Christian glossolalist. As uncovered in this research project, glossolalists do not have to lose consciousness of their reality when practicing glossolalia; frequently, the glossolalist can be using tongues and not even be aware it is occurring until a self-conscious recognition of this occurs (e.g., any or all routines of daily living can be engaged at the same time that the tongue-speaker is engaging tongues). This is also another reason that researchers can no longer ignore the findings in disciplines such as the anthropology of consciousness and neuroscience. Again, we are confronted with the complexity or complex nature of consciousness; this is seen in the research literature as confusion in the understanding of consciousness, altered states of consciousness, and trance states.

The most cogent plea is to understand glossolalia through the worldview of the glossolalist; this is something advocated by Samarin (1973a, 1973b; 1979) and later by de Vol (1974), and Hutch (1981). An omission on the part of most researchers reviewing glossolalia literature, is a consideration of the important implications in the article by de Vol (1974). We will return to his important contribution later in this review.

The rejection of glossolalia as an altered state of consciousness leads researchers to conclude that glossolalia is a learned behaviour; that it can be

“taught,” and that it involves “ego.” As will be evident in some of the respondent’s comments in the dissertation, glossolalia can be *facilitated* with a coaching by an experienced glossolalist, but it is not the natural response until a desire or recognition takes place (referring here to the Christian cultural domain). Also evident, is the fact that “non-Christian” glossolalia can occur and does occur spontaneously.

Over the last several decades psychological theories of glossolalia have come primarily from depth psychology (expressed in terms of ego-psychology), which views it as childish language and as regressive behaviour. Such a theoretical approach suggests the role of ego as being an adaptive regressive function of the brain; that is, rather than glossolalia resulting from a maladaptive ego-response to conflict or pathology, the experience of glossolalia (in modern psychology) represents “a partial suspension of normal ego functions,” a “regression in the service of the ego,” which appears [now] have a positive effect in the life of the tongue-speaker.

Mumford recognizes that certain features of tongue-speaking have “led past researchers and other observers to characterize it as regressive.” She writes:

It is suggested here that utilization of this familiar and seemingly intuitively appealing concept [regression] as an explanation for glossolalia may have preempted our full understanding of the phenomenon. A perusal of existing glossolalia literature has suggested to this researcher an association to other, more contemporary psychoanalytic conceptualizations of mental functioning which may offer a clearer understanding of features of the phenomenon that have contributed to its being cast in such terms. Prominent among these is Winnicott’s (1953) notion of a normative mode of experiencing which

bridges the individual's private, intrapsychic world and external reality (termed by him the "transitional" or "intermediate mode of experiencing"). (Mumford, 1996: 4)

Of previous theoretical frameworks using the psychoanalytical concept of regression Mumford notes:

Typically the psychoanalytic concept of regression has been invoked to account for the implication of childlike processes in the experience of the glossolalist, that is, when it has not been attributed to pathology outright. Unfortunately, the utilization of this metaphor as an explanation for glossolalia appears to have preempted further exploration of the phenomenon. (1996: 24)

Glossolalia as Dissociation and Alternative States of Consciousness

Cutten suggests that the glossolalist is in a state of dissociation while engaging tongue-speaking and he refers to it as a *motor automatism* (1927: 161). The following quote highlights Cutten's thinking on glossolalia.

For a modern man to permit himself to indulge in this form of expression means that he must put himself in a psychological state where the controlling apparatus of his mind is not functioning, and where the primitive reactions, which usually sleep in the subconscious, find their way to the surface and represent the individual. (1927: 4)

According to Cutten, glossolalia appears in the following situation:

1. External and internal excitement;
2. Suggestion in some form; and,
3. An illiterate person about to speak (1927:168).

Cutten believed where there is no "rational control" or "direction," "meaningless syllables" break forth (1927: 169).

"Is glossolalia produced in a normal state of consciousness, or is it manifest only when the subject experiences some kind of trance?" (Williams,

1981: 135) In promulgating the glossolalist's dissociation (or hyperarousal state) and altered state of consciousness, Goodman concludes the following:

There was cross-cultural agreement in the emerging patterns, and there was evidence that behavior other than vocalization could be combined with the primary one of the dissociation. In every case, however, we found that the dissociation was the one that was patterning whatever was superimposed upon it, acting, as said earlier, as a non-linguistic deep-structure (in analog to Chomsky's concept of the linguistic deep structure) for the surface behavior. (1972a: 161)

Cognizant that her definition of glossolalia is simply a *deduction* from empirical data (derived in four different cultural settings), Goodman advances an hypothesis, which has not been sufficiently explored in subsequent research. She writes: "the state into which the glossolalist places himself [sic], or rather its neurophysiological correlates, drive, as it were, the brain centers responsible for the vocalization." (1969: 238) She goes on to propose that the "artifact of trance" (whether it be tongue-speaking or some other manifestation), is decided by "the respective learning situation or cultural expectation." (Goodman, 1969: 238)

Goodman's empirical data is recorded and observed glossolalia utterances (1969; 1972a, 1972b). Cutten's work derived from secondary literature sources. Yet, this early pointing to physiological and psychological triggers and correlates, along with culture, has essentially been overlooked in the twentieth century research. This oversight might be related to a belief that an altered state of consciousness is "simply" a trance state and this is a misunderstanding of *dissociation*; current research reveals that various states

of altered states of consciousness and dissociation, is on a continuum. The focus in Goodman's research by subsequent scholarship has centered not on its pointing to the brain, with its concomitant interpretive centers, but rather on disputing glossolalia as *trance*, *tout court* and on a linguistic analysis of glossolalia (*trance* state being the primary contention in the dialogue between Goodman and Samarin's explanations of tongue-speaking).

Extensive linguistic analysis of glossolalic utterances, occurs in the work already introduced, that of the anthropologist and linguist William Samarin (1972a, 1972b, 1973a, 1973b, 1979). The debate between Samarin and Goodman centered on the validity of *trance*, as compared to examining the linguistic aspect of glossolalia as *pseudolanguage*; which, in Samarin's extensive research, does not involve a *trance* state or for that matter, an alternative state of consciousness. For Samarin, glossolalia was a culturally shared and learned phenomenon, with meaning to the individual centered in a certain belief system and cultural domain. He notes the following:

When we look at the culture of the glossolalist, we find no reason to judge him abnormal. Like other Christians, he believes that the Holy Spirit dwells in him and motivates him. But Christians differ as to when this divine residence begins and how it is manifested. In the Pentecostal view the Holy Spirit comes in a rush, and a 'baptism', and this presence is manifested physically through the baptized person.

There is much more than this to the belief system, of course. The point being made here is simply that it is cultural factor that elicit certain kinds of speech acts, whether they be 'normal' or 'anomalous', in one normal language or another (such as English or Spanish), or in one variety or another (intimate or formal). Therefore, regardless of what a glossolalist's speech may sound like and regardless of what use he may make of his tongues, his becoming a member of the Pentecostal

subculture determines his engaging in glossolalic speech events.
(Samarin, 1973b: 123)

In researching glossolalia, researchers often note various somatic manifestations. In this research project a wide range of somatic and concomitant expressions appear in relation to glossolalic expressiveness. Such alterations within the brain and body evidence the biological and spiritual “energy” that appears evident with the typology of glossolalia elucidated; this is evidenced in respondent accounts, as well as the researcher’s own direct experience with glossolalia. A few decades ago, Williams (1981) writes:

That glossolalia became associated in people’s minds with frenzied behavior is not surprising since older Pentecostal groups made full use of rhythmic clapping, dancing, and singing. The action of rhythm on the mind has been recognized, not least in trance-induction ceremonies and in techniques associated with mystical groups. (1981: 136)

Examining glossolalia as trance-induced (such as that suggested by Goodman, 1972a), or as an A.S.C., is an approach found in several studies spanning two decades: Stanley, Bartlett, and Moyle (1978); Spanos and Hewitt (1979); and Rodriguez (1981); and Spanos, Cross, Lepage, and Coristine (1986). These studies generally eschew any altered state of consciousness as ‘cause,’ inviting instead an explanation of learning theory. These studies frequently take glossolalia into the experimental laboratory.

Ethnographic studies examining trance states, altered states of consciousness, and glossolalia in varied cultural settings are found in the fields of anthropology, psychology, and sociology (see Lex, 1976; Cartwright, 1983; Holm, 1987; Bourguignon, 1989; Turner, 1996; During, 1997; Hale, 1997;

Dillon, 1998; Dombrowski, 2001, Nouvet, 2001). The focus is often on glossolalia as an A.S.C., and to explain it in terms of a learned behaviour, cultural artifact, or as pathology -- where it is medicalized (see Szasz, 1993).

Few researchers push into the field of neuroscience and interdisciplinary study. Recent years have seen effort, however, by a few researchers to push the envelope in examining and "treating" glossolalia wholistically (see the works by Bertolino-Green, 1987; Mueller, 1990[1989]; Martínez-Taboas, 1999; Philipchalk and Mueller, 2000). Suffice it to say that the "brain" has not been adequately considered in previous research on tongue-speaking, especially as regards the tongue-speakers psychosomatic manifestations. Given the typology of glossolalia (and concomitant expressions) elucidated in this dissertation, this researcher finds that it is all the more cogent to begin dialogue with other disciplines in order to understand the changes occurring in the glossolalist (expressed both during in-depth interviews with this glossolalic researcher, and experienced within the glossolalic researcher herself). To get at the essential structure of glossolalia (through a micro-interpretive look at the individuals practicing glossolalia) is to shed intellectual light upon the structural changes within the person (the human organism) and the group (the community) that engages charismatic tongue-speaking.

Glossolalia is not limited to "incoherent babbling," or "gibberish," but can evolve and involve a variety of expressions -- expressions that engage verbal, non-verbal, somatic, and somatosensory expression. These manifestations can cause personal cognitive dissonance, as well as cultural dissonance within the

charismatic Christian sect. Some of these aspects are discussed in chapter five.

As previously noted, during the 1970s the form of the glossolalic utterance was examined by linguists in anthropology, notably Felicitas Goodman (1969, 1972a, 1972b) and William Samarin (1969, 1972a, 1972b, 1973a, 1973b, 1979). These will be further reviewed, briefly, in light of research examining the manifestation of the glossolalic utterance.

The Glossolalic Utterance

To date, this approach focuses on the linguistic expression of glossolalia. It is primarily sociolinguistic or anthropological research. Such research, while interesting, has shed little insight into why an individual speaks in tongues; why he/she continues to speak in tongues; what benefits are derived by it or from it; too often such research focuses on the expression of glossolalia in a public place. Despite decades of research, we know little about the glossolalic expression in the private domain(s) of the individual's life.¹⁰ In fact, much of the research assumes "catagion" of expression in a public forum (the opinion of Cutten [1927] and Goodman [1972a]); or, considers social learning (Spanos and Hewitt, 1979; Spanos, Cross, Lepage, Coristine, 1986; Samarin, 1972a, 1972b, 1979; Holm, 1987). Spanos *et al.* (1986) attempted to reproduce glossolalia experimentally.

It is interesting to note that in the present research project, most co-researchers experienced their first manifestation of tongue-speaking when

alone (see chapter five, Table 5.3).¹¹ The focus in this project, is the actual direct experience of tongues; to reiterate, this experience is accomplished through *reflected* upon accounts of glossolalists, during in-depth interviews; through the experience of glossolalia “showing up” during the interviews; and through the researcher’s own experiencing of glossolalic expressiveness throughout the research project. Using such an approach takes glossolalia goes into the “test-tube” or human crucible -- the researcher herself -- who must then return to the role of researcher to talk-about the experience. In some respects, this is not unlike the experimental work of Spanos et al., who attempt to reproduce glossolalic utterances in the lab by “teaching” glossolalic “gibberish” to non-glossolalists (see Spanos et al., 1986). Of interest, several respondents in this research project, talk about how they try to “experiment” with tongues (e.g., trying other sounds they have heard in the communal setting); their conclusion is that they always know when it is their ego-self making sounds or utterances, as opposed to the ‘Other’ – whom they refer to as “The Holy Spirit.”

Glossolalia as Ritual

An interesting, but neglected approach to the study of glossolalia is the aspect of ritual. Throughout the respondent accounts in future chapters, the reader will see that the time and place (or form, context, and content) of

¹⁰ The researcher includes here the brain as a domain of expression.

¹¹ Only six of the respondents, who practice glossolalia, first experienced it in a public group setting (of more than four).

glossolalia is frequently a designated [ritual] time of prayer. However, this is not the only context where tongues occur.

The “glossolalia as ritual” approach is a focus proposed by Hutch in 1980; it is one approach that few academic researchers take specific notice of in future research. Although this researcher also does not delve into glossolalia as ritual, within the confines of this exploratory research project, she does note that there is evidence within the data collected that point to a need for future in-depth sociological study of glossolalia as ritual. It might be that certain aspects of tongue-speaking considered (such as the range of glossolalic expressiveness and the concomitant expressions that occur), can inform further inquiry into “why” glossolalia is continued in the social life of the charismatic Christian, and indeed, how and why it continues in the communal expression of charismatic Christianity.

Most researchers quote Hutch’s elucidation of three major “paradigms” in the glossolalia literature; his purpose was really to add a fourth “paradigm.” One wonders how researchers can ignore the implication so explicit in the title of his often-cited article: “The Personal Ritual of Glossolalia.” How can it not provoke more focus upon the experiential dimension of glossolalia?

Thus, glossolalic sounds activate a range of possible painful or pleasant conditions of dysfunction, which point to the existential meanings conditioned by human biology and actively rehearsed in terms of ritualized sounds, which are their symbols. Tongue-speaking is a personal ritual which can bring about a deepening of the spiritual dimension of human existence. (1980: 265)

Hutch essentially recognizes that previous research “precluded an exploration of the religious function of glossolalia in the life of the individual.” (1980: 256) This gets closer to the need for examining the interpersonal, intrapersonal, and subsequently, the transpersonal *meaning* of glossolalic experiencing; this is one of the gaps in the literature that this research attempts to bridge.

This paper argues that the work of each representative researcher [Kildahl, Goodman, Samarin] fails to come to grips directly with the experience of tongue-speaking as a patently personal religious phenomenon. The three research foci have precluded an exploration of the religious function of glossolalia in the life of the individual. . . . I shall argue that glossolalia functions as an exploratory rehearsal of the experiential parameters which give rise to abstract, cognitive efforts to make sense out of a wide range of situations of extreme hurt and intense joy. Overall, **the argument is that the charismatic and the non-charismatic Christian and non-Christian function alike in response to a shared existential condition symbolized by the sounds of glossolalia.** (Hutch, 1980: 256) [bolded emphasis by researcher]

In considering alternative approaches to the study of glossolalia and theoretical musings, one rarely sees an application of Victor Turner’s concept of *liminality*. Few social scientific researchers apply Turner’s theory of liminality and *communitas* to religious experience.¹² The scholar, Orestis Lindermayer, applies Turner’s theory of *communitas* to the context of Pentecostalism in Greece (1998; see also Lindermayer 1995, 2001, 2002). It would be interesting to pursue this theoretical approach looking at North American Christian charismatic culture, as well as working to see how this theoretical approach might inform sociology and anthropology as regards the

personal “social development” of glossolalic expressiveness within the personal biography (life) of the glossolalist’s spirituality (or religiousness).

Hutch’s attempt to use the concept of liminality to explain the glossolalic event stands out as another way of understanding glossolalia as ritual; especially in lieu of the theory available to the glossolalia researcher. The omission of a closer examination of meaning and ritual within the practice and experience of glossolalia, via the concept of liminality, is especially poignant given that researchers are currently searching out and using phenomenological methods to understand the individual’s *lifeworld*.

It is surprising that to my knowledge no researcher, especially no researcher from the methodological tradition of phenomenology, where one might reasonably expect it, has pointed out the similarity between the sounds of glossolalic utterances and other very evident pre-semantic (and pre-verbal) human sounds. I refer to the sounds of crying and laughing. Both of these sounds not only express strong feelings; they also serve to demarcate where language ends and non-linguistic utterances begin. (Hutch, 1980: 264)

While this researcher also does not continue this line of research in this project, she is hopeful that the findings from this micro-interpretive project into glossolalic expressiveness will promote increased understanding in other glossolalia research and study of Christian charismatic experience.

What must be noted is that other *manifest* expressions of glossolalia have frequently been neglected in favour of the linguistic examination and cultivation of verbal glossolalic utterances.

¹² Turner (1969) takes his idea from Van Gennep (1960), who wrote *The Rites of Passage*.

Setting scientific research considerations aside for a moment, given theological discourse on the "Baptism in the Holy Spirit," something is particularly noteworthy; namely, if Pentecostal dogma states that speaking in tongues is the evidence of "the second blessing" or "Baptism in the Holy Spirit," what is the evidence for those who are deaf, mute, or unable to communicate linguistically or physically (e.g., the individual with Lou Gehrig's disease and other injuries to the brain and affecting the central nervous system)? Are these individuals excluded from receiving and evidencing the "gift of the spirit" because they cannot express verbal utterances?¹³ Future social scientific research might rightfully examine how persons who are considered to be in some way (physical or neurological) "prevented" from expressing verbal utterances or somatic expressiveness of this [spiritual] experience of glossolalia, might "experience" this energy or "power" within their mind and body.

Whether glossolalia is explained as pathological, as an altered state of consciousness, in linguistic terms as regressive speech and anomalous behaviour, or in sociocultural terms (where attention is directed toward exploring the context under which tongue-speaking arises, and thus the function of tongue-speaking to the cultural group), more questions emerge

¹³ According to Samarin: "From a psycholinguistic point of view, glossolalia on the part of deaf-mutes seems highly unlikely. All glossolalia so far studied is based on the phonology of the language (or languages) known by the speaker. A deaf-mute has not stored up in himself any set of sound patterns or developed the necessary muscular control prerequisite for glossolalia. If a deaf-mute did produce sound that was taken by witnesses to be glossolalia, I would expect it to be quite differently organized." (Samarin 1972b: 66) This dissertation disputes such a narrow [linguistic] concept of *glossas*.

than are answered. One such question is: "What is the function of glossolalia?" This leads to another approach seen in the literature.

The Function of Glossolalia

This area of interest is the frequent purview of socio-anthropological interest. An early proponent of a functional interpretation of glossolalia is Virginia Hine (1969). Hine's conclusion is as follows:

Through a functional approach to the phenomenon, we have come to assess glossolalia as a non-pathological linguistic behavior which functions in the context of the Pentecostal movement as one component in the generation of commitment. As such, it operates in social change, facilitating the spread of the Pentecostal movement affecting nearly every denomination within organized Christianity, and in personal change, providing powerful motivation for attitudinal and behavioral changes in the direction of group ideals. (Hine, 1969: 225)

Samarin (1972b) found that the most interesting and most complex uses of glossolalia are symbolic. However, glossolalia is also considered pleasurable, expressive, and therapeutic (Samarin 1972b: 197).

Transitional Experiencing

Mumford (1996) invokes the theoretical psychoanalytic conception of the human experience known as *transitional experience*; essentially employing Donald W. Winnicott's theory of transitional experiencing to explain glossolalia. This she believes expands the previous understanding on glossolalia, which is still obsessed with explaining glossolalia as regression in the service of the ego and suggestive of pathology. Transitional experience is primarily "Winnicott's (1953) notion of a normative mode of experiencing which bridges the

individual's private, intrapsychic world and external reality (termed by him the 'transitional' or 'intermediate mode of experiencing')." (Mumford, 1996: 4)

Mumford attempts to "get at" the experience of the glossolalist, by doing a phenomenological qualitative study of women experiencing glossolalia. Mumford is not a glossolalic herself but believes that by gaining an understanding of what she describes as "their firsthand experience," solicited by interviewing eight women, she is attempting to understand the glossolalic experience from the inside (Mumford, 1996: 3). Mumford concluded the following: The tongue-speaking experience is integral to a sense of positive, transformative change; Tongue-speaking is pivotal in establishing and maintaining an highly meaningful dialogical and sensate connection with the Divine; Tongue-speaking functions in a variety of ways, e.g., it is experienced as a source of solace and protection and of an enhanced capacity to cope; tongue speaking contributes to a sense of derived agency, authority, and self-worth; tongue-speaking deepens connection with others; Tongue-speaking has the potential of functioning as an addictive response to painful reality; and Tongue-speakers often explain the causes of events in terms of tongue-speaking and neglect available data that would support alternative interpretations (1996: vi). Many of Mumford's conclusions can also be found in this project's respondent reflections upon the tongue-speaking experience. However, the researcher must say that while reviewing the literature on glossolalia, she did not see herself as glossolalist adequately portrayed by the findings. More importantly, she did not sense that glossolalia had sufficiently

been uncovered; there seemed to be something “more” that was going on than a verbal utterance. Instinctively, the researcher initially felt that the literature surveyed did not portray a broad understanding of tongue-speaking through the experience of tongue-speakers, nor for that matter, the direct experience of tongue-speaking by the researcher.

While extensive social science research has gone into studying glossolalia, this researcher believes that it is time to take glossolalia out of the “laboratory” (or the rational mind) and “into the street” (the practical everyday *lifeworld* of glossolalists). By speaking to glossolalists with a sympathetic heart and mind, and herself experiencing glossolalia and *living through* these encounters, the researcher believes her findings are richer and more inclusive. The researcher has essentially *felt* and subsequently knows the efficaciousness of tongue-speaking.

Research Note

This Ph.D. thesis contributes to the types of “vocalic data” identified by L. Carlyle May and Lombard, upon whom May build his classification (Lombard recognizes four main types of glossolalia) (see May, 1956: 77-78). It engages a dialogical, as well as comparative textual analysis with May’s cross-cultural typology. The researcher is hopeful that other researchers will evaluate her *natural typology* of glossolalia, for purposes of comparison and analysis of other glossolalic expressiveness; in particular, assessment is needed as to the typology’s usefulness in discussing Christian charismatic glossolalia. Such comparison will extend its usefulness and help refine the typology. This

typology also needs to be “tested” against the glossolalic behaviour or vocalic expressions in other cultural settings, e.g.) Buddhism; its usefulness should also be considered cross-culturally in other cultural domains, for example, Pentecostal/charismatic Christians in India.

Conclusion

What becomes obvious in the adumbration of the research literature into the *nature* of glossolalia, is that little substantive theory explicating the *meaning* of glossolalia, has emerged. While much of the work is ethnographically descriptive and experimental in approach, this valuable research does little to advance the scientific understanding and appreciation of tongue-speaking itself. Do we really know more about glossolalia today?

We affirm the stance of “phenomenological numenalism” (Garrett, 1974, pp. 173-176) whereby human needs, transcendent reality, and religious experience are all assumed to be substantively real and worthy of study. We also opine that this approach explains why glossolalia is an essential feature of the social groups in which the personality, value, and behavioral changes we have reported occur. Although it has been impossible to isolate the unique contribution that glossolalia makes to the group impact of these experiences, we yet feel that whereas the group may be the necessary, speaking in tongues is the sufficient, cause of these changes. This we say in spit of our inability to isolate a glossolalia effect in our research (Lovekin & Malony, 1977). (Malony and Lovekin, 1985: 262)

Just what does glossolalia *mean*?

Before reviewing the findings and interpretation of the interview data, the following chapter highlights the unique *transpersonal* methodology used to

elicit the fullest possible *meaning* about the glossolalic event. Chapter four reviews the interpretive phenomenological method known as *intuitive inquiry*.

CHAPTER FOUR

METHODOLOGY: A RITUAL OF PROTOCOLS

Overview

However, if there is to be a social science, we shall expect it
not merely to paraphrase the traditional prejudices of the
common man but to give us a new and different view of them;
for the aim of all science is to make discoveries, and every
discovery more or less disturbs accepted ideas.
Durkheim, 1964/1938: xxxvii

Methodology is a way of orienting to the world (Gubrium and Holstein, 1997: vii). It is defined as a notion, “which describes the critical activity directed by scientists toward the procedures, theories, concepts and/or findings produced by scientific research,” but should not “be confused with ‘technology,’ that is, the activity of dealing with the techniques, devices and recipes used by scientific research.” (Boudon, 1996/1993: 379)

For the purposes of this research project, methodology is seen as a pathway toward knowledge and “connotes a way of knowing” (see Gubrium and Holstein, 1997: vii). This orientation acknowledges a variety of approaches, including “the practical *modus operandi* of empirical investigation,” including perception, comprehension, representation, in short, all cognitive aspects presenting to the self-conscious, analytical social-scientific researcher. The researcher uses a chosen path or method to uncover understandings and information about the social reality that is experienced by *Homo faber*. It is in this way that the researcher stays as close to the etymological meaning of “empirical” as possible (*empiric* meaning

“one who relies on experience”).

In the examination of social phenomena within the twenty-first century, the investigator is confronted with the problematic of the “scientific method” and the “measurement of social processes.” While the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries brought forward Cartesian positivism in science, the 1950s and 1960s began to see an early shift in various disciplines, from an uncritical acceptance of science as “problem solving,” using a mechanistic, positivistic, hyper-rational conception of science (Laughlin, 1988), to one in the late twentieth-century where we see a cache of different ways to investigate social phenomena. Stimulating research approaches began formulating in psychology (Mischler, 1986; Walsh & Vaughan, 1993; Walsh, 1993; Moustakas, 1990, 1994; Braud and Anderson, 1998; Waldron, 1998; Hollway and Jefferson, 2000), in anthropology (Laughlin, 1988, 1995; Laughlin, McManus, and Shearer, 1979; Laughlin, McManus, Rubenstein, Shearer, 1983; Turner and Bruner, 1986) and sociology (Glaser and Strauss, 1999/1967; Gubrium and Holstein, 1997; Franzosi, 1998; Burawoy, 1998). Researchers began to look at other disciplines to inform their ways of doing research in order to meet the ever-increasing realization of the complexities of examining human behaviour and human experiences.

Until her linguistic study of cross-cultural glossolalia in 1972, Felicitas Goodman states that the literature on glossolalia sees “the absence of any kind of working definition, and too often richness of invention substitutes for

careful observation.” (1972a: xv) While this may now be a strong critique in light of later works, the critique is nonetheless noteworthy even today.

Complicating the systematic study of tongue-speaking is:

1. Imprecise or inadequate ethnographic reporting;
2. Inadequate categorization of a misunderstood phenomenon;
3. A focus of glossolalia within Pentecostalism in North America;
4. Undue attention to linguistic features, and psychological factors in glossolalia;
5. A division within ecclesiastical circles as to its origin, meaning, and purpose; not to mention the theological difficulty in Christianity of a doctrine of the Holy Spirit, one tied to the more difficult problem of the doctrine of The Trinity (see Rees, 1915; Robinson, 1958; Goodman, 1969, 1972a; Burgess, 1984);
6. Little exploration of the meaning of glossolalia to the person, meaning that is both internal and external and linguistic and non-linguistic.
7. An exclusion of most of the *micro*-aspects of [religious] experiencing, in favour of a *macro*-examination of [religious] social movements (e.g., Pentecostalism) in the discipline of sociology; and,
8. Few qualitative studies examining glossolalia.

Subsequent to all the above considerations is the *a priori* question: What *is* glossolalia?

Bias in Past Research

Past research examining glossolalia is not entirely prejudiced by an “anti-religious” or “anti-spiritual” bias. Some of the harshest critics are persons within the Christian tradition (Samarin, 1972b: 43; see also, Kelsey, 1964; Stewart, 1972; Dell, 1993; Cox, 2001/1995). Hine cogently notes: “Future studies of it might usefully include an examination of possible bias on the part of non-glossolalic observers.” (1969:218)¹ In this chapter, the focus is on the transpersonal methodology of *intuitive inquiry*, as it benefits the social-anthropological examination of tongue-speaking.

William Samarin, reviewing the work of Nathan Gerrard, a sociologist who conducted a sociological-anthropological investigation of snake-handling sectarians in the Appalachians, shows how three clinicians, with no knowledge of which of two groups were snake-handling glossolalists, found the mental health responses of “Church A” and “Church B” (on the Minnesota Multi-Phasic Inventory [MMPI]) within “normal limits.” (1972b: 43; see also Hine, 1969: 216-217). These same profiles were subsequently given to four clinicians for sorting. After being told that some, though not which subject profiles belonged to a Southern snake-handlers sect in West Virginia, the results were: “these analysts assigned most of the ‘normal’ ones to the conventional church and the ‘abnormal’ ones to the snake-handling sect.”

¹ Virginia H. Hine, Department of Anthropology, University of Minnesota, articulates in this article that “an anthropological analysis requires contextualization of the linguistic phenomenon, an attempt to identify possible psychological and sociological correlates, and an interpretation of its function in the cross-cultural spread of Pentecostalism as a movement.” (1969: 212) Hine suggests a functional interpretation of glossolalia; namely, glossolalia is a non-pathological linguistic behaviour that contributes toward generating commitment to the

(Samarin, 1972b: 43) "The actual distribution showed that the reverse was true." (Hine, 1969: 217)

Past Research Methodology

Richardson (1973) criticized previous research in the area of glossolalia, citing conceptual and methodological difficulties that contribute to indefinite conclusions. "Plainly the 'one-shot' study design is deficient, and we must move far beyond it for more understanding" (Richardson, 1973: 206). The suggestion was for longitudinal studies that assess personality before and after the glossolalic experience; this call was taken up by Lovekin and Malony (1977; see Malony and Lovekin, 1985)²

Among their conclusions, Lovekin and Malony (considering pre, post, and a three-month follow-up) found that all persons, glossolalic or non-glossolalic, changed in the direction of personality integration; the setting for the research project was a [Catholic] *Life in the Spirit Seminar*. Though persons who did not become glossolalic during the seminar were "higher in depression, hostility, and anxiety at the beginning of the seminar, all groups were similar at the time of follow-up." (Lovekin and Malony, 1977: 383) Lovekin and Malony interpret their findings as a function of attending the seminar rather than as an effect of the glossolalic experience. Although the researchers site a number of methodological difficulties with their study (Lovekin and Malony, 1977: 392),

Pentecostal movement, along with generating attitudinal and behavioural changes in the direction of group ideals (1969: 225).

² Apparently this was the first study to "assess persons in a controlled environment prior to their becoming glossolalic." They write: "...it is limited in its value by sampling and geographic bias. Replications are needed across a wider spectrum of locals and individuals." (1977: 392)

the fact that becoming glossolalic should *ipso facto* integrate personality and do this within a three-month follow-up period appears to be overlooked.

Second, they report: "In contrast to what Kildahl (1972) proposed, those who do not become glossolalic may be more disturbed than those who do." (Lovekin and Malony, 1977: 392) These authors comment on this as follows:

Being more anxious, hostile, and depressed may predispose a person to being unable to become glossolalic. The experience of speaking in tongues is one in which a great deal of trust and surrender is involved. It could be that some persons are too inhibited to respond in this manner. (1977: 392)

Other researchers such as: Cohn (1967, 1968); Laffal, Monahan, and Richman (1974); Stanley, Bartlett, and Moyle (1978); Niesz and Kronenberger (1978); Spanos and Hewitt (1979); Smith and Fleck (1981); Spanos, Cross, Lepage, and Cristine (1986); and Francis and Kay (1995) bring glossolalia into the arena of controlled scientific experimentation. Yet, the experimental approach is primarily to replicate the verbal utterances, believing these to be the [full] expression of glossolalia; simply put, most researches focus on the "mode of speech;" as this research project reveals, glossolalia is "more" than verbal utterances.

Elsye Nouvet (2001), in an ethnographic study of Pentecostalism in Nicaragua, argues that sacredness is experienced differently based on culturally contingent shaping of bodes. Nouvet also finds: "Much of the academic literature over the last 30 years has adopted a linguistic and/or psychological approach to speaking in tongues," (2001: 118) and her

ethnographic study seeks to look at how class, ethnicity, and age informs knowledge of the sacred. Nouvet uses formal interviews with twelve members of an Apostolic Church in Nicaragua, to supplement her ethnographic fieldwork. She concludes the following:

For the Apostolics with whom I worked it is the full body, and not just a mode of speech or mind that is involved in 'speaking in tongues.' My exploration of glossolalia (speaking in tongues) as a full-body experience and performance contributes to filling **phenomenological gaps** in the literature on this phenomenon. (Nouvet, 2001: 119 [emphasis by researcher])

Nouvet finds "the centrality of the body as a source of knowledge and medium for the sacred emerges in the specifics of Apostolic members' experiences" (Nouvet, 2001: 152). Here we see an attempt to view the phenomenon of [charismatic] glossolalia more wholistically.

Why is it not possible to gain knowledge of "the divine" through the physical body? How is the body used in modern twenty-first century Christian charismatic worship (communally and personally)? This research project finds that Christian charismatics *experience* their body (meaning here mindbrain and body) in a way that these respondents did not encounter previously. Within Pentecostalism in Latin America, Nouvet found a "silencing of the body" and with her particular ethnographic study shows something of what it *means* and *feels like* to be charismatic in a specific [cultural] context. This research project also fills phenomenological gaps in the North American literature on glossolalia, uncovered through the rich accounts of glossolalists, the observation and participation of Christian charismatic behaviour in one

Christian charismatic group, and the frequent charismatic behaviour

“showing-up” and “confirmation” in the mind-body of the researcher.

As the social scientific study of religion began looking at the *experiential dimension* (see Stark and Glock, 1968), quantitative efforts to understand its distribution and characteristics led the way.

To summarize briefly, between 1962 and 1992, some 20 studies have used closed-ended survey questions to measure direct personal experience of the ultimate. . . . Overall, the average positive response rate to these types of questions has been estimated at around 35 percent (Spilka *et al.* 1985:182). That is, across all the surveys, about 35 percent of respondents report having had at least one religious experience, variously defined. Such findings are not easily explained within the principal frameworks guiding sociology. The extensive operation of magical, mysterious, supernatural forces to which these data point necessitate some reevaluation of the dominant approaches to understanding religion in the modern world. (Yamane and Polzer, 2001[1994]: 70).

Many researchers eschew *qualitative [transpersonal] methodology* as a method; one that this researcher believes contributes to an increasingly wholistic understanding and explanation of glossolalia. An example of a recent exception is a dissertation in psychology by Linda Anne Mumford (1996); while not a tongue-speaker herself, Mumford attempts a phenomenological approach to examine glossolalia in eight female glossolalists.

In the extant literature reviewed, what stands out is the fact that few researchers take up what is really a transpersonal challenge presaged by de

Vol (1974)³ and Richard Hutch (1980). De Vol ventures into the area of discussing glossolalia as an altered state of consciousness [sic] and the “dissolving” of ego. Reflecting upon his own glossolalia, de Vol developed ways of testing the depth of his altered state of consciousness. Thus, we see in de Vol’s article, an example of how the glossolalic researcher can invite a testing of spiritual experiences. The researcher believes that the current project also makes a nascent contribution to opening up *transpersonal experiencing* to scholarly communal confirmation. At the very least, she invites a testing of phenomenological methodology of glossolalia [or other human experiencing] via the crucible of direct experience.

Hutch offers researchers a “fourth paradigm” on glossolalia: “Glossolalia is seen as *ritual* behaviour which aims, first, to amalgamate the sounds of *crying* and *laughing*, which are symbols of hurt and joy in life, and, second, it thereby points to *conditions of existence*, that is, to death and birth in life.” (1980:255 [emphasis by researcher]).

Emile Lombard (1910) promulgated a typology of glossolalia that has subsequently been rejected. Lombard elucidated a four-member typology of glossolalia: (1) *phonations frustes* (“characterized by incomprehensible sounds such as mumbling, gurgling, groaning, and the like”); (2) pseudo-language (alliterative sounds and word fragments) which “may conform to

³ De Vol, at the time of writing this article (see bibliography), was a graduate student in psychology at the University of Missouri-Columbia and employed as a psychologist with the Crisis Intervention Team, Inc., in Cleveland, Ohio. His attention to glossolalia and ASC is rarely cited and yet is an excellent example of “autoethnography.” His articulate comments about his own experiencing cannot be overlooked.

certain exterior aspects of ordinary language when grouped into a form simulating a sentence"; (3) *verbal fabrication* (an example of this is the famous case of Hélène Smith [a pseudonym], who presented with a Martian language [spoken and translated] to Professor Th. Flournoy, professor of psychology at the University of Geneva [1900]);⁴ and (4) *xenoglossie* or speaking foreign languages (May, 1956: 77-78; see also Jaquith, 1967: 1).

Along with these four main types of glossolalia presented in the work of Lombard (1910), L. Carlyle May's cross-cultural divisions are also largely eschewed. May's cross-cultural categorization of glossolalia is as follows:

1. Language of spirits;
2. Sacerdotal language;
3. Animal language;
4. *Phonations frustes*;
5. *Xenoglossia*; and,
6. *Ermeneglossia* (interpretation of tongues).

The following quote highlights May's explanation of these categories.

Language of spirits, an esoteric 'dialect' known only to the spirits and to the shaman who speaks it, is difficult to define in terms of sound quality. Sacerdotal language, similar to the jargon of spirits, is a vernacular containing obsolete or archaic words preserved through the years by a priestly class. Animal language is simply the reproduction of animal sounds. The category *phonations frustes* will contain a miscellany of examples describing muttering that vary from gurgling to meaningless syllables; the cases found under this heading are perhaps less uniform than those placed in the other five divisions. Accounts of xenoglossia, animal language, and ermeneglossia tend to be more straightforward and amenable to classification than those of *phonations frustes*, language of spirits, and sacerdotal language. (May, 1956: 79)

⁴ Professor Th. Flournoy wrote about this case in *Des Indes à la Planète Mars. (From India to the Planet Mars.)* Geneva, 1900.

With “one fell swoop of his pen” James R. Jaquith (1967) effectively discourages the development of a fuller *typology* of glossolalia. Jaquith views glossolalia as *communicative* rather than religious behaviour, and suggests that such a typology [sic] is “scientifically more useful than some traditional ones in that it will be based on the structural facts of behavior and will not depend on nonverifiable [sic] notions like unusual psychological states or God.” (Jaquith, 1967: 7)⁵ While there is merit in Jaquith’s work, it is similar in effect, to that opinion brought forth by Cutten (1927); science does prove otherwise.

In chapter six the reader will see a *natural typology* of glossolalia developing from the research data collected in this project. This current typology highlights that May’s cross-cultural typology has merit; thus, many of these experiences evidence a universality of expression. The final chapter of the dissertation discusses this aspect further, but in some respects, this project “verifies” previous attempts to classify glossolalic behaviour. It is hoped that future research will refine and if necessary expand this typology.

Transpersonal Methodology and Intuitive Inquiry

The essential qualities proposed here place attributes such as intuition, compassion, immediate apprehension of meaning, and service to society’s disenfranchised persons as central to scientific or empirical inquiry in psychology. (Braud and Anderson, 1998: 70)

⁵ Jaquith writes: “Data for the present paper are taken from two glossolalic utterances recorded by the writer. The informant is a young, white, adult male, born and raised in the same large Midwestern city, a product of Anglo-American and Pentecostal traditions.” (1967: 3 [emphasis by researcher])

One of the challenges in this particular research project, was how to investigate glossolalia in a scientifically valid way, without Likert scales and constraining logical-ratio research design. While rigor, precision, clarity, and working definitions were admired, the researcher also valued “mystery” and the doing of something unconventional. One of the underlying tenets of research is the fact that research is both art and science; for this researcher, there is an aesthetic aspect inherent in the research process.

In the final analysis, *intuitive inquiry* met the requirements of the phenomenological research question. It facilitated an examination of the *meaning* of tongue-speaking and allowed the researcher to admit her on-going glossolalic experience. Essentially, it also meets Wilbur’s requirements of *injunction*: “always of the form, ‘If you want to know this, *do this*.” (Wilbur, 1983: 133)

As I have tried to suggest elsewhere, this spiritual knowledge, *like all other forms of valid cognitive knowledge*, is experimental, repeatable, and publicly verifiable, because, like all other valid modes, it consists of three strands:

1. *Injunction*: always of the form, “If you want to know this, *do this*.”
2. *Apprehension*: a cognitive apprehension-illumination of the “object domain” addressed by the injunction.
3. *Communal confirmation*: a checking of results with others who have adequately completed the injunctive and illuminative strands. (Wilbur, 1983: 133)

Intuition is a key concept in this approach; it is also a key concept of *transcendental phenomenology*. The etymology of the English word “intuition” reveals that its meaning comes from the Latin word *intueri*, meaning “to look at, contemplate.” Intuition is defined as a quick and ready insight; the power

or faculty of attaining to direct knowledge or cognition without evident rational thought and inference (Merriam-Webster, 1994: 615). For Descartes and Husserl, intuition is “the beginning place in deriving knowledge of human experience, free of everyday sense impressions and the natural attitude.” (Moustakas, 1994: 32)

Specialties within post-behavioristic psychology, such as cognitive science and neuropsychology, have recently rediscovered the phenomenon of consciousness. Consequently, the phenomenon of intuition has also been discovered, and the move is on to integrate intuition with well-documented findings from behavioral analysis. (Davis-Floyd and Arvidson, 1997: xii)

Using transpersonal skills and intuition the researcher applies a particularity (especially the researcher’s voice and the participant’s voice) to her investigation of a human experience. Regarding *intuition* and our state of scientific knowledge, “it is necessary to acknowledge the central importance of intuitive processes in the production of knowledge.” (Laughlin, 1997b: 33)

Intuitive inquiry is a phenomenological method that explores the nature of human awareness and experience; at all times being consciously aware of one’s own intuitive processes and personal experience (Leedy, 1997; Braud and Anderson, 1998). It brings a “renewed intentionality” to the research via “the heart of compassion as value and Principle of Validation and consensus.” (Braud and Anderson, 1998: 71)

Compassionate listening, compassionate analysis, and compassionate synthesis of experience allows the researcher to “see the value of significance

of the data as they shape themselves.” Compassion is an explicit principle here; a process which is both scientific and accessible.

If compassion guides each step of the research process of asking, analyzing, and telling, the final research findings may be less honed to focused precision. Yet they will be fuller and richer and, from my view, more valid and generalizable as well. (Braud and Anderson, 1998: 72)

Compassion for the phenomenon allows the “what” that is investigated, observed, talked about, and felt, to yield itself to the researcher’s analysis and *knowing* (see Braud and Anderson, 1998: 80).

It must always be remembered that every approach and way of knowing has its cultural assumptions. “Each culture provides people with a way of seeing the world, by categorizing, coding, and otherwise defining the world in which they live.” (Spradley, 1980: 14). How does one escape culturally bound assumptions? Spradley writes: “Social scientists and their theories are no less culture-bound than other human beings.” (1980: 14)

Alternative ways of knowing become possible when we accept what anthropologists and ethnographic studies reveal; there are *alternative* realities. We seek to find ways of knowing these realities in their own terms (Spradley, 1980: 14; see the sociological findings on the paranormal by Greeley [1975]). As the anthropologist Charles Laughlin notes: “. . . we must carefully consider the possibility that our informants have indeed experienced a non-ordinary reality that has given rise to the tradition being examined.” (1988: 45)

In social science, “grounded theory” (Glaser and Strauss [1999/1967]) permits cultural categories and description to emerge from the data without

preconceived or constructed concepts. *Transpersonalism* goes even deeper into the culture being investigated, by allowing the experience under investigation to be experienced by the researcher.

Transpersonalism labels a movement in science toward acknowledging the significance of experiences beyond the boundaries of ordinary ego-consciousness (Laughlin, McManus and Shearer 1983). Roger Walsh and Frances Vaughan in their book, Beyond Ego, use the term transpersonal to 'reflect the reports of people practicing various consciousness disciplines who spoke of experiences of an extension of identity beyond both individuality and personality (1980:16). There occurs a remarkable range of such experiences. (Laughlin, 1988: 30)

Research Caveats

In this research project the researcher is a type of *translator*. She needs to be "true" and "truthful" to the accounts of the glossolalist, as this experience is put into the language of science. Spradley writes: "A translation discovers the meanings in one culture and communicates them in such a way that people with another cultural tradition can understand them." (1980: 161)

We must also consider that:

We are not saying that the informant's interpretation of his or her experience need be accepted as a veridical description of reality. Indeed, we may in the end be incapable of discerning the truth value of the native interpretation (see Ross 1981). Rather, every attempt should be made to ascertain in the greatest possible detail the elements of the informant's direct experience, fully realizing of course that there is likely to exist a causal interplay between experience and (culturally loaded) interpretation. (Laughlin, 1988: 46)

Applying transpersonal methodology implies a perceived personal encounter with tongue-speaking; contrasted to the traditional ethnographic approach where the researcher attempts to understand and describe culture

from outside the experience being investigated via the traditional role of “participant observer;” an example of this is the research project on glossolalia by Mumford [1996]).

Glossolalia has a *nature* that is largely unknown to North American/Western science and much of organized religion as well. While much research has gone into investigating cross-cultural experiences, such as are found in the anthropological study of trance and A.S.C. and the good sociological studies on religion and religious movements, the researcher initially came to the project with the feeling that “something” was missing in the work investigating glossolalia. It was this “call” to glossolalia and its nature that she wanted to visit, competently and rigorously.

The metaphor of “jumping into the river” is apt here; with this study the researcher, respondents, and readers of the text are moving into the ongoing experience of tongue-speaking to “see” or “feel” what is the quality, the meaning, and the essence of this experience. In doing so, change is expected to occur to all; just as it occurred at all phases of the research; it was also initially expected to be an experience of transformation as well as a transformation of experience.

Intuitive inquiry is a conscious blending of various qualitative procedures. It allows inter-subjectivity (the researcher and the respondent; the researcher and the transcribed text; and the researcher and her own on-going experience in tongue-speaking and living with the experiences described by

respondents). It is a thorough exploration of tongue-speaking, through an awareness that glossolalia does indeed have structure and essence; and as the researcher has uncovered, a *personality*. Initially, the researcher also felt that an heuristic for uncovering the “what is glossolalia” question, was lacking; the question emerged as to the hermeneutic available to research into glossolalia. In other words, could an in-depth analysis of glossolalia, via *direct* experience help social scientists “talk about” what social scientists “talk about,” when they examine “Pentecostal experience” with the manifestation of tongue-speaking?

Within the study of glossolalia, as others have pointed out, an emphasis on linguistic and social-anthropological aspects of tongue-speaking is dominant but appears inadequate (at least to the glossolalist researcher). This research project aims to fill this phenomenological gap *through* the experiencing of what it is that this research investigates. As a result of direct experiencing, the researcher has uncovered a wide range of glossolalic expression.

It should be pointed out that the researcher soon realized that she could only be true to the respondent’s accounts, by remaining consciously aware of the lifeworld and worldview of most glossolalists interviewed; namely, to view glossolalia within their Judeo-Christian tradition (this is the cultural domain of these respondents). Essentially then, the narratives analyzed could rightfully be called “*charismatic glossolalia*” or alternatively, “*Christian charismatic*

glossolalia."⁶

Researcher characteristics

There are certain skills required to engage intuitive inquiry. It is a conscious application of logic, analytical skill, imagination, intuition, and alternative phases of consciousness. At all phases of the inquiry there is the conscious application, to a lesser or greater degree, of the following skills.

1. "*Reflective Listening*" is required, as the researcher listens not only to her respondent's experience but she must listen to her own experience as well. This is accomplished by recording her thoughts and experiences during the project; as well there were constant and sometimes long periods of inner reflection.⁷ The process is reflective throughout and assumes a dynamic, ever-evolving experience in which both researcher and respondent change.

It requires a capacity for *sympathetic resonance* – a process that facilitates a field of expansive awareness of all that is perceived and symbolically witnessed and described. Sympathetic resonance involves the awareness that inter-subjectivity and compassionate understanding facilitate intensification and enriching of the glossolalic experience; this yields greater understanding and *knowing-about* the experience. It is the ability to "vibrate" in mind-body-spirit with that which she is hearing. The following is a good scientific expression of this "vibrating."

⁶ The researcher eschews the term "religious glossolalia."

⁷ In fact it was found toward the end of the project, that the researcher had to remain "away" from regular church services for a few weeks, in order to re-enter the situation with renewed vitality.

We may describe an oscillator as any object that moves in a regular, periodic manner. We may call a vibrating string an oscillator, or a weight hanging from a spring, or a pendulum – anything that performs a repetitive, periodic movement, that is, vibrates. We may generalize and say that oscillators produce a sound or a note, whether audible or not, as long as they alter their environment in a *periodic* manner. That environment may be tissue, as in the heart-aorta oscillating system, water, air, electrical fields, gravitational fields, or anything else.

Suppose we tune two violins, then put one of them on the table and play a note on the other. If we watch carefully, we shall see that the same string that we are playing on one violin is also humming on the violin that we placed on the table. Clearly, there is a 'sympathetic resonance' between the two. . . . (Bentov, 1977: 18)

It is the echoing of the experience in a *bodily-felt relating*, often pointing to that inchoate "something," which needs to be sensed and experienced even if it cannot be completely described. The researcher found that she had the following experience.

As I went on interviewing, I 'learned,' without realizing that I was learning, to shift over more and more to figures of speech, metaphors, similes, etc., and, in general, to use more and more poetic speech. It turns out that these are often more apt to 'click,' to touch off an echoing experience, a parallel, isomorphic vibration than are sober, cool, descriptive phrases. (Maslow, 1976: 84-85)

Also, with each new interview, the field of sympathetic resonance expanded.⁸

2. "*Indwelling*" comes out of the heuristic research of Clark Moustakas (1990). It draws out the nuances, texture, facts, and meaning of the experience. This process is a preoccupying feature of *all* daily activities during the course of the research project. Everything becomes fodder for examination and is used to "speak" about the tongue-speaking. Relationships,

⁸ Later in the dissertation, the reader will see how glossolalists in particular, are apt to use simile and metaphor to express their particular experience.

dreams, newspaper articles, casual conversations, chance encounters, medical visits, personal tragedy (e.g., the death of one of the respondents; the death of a friend suffering the ravages of cancer during this year of data gathering activities), all these become part of the ever expanding field. One “that clarifies, expands, focuses and rips apart” the understanding of tongue-speaking.

3. “*Trickstering*” is found within indigenous cultures; essentially, tricksters open gateways of awareness and insights (Braud and Anderson, 1998: 84). Here the researcher leaves herself open for “auspicious bewilderment.” It is to have the capacity for surprise; something that gives any good scientist renewed intentionality and pleasure. This yields a fresh understanding of glossolalia; for example, the charismatic church services I attend become a “place,” a “space” and a “time” to let-go and see what emerges. My own dream-work analysis, listening to conversations more carefully, letting go of comfortable ideas, ‘hearing’ metaphors, reading books, such as Hermann Hesse’s *Siddhartha*, resting, sleeping, walking, music, day-dreaming - all these creative “non-rational” living activities are allowed to permeate conscious reflection about tongue-speaking. It facilitates and allows for times of confusion and bewilderment; such as the month the researcher had to leave the research project and head back home under extremely difficult circumstances, coming back feeling essentially “brain-dead.” All these unanticipated directions are “tools” as one sticks to her project.

Rosemarie Anderson notes that: "Contradictory stories and examples move us deeper into the intricacies of the topic of inquiry." (1998: 84) This is especially true during data analysis, and in this project it is facilitated by interviewing an anti-glossolalia respondent (M1), and a respondent from another culture (F2).

Trickstering or "Auspicious Bewilderment"

Here is an example of the way in which the researcher attempts to experience all that is ongoing in the lives of the charismatic community in which she is participating.

One particular audiotape of a charismatic service in February 2003 is used to generate meditative and reflective periods of tongue-speaking. On that occasion the one-hour worship time lapsed into two hours of on-going charismatic activity with no teaching by the pastor occurring. It is an excellent example of freedom in spiritual charismatic expressions, not to mention a valuable ethnographic experience. The researcher has first-hand experience in perceiving every charism identified.

4. "*Varying the focal depth*" is the art of determining when and how deep one looks at aspects emerging from the data. Sometimes an in-depth excursion into minutiae yields great dividends and the researcher must use her intuition to guide her. It is similar to moving from the old microscope – from 100x magnification to the power of the electron microscope, where "...One lens reveals the cellular level of activity, another the chromosomal,

another the molecular, and so on..." It is here where you really "get a feeling for the organism."⁹

When the Nobel prize winner, Barbara McClintock, was asked about her ability to "see further and deeper into the mysteries of genetics than her colleagues,"

Her answer is simple. Over and over again, she tells us one must have the time to look, the patience to 'hear what the material has to say to you,' the openness to 'let it come to you.' Above all, one must have 'a feeling for the organism.' (Keller, 1983: 198)

The researcher began to ask herself how she could "get into" glossolalia itself – something beyond the simple expression of tongue-speaking. For if she can enter into and "be" glossolalia - when she understands some of its aspects - "it emerges as something solid and real."

By loving, and through living thoroughly the experience studied, the researcher looks around from inside the experience and notes what is there. The researcher searches from inside the experience until the essential qualities of the experience come to life as the researcher's own experience. Gradually, the entire panorama of the experience comes more clearly into view. (Braud and Anderson, 1998: 81)

5. "*Ritualizing intentions*" are the planned and usually written out guides to the research project; but they also emerge throughout the project. In this project plans were made to conduct interviews with those who would permit a university researcher to speak to them about their experiences. Finally, after finding a receptive and friendly charismatic congregation, speaking to

⁹ See here two excellent books, one by Evelyn Fox Keller (1983) titled *A feeling for the organism: The life and work of Barbara McClintock* (San Francisco: W.H. Freeman and

glossolalists was facilitated by the Pastor announcing my presence most immediately to his congregation; announcing support of the research and encouraging the project.

Ritual occurred as each week the researcher attended services and the wonderful surprise of finding each week's service was being audiotaped. This finding facilitated listening to various corporate occasions of glossolalia and allowing these to permeate the researcher's conscious experiencing.

There has to be a continual focus and intentionality to the research but one that brings consciousness to these intentions. All of the activities foisted upon the researcher as Ph.D. candidate also become part of the ritual (e.g., preparing the research proposal, planning to meet with individuals, "utilizing" false starts and rejections; generally, all aspects of "getting" into the research are ritualized). The researcher benefited from all these lived experiences on the road to getting started and finally doing the art of the research.

Focus, coherence and discipline are a benefit of ritualizing intentions and it is the ritual of research protocols that keeps one going during times of confusion, discouragement or even high excitement, where hyperactivity and energy can lead to a too early conclusion or confidence; the project needs to be finished on-time but the researcher has to climb down from the mountain-top experiences to talk about the trip.

6. *"Intersubjectivity"* of researcher, respondents, and audience is explicit within intuitive inquiry. It is recognized: "At the heart of transpersonal research is personal and social transformation." (Braud and Anderson, 1998: 87) Every facet of the research process from topic selection, the unfolding of data gathering and analysis, and the final communication of the inquiry is active and transformative. Quite frankly, researchers cannot attempt transpersonal inquiry without consciousness of being both influenced and influencing the experience under investigation -- despite the purposive pursuit of inquiry. Rosemarie Anderson writes that everyone involved is changed in the process and gives voice and expression to a comprehensive understanding of some facet of human experience (Braud and Anderson, 1998: 87).

Evidence of personal transformation within the researcher is the fact that during the time of examining glossolalia, her glossolalic tongue expressed two new "languages" or "dialects." The researcher also experienced significant changes to her own experience of tongue-speaking that involved new and unusual physical and physiological changes and sensations. There were also strange and meaningful dreams and visions. Visionary insights were also given to the researcher by several charismatic persons who became party to the research as a result of interest in the endeavor.

7. *Alternative phases of consciousness, imagination, and intuition* are all data sources and part of each phase of the research project. In the

researcher's particular experiencing and context, it meant that she needed to be receptive to such experiencing as being "slain-in-the-spirit" and being receptive to strange experiences of charisms reported and evidenced by respondents.

These alternative phases of consciousness bring one deeper into the "heart" of glossolalia. Using creative imagination and intuitive processes enhance the researcher's conscious awareness of looking at the experience both from within and without the experience. This leads to amazing insights and uncovering. It privileges all aspects of consciousness, whether they are rational or non-rational aspects; these are datum and incorporated into the final creative output - the Ph.D. dissertation.¹⁰

Strengths and Weakness of Transpersonal Research

The greatest strength of intuitive inquiry is that it extends and expands conventional and traditional scientific ways of investigating human experiencing. It is an extensive, intensive investigation, honouring a plurality of "ways of doing science." It is a tailoring of method to specific, concrete, or "ineffable" human experiencing. A variety of ways of doing, being, and knowing are honoured because a variety of perspectives are acknowledged.

¹⁰ Quoting again from Braud and Anderson, Rosemarie Anderson writes, "Intuitive and imaginative information typically present right-hemisphere information, including symbols, pictures, music, or even vaguer indications of movement or shifts in consciousness. This information must be joined with the pragmatic and practical aspects of research inquiry to distill a topic suitable for inquiry." I would also agree with her that these are essential to intuitive inquiry. Without these abilities, I would have been unable to understand much of that which my respondent is experiencing.

Due to the inter-subjectivity of researcher and respondent, collaboration and change take place. The transdisciplinary aspects of this mode of inquiry expand knowledge in a variety of disciplines and thereby transcend traditional boundaries. Conceptually, the notion of validity is expanded through the use of new "indicators" such as compassion, sympathetic resonance and "circles of sympathetic resonance" (see Braud and Anderson, 1998: 74). Laughlin cogently states that transpersonal method "carries the method of participant observation to its ultimate limit." (Laughlin, 1988: 47)

A weakness of this approach is its requirement for *focus*. The researcher, while eschewing narrow constraints of research, had to constantly battle becoming too broad in scope. She had to constantly come back to her research question and the aims of the research.

Personal boundaries were challenged at many levels.¹¹ This method also requires sensitivity that not all individuals pursuing human sciences possess and at times, such sensitivity is exhausting. Openness on the part of the researcher is required so that she experiences all that she can.

Bias, on the part of the researcher is always possible. Intuition and alternative phases of consciousness are personal. It is essential that

¹¹ One of the researcher's boundaries was constantly being effaced, particularly within the charismatic context of the Sunday service. Many charismatics engage "hugging" as an expression of "brotherly love". This was particularly unnerving for the researcher who values personal space and the desire to "choose" who hugged her. At times she felt this hugging behaviour a personal invasion over which she had little control. Sometimes she permitted the hugging and at other times she refrained or verbally requested a handshake or "no hug."

researchers who are familiar with this method verify this project's conclusions. This method also requires that all aspects of the research process be made transparent; therefore, the researcher has at all phases of the project and its elucidation, attempted to be as explicit as possible (again, recognizing all the inherent inadequacies of language but for that reason alone, not eschewing the best depiction possible). As other scholars examine the project's results, it will assist in identifying bias ("contamination").

As previously mentioned, transpersonal methodology requires openness to change and the willingness to be challenged by one's empirical findings. It requires an integrated psycho-spiritual personality; an attenuation to intuition and requires well-developed social skills.

Ultimately, transpersonal methods honour researcher and respondent as human who share experiencing a universe that is composed of ineffable, exceptional, numinous, mysterious experiences, alongside the mundane.¹²

Selecting and Focusing Inquiry: The Research Question

Initially, the researcher came to the research project with a desire to understand and study religious experiencing. The point-of-entry to the dilemma became an experience which she herself engages and experiences; namely, tongue-speaking. At the time of considering the "what" of the study, the researcher decided to study that which she felt had become

Such hugging created inner conflict at several levels and was on occasion, a dissonant experience.

¹² The researcher's presumption however, is that what is determined as "mundane" and "supernatural" or "sacred" is culturally conditioned and constructed.

misunderstood, misused, misrepresented, and taken as a "form of religion;" speaking in tongues, it seemed, was generally not valued by social scientists as something of benefit, except perhaps to those who practice it. Especially lacking is the speaking about the "religious" in the academic arena without apology or the social survey technique.

The second dilemma was to do this without delimiting the research with standard qualitative or quantitative methodology. Just how could one really "get at" her own experience, and that of others, with the methods of social science? The desire began to materialize that it should be possible to privilege her own and others' experience of tongue-speaking by a systematic study of the phenomenon and thereby, perhaps help to more fully describe and understand it; then came transpersonal methodology, primarily through the book by Braud and Anderson (1998).

From an early reading of the research and thinking about glossolalia, the researcher decided there was, at the very least, an heuristic gap; the nature and essence of glossolalia had not been fully explored, even by the researcher, in her own life. *"I speak in tongues but why do I speak in tongues and what is the meaning this has for me in my life? After all, I had this ability for twenty-five years."*

Very quickly the title emerged and just as soon the researcher began feeling derailed by it: "The Glossolalic Utterance: What does it all Mean?" After a year of struggling with getting started and preparing to go "into the

field,” her feelings began to become articulated. She began to understand why she was troubled by the title. Specifically, the title is the research question and the reason it derailed the researcher is that she did not understand the importance of tongue-speaking in her own life.

Both phrases of the title are important. First, “the glossolalic utterance” is the problematic, the subject of inquiry. Second, “What does it all Mean?” is important, as “all” is perhaps hubris, as one cannot claim she can uncover everything and yet, it is important that she do “all” to elucidate or uncover aspects of tongue-speaking hitherto unexplored.

The “meaning” of tongue-speaking is the search and the “utterance” is the immediate evidence of glossolalia – its physical or material expression – its form.

The heuristic gap began with the researcher; that is, the initial “data” is within her and the challenge was to discover and explicate the nature of tongue-speaking for her and others. There was in it a quality, a meaning and an essence that had to be explored; it was compelling, drawing the researcher to the project. In all the endeavors, the primary research agenda really became an attempt to look at the mechanism of a complex event as it is situated in the structure of experience.¹³

The importance of the research is that it makes clearer the social fact that there are universal aspects to human experiencing, these are *reality*, and

¹³ “*Mechanism*” refers here to both a process and technique for achieving glossolalia and including, but not determined by, the [*natural*] laws of science.

that indeed, persons interface with a world of spirits (both “good” and “bad”). It does this by the use of transpersonal methodology – an inductive method that is not yet common among social scientists in Canada (an exception is the work in *transpersonal anthropology* by the anthropologist Charles Laughlin); more specifically, it is not one applied to the study of glossolalia.

I further argue,... the inductive approach, is finally viable. I further contend that the contestation between the major world religions, particularly between the traditions emanating from the religious history of western Asia and the traditions given birth on the Indian subcontinent, should be a centrally important theme for theology and religious thought in the future. (Berger, 1979: xi)

Figure 1 below, summarizes the research phases of intuitive inquiry.

- ❑ Selecting and focusing the topic of inquiry (glossolalia as public and private experience);
- ❑ Collecting the data (in-depth interviews and allowing the experience under investigation to show up within the interview and within the researcher);
- ❑ Incubating the data (an essentially creative process which occurs as the researcher rests, relaxes, muses and allows non-linear brain activity to process naturally and spontaneously all that emerges before her; it permits information to shift in conscious awareness);
- ❑ Analyzing the data (this process is one which accommodates that data which presents itself the researcher; it is something that is not immutably established at the outset; a process which borrows and mingles several ways of uncovering meaning);¹⁴
- ❑ Examining breakthroughs in understanding the data and synthesizing findings (this is part of incubation, analysis and synthesis where overall patterns reveal themselves over time; with all information in the mindbrain, one begins to see themes and patterns emerging);
- ❑ Communicating the findings through sympathetic resonance¹⁵; and
- ❑ Honorable closure (celebrating the experience of the inquiry; acknowledging the contributions that all [informants qua respondents] have made; recognizing all "difficulties;" celebrating acts of generosity that allowed new understandings to emerge).

¹⁴ Within the researcher's evolving conception of the structure of the glossolalic experience, it was expected that the research process would permit/yield itself to a more fully articulated conceptualization (broadly conceived within biophysical, socio-cultural, intra-psychic, and transpersonal systems).

¹⁵ *Sympathetic resonance* is the key empirical tool for validation in intuitive inquiry. An example of this could come from the poetic, i.e., and the use of metaphors. What occurs is that "meaning somehow passes directly from the writer to the reader or listener, seemingly by pointing to an inchoate experience already shared by both." (Braud and Anderson, 1998: 74) This is also what Laughlin cites as the 'phenomenological typewriter' (Laughlin, 1988: 42).

FIGURE 4.1: Phases of Intuitive Inquiry [Source: adapted from Braud and Anderson, 1998]

Collecting the Data

If the discipline of ethnographic study is to uncover what is familiar in the strange, it is also to uncover what is strange about the familiar. (Fields, 1995: xxxix)

This section highlights the specific steps taken to gather data within the framework of the phases of intuitive inquiry, highlighted in Figure 4.1.

Prior to collecting the data presented here, the researcher began participant observation in another Charismatic Church in a large Ontario city. Within a short period of time, it was felt that this could not be a place where the researcher could safely, morally, and ethically conduct research. The pastor of this small congregation would not permit early disclosure of the researcher's presence and purpose in the congregation. While the researcher made full intentions of her desire to do both research and worship, the pastor had welcomed the potential researcher as worshiper/attendee and as student, but not as someone who could reveal that her interest was to investigate tongue-speaking. The following are field notes about the first meeting with the Pastor of the church, from which she decided to withdraw. This account is included in order that the reader gain a sense of some of the research "obstacles" encountered in this project.

September 12, 2001

Place: [Pseudonym] Riding Horse Café

Time: 2pm-3:30pm

Impressions and notes after my meeting:

- We meet in front of Riding Horse. I am trying to remember if I remember his face from the picture on the web site. Suddenly a man approaches me, 'Irene?' and I say 'Pastor R?' [pseudonym] He had decided he would simply look for someone who also appeared to be looking for someone else. It worked.
- I asked if he'd like to go into Riding Horse. I had been in there already because I

got lost when I first came into the mall.

- I purchased a natural bottle of juice for him (he decided that's what he was having) and I had de-caf.
- Pastor 'R' wanted to know about my experience with glossolalia (where, when, how long). He seemed a little surprised when I said I had been tongue-speaking for 24 years.
- I gave him the highlights of my own experience, out of which I gave him the bare-bones of my life: divorced, cities lived in, academic pursuits, lived in City two years and an Anglican from original Mennonite background, no home-church in City.
- I disclosed myself fully as participant but also as to my goal – to study glossolalia but open to the experiences the individuals at [his church] were having.
- He doesn't want me to disclose now my research purpose. Rather, to just come and worship and get to know [Church].
- I explained the necessity of ethics and academic requirements.
- He spoke about himself and the early origins of the church's history; six years in City. Raised in [another] City, wife from [Province], several children, musician, bible-school education, has criss-crossed Canada. His origins are Zion Apostolic [I think this is the "Jesus Only" emphasis]
- Pastor 'R' is very pleasant; small man, the church has 80-90 worshippers; and he told me about his wife and her work employment outside of the church. From what he tells me I am thinking that it's a bit of an 'odd' combination of her type of job and her ministry.
- After this meeting I feel OK but I have some trepidation about their emphasis on evil and the devil, e.g.) I told him about the possibility of the aboriginal 'sweat' in [Province] at the Restorative Justice Conference. His "concern is that if you go into it with a firm spirit you should be OK but if you go into it with an open spirit you could have problems lasting for a long time afterward." He refers to 'demon-possession.' This makes me feel very uncomfortable.

The researcher began to feel that a great deal of control was being exerted; that a peculiar and almost cult-like behaviour was present within the group. The intuitive feelings of this researcher were leading her to believe that this was not the place to continue; she literally felt that she would be "torn asunder" emotionally. Here are some field notes to highlight the researcher's sense of "something amiss."

Sunday: I attend the church and did my usual thing of attempting to listen well and worship in my own mental/spiritual space. During one point of the pastor's little sermonette (he doesn't preach really, at least I haven't heard a real formal sermon), I felt very strange and felt something dark descending – later I called this "evil." I attempted to

ignore it, blaming it on my sensitivity and dislike for some of this conservative charismatic, poorly thought out “canned-sounding” ideas. After the service I meet a number of people, get invited to two groups that meet bimonthly. . . . during these conversations little “red lights” were blinking in my mind; again something I thought I better just ignore because I am, after all, a social scientist. Leaving the group I encounter the pastor and get a hug – this group likes lots of hugs (ekkkk, but I thought, let them love me and reach out as that’s their goal, fine); the pastor asks me, “In one sentence or less, can you tell me about that experience [the aboriginal sweat I unfortunately had told him about weeks ago]?” I knew he would ask and was prepared with an answer but I was not prepared for the darkness that descended in depression after I left. It took the long bus ride home and a deep sleep upon getting home to quell these feelings I couldn’t shake. What is this all about?

It took patience and persistence to reach a point where a pastor of another charismatic church willingly and openly accepted the researcher into his congregation.

Numerous phone calls had taken place over many months to reach the point of finally being able to begin and feel a degree of comfort. Reaching this particular congregation was facilitated by using the yellow pages of a large Ontario city phone directory; the researcher began calling all churches known to be open to tongue-speaking at one time in their church history, or that the researcher knew from personal experience should be receptive to it. The researcher kept a log of churches called, when and how many calls were made; some churches were also sent literature about the project. In some cases, the researcher’s purposes were presented to the church secretary, who then left a message for the pastor. Only one church pastor was kind enough to immediately return a message left on the church’s answering machine.

Another two pastors called back later; however, after attempting to meet them, and deliver information, these places did not present as receptive places for research. The pastor who was kind enough to call back so quickly agreed to be interviewed, despite the fact that he did not believe in the charismatic phenomenon of tongue-speaking.¹⁶ It should be mentioned that since a pastor is considered a "shepherd of his/her flock," the researcher is required to respect the pastor as the person whom she must first contact and respect; the pastor is, quite literally, the "gatekeeper."

Although the researcher was aware that she was an "unknown" to these pastors, it surprised her that many pastors would not return calls; hesitated to meet and speak to her; stated they were too busy; had their secretary call; began a connection with the researcher but then abruptly disconnected themselves from the project; or forthrightly told her that the project could not be conducted in his/her congregation. One reason for not being able to pursue the project in a particular church, was expressed in the following manner: "speaking in tongues is a gift from God" and the researcher could not be investigating this "spiritually" if she was proceeding academically (also within what was likely considered the 'secular university'); apparently the researcher's method (fully disclosed) was being viewed as not being a "spiritual approach," and he/she [the pastor] could not, therefore, recommend me to congregants who are tongue-speakers. Initially, a number of calls were

made to tongue-speakers whose names were given to the researcher by individuals who hoped to assist the researcher's project. After following-up, it was determined that these persons were too busy and perhaps even sceptical of the researcher's intent. In the end, it appeared best for the researcher to wait until a suitable and receptive church/group could be found.

The researcher disclosed to all she spoke to, that she was herself a tongue-speaker and that she wanted to honour and respects the tongue-speaking experience. Finally, on September 24, 2002 the researcher met with a congenial pastor who welcomed her and later agreed to be formally interviewed. The pastor immediately facilitated the researcher's acceptance into the congregation by introducing her in a Sunday service; with the introduction was a public acknowledgement of his approval of the project, believing, he said, that to conduct a research project in tongue-speaking at this point in time and within the academy was a courageous act. That particular Sunday opened the way for interviews to begin, when a number of persons identified themselves as tongue-speakers.

Participant observation has taken place for a year and is still ongoing. The researcher attended weekly Sunday services as she began meeting and interviewing tongue-speakers. Several referrals were forthcoming from the fourteen glossolalists interviewed within this congregation. The researcher decided to end the process after the twenty-first interview. In total twenty-two

¹⁶ This pastor is (by his own description as well) a "cessationist," that is that he does not believe in the charismatic 'gifts' for the church today. Phenomenon such as tongue-speaking

interviews were conducted.¹⁷ The characteristics of all respondents are discussed in chapter five.

What does it All Mean? The Interview Process

M5:5

I: What is most meaningful to you about speaking in tongues?

M5: Me, it's the idea that is just comes up.

I: Ok.

M5: It's, I don't know, it's exciting just to know. And like when it does happen like that, I don't know, I'm just reminded of God and like even almost as a sign that to reassure me of my salvation. I don't know. [pause] It's exciting.

M9:13

I: So, in your own words, can you just describe for me, what speaking in tongues means to you?

M9: [long pause] It is one of the best proofs of a supernatural connection with God. [pause] Because, I know that this is not just my gibberish. I can tell the difference; it's supernatural, and that's why I can see where the Pentecostals fell into that trap of making it the only way of knowing is that unique experience of the filling of the spirit. But, [clears throat] beyond that, it is one of those things that confirms to me more than anything else [pause] that I can be connected with the supernatural.

F8:11

I: What would you say is the most meaningful thing to you about speaking in tongues?

D: [pause] Speaking in tongues, to me, is like it's taking me out of myself. [pause] And by speaking in tongues I'm saying something I don't understand. But it's what I believe is on God's heart. And it's making me – it's not making me [or] forcing me – but it's giving me [long pause] the desire to pray and intercede to do whatever needs to be done for God's purposes.

F11:11

I: So if I ask you what does speaking in tongues mean to you? [pause]

are believed to have stopped after the time of the apostles and Early Church.

¹⁷ Included in these twenty-two interviews is an interview with the researcher herself. Her responses are drawn out from a formal interview conducted with her, as well as dialogical entries taken from the taped interviews with glossolalists. These were quotes that reveal her experience; snippets that were mentioned during interviews in order to "share" in the glossolalic experience.

F11: It means doing a job for me. Doing a job. Some people say that it sort of builds them up and uplifts them; I've never used tongues that way [pause] usually worship tapes or worship will be what fills me up. And this is done mostly – oh, the odd time, I'll burst into a little bit of tongues if I'm praising, but mostly it's used to do a job. This is my job.

The researcher interviewed respondents at a time and place of his/her choosing. Some interviews were conducted in church offices, the church library and the church kitchen. Other glossolalists were interviewed in their home; two glossolalists came to the researcher's office at Carleton University to be interviewed. All glossolalists were informed that their "role" is that of a "respondent;" that is, each glossolalist has a 'story' or narrative about their particular experience that is to help elucidate or tell the researcher about the *meaning* of tongue-speaking. They were also informed that they could refuse to answer any question asked and stop the interview at any time. As well, respondents were told their experience was to be honoured and that the researcher herself spoke in tongues. Only two respondents overtly expressed nervousness in being interviewed.¹⁸ All respondents found the interview process a pleasant experience, as expressed during or after the interview's conclusion.

All glossolalists were given a copy of the *Ethics Protocol* (Consent Form) prior to the interview (see Appendix 'A'). Most were given a copy at the time

¹⁸ In one case of nervousness, it appeared directly related to a sense that this person felt "not educated enough." The researcher attempted to dispel such a concern by reassuring the potential respondent that it was the experience with tongue-speaking that was paramount; that life was itself an "education" and that perhaps "formal education" was being confused with "education." Simply put, the researcher attempted to explain that she [researcher] was not interested in speaking to persons of a particular level of education based on "years of

the interview was arranged, in order that the person read this before the interview so that any hesitations or questions could be dealt with prior to the interview. As well as the *Ethics Protocol*, respondents were asked preliminary demographic questions (see Appendix 'B'). After the first few interviews, it was found that most individuals preferred to fill out the preliminary structured questionnaire *prior* to or *after* the long-interview. The researcher felt that this showed consideration of the respondent's investment of personal time, since no one interviewed received any remuneration for participation in the project. Most frequently then, the preliminary structured questions were filled out prior to the interview or later at home; these were then given to the researcher in church or the researcher had them returned in a self-addressed-stamped envelope. All respondents returned these questionnaires and no one refused to complete this or the long-interview. All respondents were interviewed face-to-face, and permitted the interview to be audiotaped. Those interviewed were told that the interview was confidential and their anonymity assured through coding of the transcribed interviews and questionnaires.

After assuring herself that the respondent was comfortable to begin, the researcher turned on the tape-recorder and began with the basic question: "I want to learn about your experience of speaking in tongues. Will you describe for me please when you first spoke in tongues?" This question was the start to describing their first tongue-speaking experience and rarely did the

schooling," rather, each participant was co-creator of the research project based on his/her particular tongue-speaking experience.

researcher vary this basic question, except perhaps to add a little description first as to how the interview might proceed (see Appendix 'C' for the questions constructed for the interview).

Two individuals were not themselves glossolalists (i.e., M1 and F2). Therefore, they were interviewed about their views on glossolalic expression or experience with such a phenomenon (as "outsider" or "unbeliever"), and what they knew about it. The researcher allowed the interview to proceed as seemed most appropriate. Both the anti-glossolalia respondent and the respondent, who spoke about her experience in a cross-cultural healing ceremony, were open and articulate. The researcher used their personal account to probe and elaborate upon the views and experiences they expressed.¹⁹ It should be noted that respondents identified as "M1" and "F2" are used as "background interviews" to all other respondents interviewed. "M1," an individual, who refers to himself as a [partial] cessationist, does not believe in the use of glossolalia in the Christian church today. Since a number of respondents come out of this type of church belief, the interview with "M1" enriched the researcher's understanding of some of the biographical information and opinions given by respondents in the in-depth interviews. The interview with "F2" was used implicitly to "compare and contrast;" as the researcher lived and experienced the Christian charismatic environment,

¹⁹ These two respondents were also the first two persons to be interviewed. In retrospect, these two unique interviews facilitated ease of entry into the future interviews, because the researcher felt she had faced "the unknown" (these two individuals were not themselves tongue-speakers) most immediately and "survived." It had actually been a very pleasant and memorable experience.

experiencing and observing a range of glossolalic expressiveness; this one cross-cultural story of a healing-ritual using tongues, enhanced understanding of some of the universal features of glossolalic expressiveness. Essentially, these two interviews enliven and enrich the research data collection effort, and facilitate an enhanced understanding, despite their "silence" within the dissertation's many respondent quotations.²⁰

Two respondents were "interviewed" via e-mail, using the same research protocol. Each individual gave consent first (one in-person and another via e-mail); completing the consent form and the preliminary questionnaire, and then submitting these electronically to the researcher. The reason for completing these electronically is that both respondents reside outside of Canada. Other than these two respondents, all interviews were conducted face-to-face at a place and time of the respondent's choosing. Each interview took approximately two hours.

The Long Interview and Number of Respondents

The interview type chosen for investigating glossolalia is framed and informed by the qualitative interview known as "the long interview" (McCracken, 1988).

The long interview is one of the most powerful methods in the qualitative armory. For certain descriptive and analytic purposes, no instrument of inquiry is more revealing. The methods can take us into the mental world of the individual, to see the content and pattern of

²⁰ The researcher would like the reader to note that originally she had hoped to broaden the comparative base of this project through cross-cultural interviewing. Given the dilemma of "time, money, and energy," she was not able to pursue this aim. This is however, an area for future research.

daily experience. The long interview gives us the opportunity to step into the mind of another person, to see and experience the world as they do themselves. (McCracken, 1988:9)

According to McCracken, the intensiveness of this method suggests that "less is more," and that "for many research projects, eight respondents will be perfectly sufficient" (1988: 17). For a *phenomenological* research strategy using "in-depth conversations," Morse suggests six participants (Morse, 1994: 225). In a variety of *transpersonal* research projects, six to nine participants are often interviewed (see Braud and Anderson, 1998: 151-173).

Reviewing literature and the variety of research investigating glossolalia, the number of "subjects" varies; research has analyzed data from one (Jaquith, 1967; de Vol, 1974) to one hundred, sixty-one subjects (Smith and Fleck, 1981). The larger number of subjects within the research projects, are studies that include both glossolalists and non-glossolalists (where an experimental control group is required). These studies also represent a variety of scientific disciplines.

Although the researcher wanted to use transpersonal methodology (recognizing that it mixes and blends various qualitative methods), she also wanted a "representative sample" with regards to sex.²¹ The researcher, therefore, continued purposive interviewing until an almost equal number of

²¹ This was a conscious desire on the part of the researcher, given the findings of Mumford (1996) whose psychology dissertation, using grounded theory and a phenomenological approach, centered on the analysis of interview data from eight female glossolalists. It was also felt that a critical analysis of the data by outside reviewers would be able to see that glossolalia is present in both males and females. Often, the extant literature has tended to

males and female glossolalists presented themselves; at the conclusion of data collection the number of male glossolalists numbered nine; female glossolalists numbered ten; one is a non-glossolalist, one is anti-glossolalia, and one is a *spontaneous* glossolalist.

Interview Transcription

The researcher realized that the long interviews yielded such rich data that most if not all the interview needed to be transcribed. Given this labour intensive effort and the fact that the interviews followed successively from September 2002 through to early December, 2002, the researcher decided to use the month of January 2003 to fully complete the transcription process.

Upon completion of each interview the audio-tape of the glossolalist was put away for a few hours; this was done in order to allow the researcher time to rest and relax, in order to distance herself from the interview process. After a lapse of a few hours, or a good night's rest, the audio-tape was reviewed by listening to the tape without preconceived notions of the research project, analysis, or affected by what transpired in the course of the interview. The researcher simply listened to the tape in a relaxed manner, being open to re-experiencing the interview as an "outside" observer. The researcher listened to herself both as interviewer and glossolalist, as well as listening to the narrative of the glossolalist interviewed. The audiotape was then safely stored away until time of transcription.

implicitly as well as explicitly imply that more females than males are religious, church-attendees, and speak in tongues.

Each audiotape was carefully transcribed. To capture the “feel” and experience of the actual interview, the initial transcribed text included all body behaviour and verbal mannerisms. The following is an example of this nuanced process.²²

F8:1

I: All right ‘D’, I want to learn about your experience in speaking in tongues. So can you describe for me when you first spoke in tongues?

D: Uh, When I gave my heart to the Lord – as a small little girl [Mm], I was just 9 years old. [pause] Uh, I didn’t even know about tongues, really. Uh, I had been at prayer meetings and stuff with my mom and uh, my mom had been a Christian by that time, for about [pause] four years [pause], I believe it was about four years. [pause] And I was nine. And uh [pause] I came to the church with my mom, and they had an altar call; and I don’t know what the man spoke about – it was Pastor _____ [Oh, Yes. Yes.] Who is the father of _____ who started the _____ Mission. And he was an awesome old man. And [pause] he really liked me. And so, he, he talked about something and it must have struck a nerve or something, ‘cause I couldn’t get up to the front fast enough, like; but the sad thing was, I gave my heart to the Lord and I didn’t even know about talking in tongues or whatever but, [pause] nobody told me I had to read the Bible; nobody told me I had to pray; nobody told me I had to sing songs to the Lord; and they didn’t tell me anything. I just; it was like I felt like I gave my heart to the Lord and where do I go from here? And there was nobody there. And it was really [pause] an experience because [pause] I was crying and weeping, and I felt so guilty because some of the things that had happened to me – I thought it was my fault. And it was like I sensed [pause] at that time, I started talking in this funny language. [pause] And

I: Was that after – you gave your?

D: Just, just the very same time I gave my heart to the Lord, during this time of emotional upheaval, when I was so [pause] I didn’t know what was going on; and nobody said anything to me. They just took me to the front and told me how to give my heart to the Lord and left me there. [Wow] And I was crying because I had felt so guilty because of all the horrible things that had happened to me. And it was just like all of a sudden, these funny words started coming [Mm]. But it gave me such a comfort and such a peace and I felt so good in my heart.

Grammar and syntax were used in such a way as to facilitate the re-experiencing of the actual interview upon the researcher’s re-reading of the

text. Nuances such as laughing, smiling, pointing to the body, coughing, and pauses were included in the transcripts with periods or commas designating the point at which the glossolalist stopped a thought or phrase. Since all interviews and transcription were the responsibility of the researcher, it was not difficult to remember the interview and re-live it during the actual transcription. The researcher found that she was able to make notes as they came to her during the transcription process; also, she would highlight words that at the time of transcription appeared to be “leaping out.” The following is an example of how the transcription process triggers other mental processes.

F3: The other aspect though of the beauty – is uh [pause] in my imagination. And it's not, like all in my thoughts? [Mm] I can get a picture of the Lord [mm] and his beauty surrounding – especially the picture in Revelation that John gave – [Mm] – the revelation of the uh, Lord being seated on his throne [Yes] high on his throne with the emerald, ah with the emerald rainbow around him and the crystal sea?

I: So you actually get a picture of that?

F3: Well, I try. [she laughs] I sometimes get little imagines, not the whole thing, not clearly. [*CONSIDER HERE – the holographic mind*] [Yeah.] But, but it does to me, though, when I try and focus on it, is very beautiful. It's like, I don't see the beauty but it gives me an aspect of beauty. [*see here aspect theory of mind article*] Yeah, do you understand what I mean?

F7:5

I: Do you find you are so focussed on the ritual aspects of it, that it doesn't invite the same [pause] depth for you to enter into?

F7: I, I think that's part of for me. I, I, I don't lose myself in it [Ok] as much when I'm thinking about uh, but a lot of that has to do with whom I'm worshipping with. [pause] **[IMPORTANT FOR – theory/consequences of the group setting – the collective and individual contexts; Durkheim/Simmel, others]** If I'm worshipping with a group of people uh, who really want to worship; who are prepared to lose themselves in it. Then I can too. [Ok] If I'm worshipping with a group of people who are, you know, “been an hour now [Mm] lunch is almost ready!” [Mm] Uh, I will get cold then {unsure of tape here}; I don't seem to – that sort of [pause] uh [pause]. And I have led worship in places where people are [pause], I think unconsciously

²² It should also be noted that during the interview, the researcher made a few notes on the prepared open-ended questionnaire to facilitate probing.

but sometimes fairly actively, resisting the presence of the spirit. [Mm Mm]
Which doesn't help. [pause]

The researcher felt that the nuances were important for another reason.

Consider the following quote:

M5:5

I: Now, [clears throat] this question just, I want you to describe [Mm] it from your experience, how does speaking in tongues make you feel? And you can talk about it as a physical feeling, or a mental or when I ask you that question about how does it make you feel, what can you say?

M5: I would say when I do it, it sort of gives me, I don't know – it's some kind of relief in side. [Ok] It's like a [pause] I don't know, it's accompanied with, with a certain joy. [Ok] Yeah. [pause] It's funny, like when you are saying it now, it's coming out like under my breath and I don't know – just to show me the feeling I guess. But, I'd say that, that it's a release and it's also a joy.

The foregoing excerpt highlights an experience the researcher felt occurring in many of the interviews; namely, the individual was *engaging* tongue-speaking during the interview. In several interviews phrases of glossolalic utterance actually occur. This is in fact what *intuitive inquiry* facilitates – allowing the experience under investigation to show up. Several respondents made explicit reference to the process of what they sensed happening.

F7:16 [regarding what she just has spoken to the researcher about] . . . Is to tell you that the Holy Spirit is guiding our conversation. [Yes. Yes] Because my mind is filled with the good shepherd and you start talking about it, [we laugh] and the sheep.counter at #095

To reveal the flow of thought expressed and facilitate ease of reading the transcribed text, the researcher has in future chapters edited out some of the repetitious use of "uh" or "ah," repeated pronouns (e.g., I), and repeated phrases (e.g., I think it was, I think it was) where she felt doing so would not

compromise the thought being expressed.

Incubating, Analyzing, Synthesizing Data

After transcribing the interviews the process of “living with” the data began in earnest. Intensive reflection upon both the interview material transcribed and the inter-subjective experience was and is ongoing. Self-reflection and long periods of meditation upon the researcher’s own glossolalic experience occurs as well. Both critical reflection upon the inner experience of self and an openness to simply “let-go,” facilitated and stimulated on-going insights and spiritual experiences throughout the analytic enterprise. Field notes, in the form of journalizing occurred throughout all phases of the inquiry.

Initially it was thought that the researcher would incubate and “live-with” the actual audiotape of the interview. After the first intensive read-through of the text, the researcher decided against doing so. Having the actual text in front of her facilitated the researcher’s first experience with glossolalia as “subject.” That is, the researcher desired and needed to experience what was coming out of the data, but it appeared that the first trigger was that which was most familiar to the academic enterprise, namely text. It occurred to the researcher that living with the text was parallel to the entire Judeo-Christian perspective. The Christian reads the Bible and that is “the Word.” The researcher herself as student in the academy and a “student” of the Christian scripture was comfortable reading. Perhaps the researcher’s unfamiliarity with transpersonal methodology and her desire to do the analysis “right” narrowed

the freedom she initially felt. However, during the first thorough reading of the transcribed texts [hereafter, these will be referred to as text or texts], several questions presented themselves to her consciousness. Armed with these questions (listed below), it was felt that these would now guide subsequent analysis. At the same time, the researcher would be open to experiencing what it is she was reading about.

Questions Guiding the Analysis

Many thoughts and ideas started to percolate in the researcher's consciousness as she waded into the texts. Several file folders contain many of the thoughts and ideas developing during the entire course of the research endeavour. To facilitate an initial focusing upon the text however, the following questions presented themselves to the researcher.

1. When do persons use glossolalia?
2. Where do persons use glossolalia?
3. Why do persons use glossolalia?
4. What is "it" [glossolalia]?
5. Why might someone not speak in tongues?
6. What about rational thinking?
7. What does tongue-speaking mean to the glossolalist?
8. Can glossolalia be taught?
9. What metaphors do glossolalists use?
10. What physiology is involved in glossolalia?
11. What is the glossolalists 'role' in tongue-speaking?
12. What are the consequences of tongues?
13. What surprises glossolalists about tongue-speaking?
14. Are there different types of tongues?

Armed with the questions cited above, the texts were read once; then a second and third reading took place. This was an intense process as the

researcher began interspersing these readings with:

- ❑ her personal meditations;
- ❑ reading of scriptures;
- ❑ reading of academic literature;
- ❑ spending time engaging in tongues;
- ❑ allowing as much non-rational activity as she was giving to rational activity; and,
- ❑ To *be existing* and *experiencing* her world as tongue-speaker.

Conclusion

Without a doubt this project has seriously challenged the researcher's own evolving worldview, especially regarding that, which most call religion or the "religious" experience. Although experiencing tongues is ongoing, the researcher senses that we are spiritually conscious beings having human experiences. The researcher also recognizes the methodological problem of the *direct* (as opposed to textual) investigation of the higher (superconscious) levels of inquiry (Wilbur, 1983: 133). According to Wilbur, "Spiritual knowledge itself is *not* symbolic; it involves direct, nonmediated, trans-symbolic intuition of and identity with spirit;" and such knowing is "spiritual knowledge;" that is, it is valid, cognitive knowledge – experimental, repeatable, and publicly verifiable (1983: 133).

It also needs to be noted that this methodology requires large temporal blocks of intense reflection, and should not be attempted unless the researcher has the emotional time and energy to facilitate such *personal experiencing*. The consequences of this methodology are personally efficacious, yet it requires great psycho-spiritual integration.

The researcher also recognizes the explicit challenge of a dialectic engagement with a vast body of literature, spanning many disciplines. This researcher has not engaged only sociological and anthropological studies. It therefore asks for an engagement that frankly, social scientists do not normally engage; the philosophical epistemological assumptions of the project may be unacceptable to mainstream sociologists and anthropologists. Just as religious experience challenges churches when they “show up,” doing this project, in this way, consciously pushes sociological boundaries. By not doing a “safe” dissertation, this “minor” exploratory dissertation on glossolalia, which expands sociological conceptions of spiritual experiencing, is expected to evoke critical analysis. Yet, at the same time, the researcher feels that so doing, engages a critical [re-] thinking of science, and this adds to an already rich literature in social science. Any “new way” is apt to challenge traditional social science, not unlike Glaser and Strauss challenged social science with “grounded theory.”

To understand glossolalia in its charismatic Christian expression, it is necessary to know something about the charismatic Christian [glossolalist] interviewed. The next chapter presents demographic features of all the respondents, thereby contextualizing this research project’s findings.²³ A

²³ Given the demographic findings presented in chapter five, this researcher feels confident that the “better” term for tongue-speaking in this project is Christian charismatic glossolalia or *charismatic glossolalia*. While other researchers use terms such as “religious glossolalia,” “Christian glossolalia,” “Pentecostal glossolalia,” or simply glossolalia, for this project, the term “charismatic glossolalia” is more precise; since all these findings are primarily discovered within one particular Christian charismatic setting and those glossolalists interviewed all identify with charismatic Christianity (except “F1” who evidences *spontaneous glossolalia*).

more complete summary of the respondent demographic characteristics is found in Appendix 'D.'

CHAPTER FIVE

FORM, CONTENT, AND CONTEXT

Introduction

Knowledge about a thing is not the thing itself.
James, 1958: 369

This chapter presents demographic characteristics of respondents. It discusses particular characteristics of the glossolalist as they presented within the semi-structured interview. Armed with this practical information, the reader can better put into *context*, the emerging *form* and *content* of glossolalic utterances formalized in the *typology* presented in chapter six.

Form

The English word “form,” as used here, refers to the particular shape and structure of the respondent’s manifested expression of glossolalia.¹ It refers to the external appearance of glossolalia and the glossolalist’s behaviour, as seen by an observer or as reported by the glossolalist.²

Similar external form does not imply that persons give and hold the same *meaning*, despite expressing the same type of behaviour. Used in this manner, form refers to the observable manifestation of glossolalia (e.g., the procedure, the “words,” the mode of action). The form of tongue-speaking observed includes the extraneous controls, customs if you will, [put] upon the behaviour in terms of ceremony or *ritual*.

¹ This does not exclude the *inner* experience and form of glossolalia. It refers here, only to that aspect “objectively” observed by the glossolalist and participant observer. It should be recalled that *thought* is one form of consciousness.

² It includes, but is not limited to a linguistic form of glossolalia.

In this chapter, “form” also applies to the structure of research; that is, it applies not only to the “ritual of protocols” discussed in chapter four, but to the objective descriptions of respondents interviewed. There are certain personal features reported on a closed-ended questionnaire, which reveal characteristics that give substantive information about the glossolalist interviewed. These reported characteristics are systematically presented in the form of several tables, in order to illustrate particular substantive features of the person who is interviewed in this research project.

Content

Peter Berger writes: “content of religious experience is communicated in a language” and “it is included in a specific body of symbolism that has a history and a social location.” (1979: 50) *All* that makes up the glossolalic expression, whether manifest or latent, internal or external, subconscious and conscious - all are included in the term “content.” It also refers to physical details of the glossolalist, i.e., his/her age, ethnicity, the number of years as a tongue-speaker, frequency of the use of tongues, and other demographic data. Glossolalia engages a particular experiencer in a particular socio-historical moment; most glossolalic expression is not a “one-off” experience (except for persons such as “F1” who do not engage organized religion or a particular charismatic sect – her experience is one of *unintended spontaneous glossolalia*); rather, *Christian charismatic glossolalia* continues or can be said to be *ongoing*.

Within glossolalia's *ongoingness*, there is personal biography and history. These aspects of *existence* have content; there is physical detail and information; glossolalia is an event within and without a human experiencer. Glossolalia has "substance" and entails meaning and significance, located within personal events that have physical detail and provide information.

To understand glossolalia, we need to know something about the person who expresses glossolalia. These details make up the content of the "sample" surveyed. The paradox in glossolalia is that it is evidenced *through* "language" (but not restricted to verbal expression, as the reader will come to see in subsequent chapters); its description as an experiential event is expressed via the *medium* of language.

Context

Should the lives of individuals show identical religious elements? To this question James answers "*No*," for the following reason.

I do not see how it is possible that creatures in such different positions and with such different powers as human individuals are, should have exactly the same functions and the same duties. No two of us have identical difficulties, nor should we be expected to work out identical solutions. . . . The divine can mean no single quality, it must mean a group of qualities, by being champions of which in alternation, different men may all find worthy missions. (James, 1958: 368)

Context here refers to the physical/external conditions in which glossolalists live their lives; as well, the word also refers to glossolalia's place within the life of the glossolalist (for example, how frequently is glossolalia practiced). Context includes all those aspects that *interrelate*, *contributing* to the nexus of *meaning* in glossolalia.

In future chapters the researcher refers to the issue of *consciousness* and *power*, especially as it relates to glossolalia and the glossolalists' *existence*. At this point, however, a little introductory quote is apt.

Dr. David Hawkins wrote a work with Nobel Prize winner Linus Pauling called *Orthomolecular Psychiatry*. Dr. Hawkins is currently the director of The Institute for Advanced Theoretical Research, and has spent years researching kinesiological responses to "truth and falsehood." Space prohibits a discussion of this type of research; it provides valid and reliable evidence, illuminated further by the revolutionary discoveries in advanced particle physics and nonlinear dynamics, which point to "a form of communal consciousness, *spiritus mundi*, or as Hawkins calls it, following Jung, a 'database of consciousness.'" (Whalen, 2002/1995: 5)

The majority of people utilize their life experiences to elaborate and express the variations of their native energy field; it's the rare individual who manages to move beyond it, although many may make considerable internal improvement. The reason for this is more easily understandable when we see that what defines one's level is *motivation*. Motivation proceeds from meaning, and meaning, in turn, is an expression in context. Thus, achievement is bounded by context, which, when correspondingly aligned with motivation, determines the individual's relative power. (Hawkins, 2002: 191)

What follows is one example of a form of glossolalia (posturing) within a particular context (time devoted to prayer in her bedroom, in an area prepared for this purpose). Also highlighted, are aspects of manifested content (praise and [doxa-] glossolalic utterances) of this glossolalist's expression.³

³ In glossolalia, aspects of form, content, and context are interrelated and not mutually exclusive [these make up the *glossolalic nexus*]. The glossolalist is the "point-of-intersection" for the manifestation of glossolalia.

F3:5

I: Do you take a certain posture? For instance when you're up in your room and you're going to have your devotional prayer time? [pause] Do you kneel, do you do any physical posturing?

F3: I've done different things, different times. I mostly just sit. But I have knelt. I have lain **prostrate** on the floor. I've been **dancing** around the room. Or, I've been up there with my **arms raised** up and praising the Lord, like, depending what I'm doing. If I'm basically [pause] I think, **kneeling** before him, or if I'm really **pleading** with him, maybe I'm kneeling. [pause] If I'm **praising** him, I'm up and if I'm very **happy** and **thankful** I'm dancing [she laughs]. I go through the whole lot. [she chuckles]

Summary of Research Project Sample

To recap, the researcher interviewed twenty-two individuals who were self-selected or agreed to be interviewed about tongue-speaking when approached by the researcher. Data was gathered during long interviews, using an open-ended questionnaire to guide the interview process. Since the researcher was a tongue-speaker who [herself] had questions about the phenomenon, she used these gaps in her own experiencing and information from the glossolalia literature, to select questions for discussion during the interview.

Prior to each interview, respondents completed a preliminary questionnaire (see Appendix 'B' for a copy of the questionnaire). The answers to these questions provide background information that contextualizes the life of the respondent.

Respondent Characteristics

The twenty-two persons (respondents) interviewed for this project, consist of ten males and twelve females. Nineteen of these twenty-two persons are glossolalists. Nine males are tongue-speakers, while one male is

anti-glossolalia [that is, he does not believe in the use of glossolalia in the Christian church today]. Of the females interviewed: one female is an occasional *spontaneous* glossolalic; one female is a cross-cultural comparison (used to compare aspects of ritual and interpretation of experiencing [within the course of experiencing a healing Muslim ritual, where the healer engaged glossolalia]); ten females are glossolalists.

The *median* age of the respondent is that he or she is 56.5 years of age; the *median* number of years as a tongue-speaker is 21.5 years, and the individual's self-perception of socio-economic status, is that he or she regards their particular standard of living as "above average."

Fourteen of the twenty-two respondents attend the same charismatic church. During the course of this project, one of the female respondents died of cancer.⁴

The tables that follow profile various demographic details of the respondents interviewed. Demographic features reveal that these individuals are less than an homogeneous group; despite the "somewhat" limited age range of these glossolalists. Demographic features presented do not mean there that there are not any similarities between glossolalists. Features presented do entail recognizing diversity in *experiencing* within the structure of that particular percipient's [glossolalic] experience.

⁴ Despite decreased energy, this lovely cheerful woman yielded her story to the researcher. In this interview, the researcher interviewed the husband (who also agreed to an interview) and the wife in the same room with the other spouse present, although each person was interviewed separately. To the researcher's surprise, the female glossolalist was extremely candid despite the fact that her answers challenged her husband's experience. I am most grateful to this couple for their participation.

Presenting these demographic features allows the reader to formulate an over-all picture of each respondent/glossolalist and also gain a perspective about the group of persons interviewed in this research project. For the reader's convenience, the information from these tables and additional information from the preliminary questionnaire is reproduced in spreadsheet format in Appendix 'D'.

Table 5.1 Age, Marital Status, Church Attendance, and Religion, as Reported on the preliminary questionnaire, for all Respondents^(a)

Code ^(b)	Age	Marital Status	Church Attendance	Religion
M1	47	Married	Weekly	Evangelical Baptist
M2	60	Married	Daily	Charismatic
M3	60	Married	Weekly	Charismatic Christian
M4	42	Married	Weekly	Christian
M5	50	Married	Weekly	Christian
M6	68	Married	Weekly	Protestant
M7	79	Married	Weekly	Charismatic
M8	57	Married	Weekly	Roman Catholic
M9	62	Married	Monthly	Protestant/Christian
M10	41	Married	Rarely	Christian
F1	56	Married	Non-response	None
F2	44	Married	Never	Muslim
F3	56	Married	Weekly	Born-again
F4	48	Single	Weekly	Christian
F5	67	Married	Weekly	Christian
F6	66	Married	Weekly	Christian
F7	49	Married	Weekly	Christian
F8	65	Divorced	Weekly	Christian
F9	41	Married	Weekly	Christian
F10	80	Married	Weekly	Charismatic Christian
F11	60	Married	Weekly	Non-denominational
F12	49	Divorced	Weekly	Non-denominational

^(a)Refer to Appendix 'B' for copy of preliminary questionnaire filled in by each respondent.

^(b)The alpha-numeric code for each respondent represents the sex of the respondent ('M'=Male; 'F'=Female) and the numerical place of that interview in the total number of interviews that took place for males and females (M1 means the first male interviewed; F2 means the second female interviewed, etc.)

Most of the respondents are married (19 of the 22, or 86.4% of the sample). Twenty respondents or 90.9% attend church weekly. When asked to report on "Religion/Faith," the researcher was surprised to find that 40.9% (or 9 out of 22) responded as "Christian," while 9.1% (2 out of 22) replied "non-denominational." Two respondents or 9.1% responded to this question by stating their "Religion/Faith" as "Charismatic Christian;" while another two replied it was "Charismatic." The remaining respondents affiliated with:

mainstream religion, 9.1% reporting Protestant and Muslim; or identified with a mainline church, Evangelical Baptist and Roman Catholic. One respondent specifically responded with "none;" another as "Born-again;" and another as "Protestant Christian." The surprise for the researcher lay in the fact that she anticipated most respondents to report a denominational affiliation or perhaps denote themselves as "Christian." She did not anticipate the "hyphenated responses," e.g.,) Charismatic Christian or Protestant Christian, nor did she anticipate a response of "Charismatic."

According to Statistics Canada.⁵

The 2001 Census also recorded an increase in those reporting simply that they were 'Christian,' without specifying a Catholic, Protestant, or Christian Orthodox faith. This group more than doubled (+121%) during the decade to 780,400, representing 2.6% of the population in 2001. This was one of the largest percentage increases among all major religious groups. (Statistics Canada, Catalogue: 96F0030XIE2001015)

Regarding attendance at religious services in Canada, the General Social Survey data reports: "In 2001, four in 10 adults (43%) reported that they had not attended religious services during the 12 months prior to the survey, compared with only 26% in 1986." (Statistics Canada, *Religions in Canada*, Catalogue: 96F0030XIE2001015)⁶ Although most respondents attend church regularly, there are several that, by their own admission, "rarely" attend or do not attend "church." From the researcher's subsequent observation, her experience, and discussions with several glossolalists, it is not unusual for a

⁵ This Statistics Canada report was released after the researcher had designed and implemented the research project.

respondent to “refrain” from church attendance (sometimes for extended periods of time) due to the experience of *dissonance*; this will be further discussed in chapter six. Thus, while the data in table 5.1 suggests most respondents attend church weekly, this should be put into context; namely, that this is not the case for glossolalists at all periods of their church-going existence. The experience of dissonance discussed in chapter seven will highlight personal and communal cognitive dissonance.

In chapter six the reader will begin to recognize that even within the charismatic community, various *types* of glossolalia are not wholeheartedly embraced.

⁶ This Statistics Canada product, Catalogue no. 96F0030XIE2001015, is available at <http://www.statcan.ca/cgi-bin/downpub/freepub.cgi>.

Table 5.2 Age, Mother-tongue, years of Education, and SES^(a) for all Respondents

Code	Age	Mother-tongue	Education	SES ^(a)
M1	47	French	MDiv-4 years	7
M2	60	English	MDiv-4 years	7
M3	60	French	1 year college	5
M4	42	English	2 years university	8
M5	50	French	College	8
M6	68	English	H.S.	7
M7	79	English	H.S.	6
M8	57	English	College	7
M9	62	English	M.A.	7
M10	41	English	B.A. & 2 yrs grad school	4
F1	56	English	PhD [ABD]	6
F2	44	Somali	College	6
F3	56	English	H.S. [XII]	7
F4	48	German	M.A.	2
F5	67	Czech	H.S.	5
F6	66	French	H.S. [IX]	5
F7	49	English	B.A., BTh	9
F8	65	Gaelic	H.S.[XI]	4
F9	41	English	B.A.	8
F10	80	English	H.S.[X]	5
F11	60	French	Chem Technologist	5
F12	49	Low-German	Ph.D. [ABD]	1

^(a)The question on the preliminary questionnaire reads as follows: "On a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 considered a low standard of living and 10 an excellent standard of living, how would you rate your economic status?" The respondent then circled the number of their choosing, to indicate 'SES.'

Table 5.2 above, simply provides additional background information. Since glossolalia is frequently referred to as "non-language," "gibberish," and "non-sensical," and it is suggested that it uses the speaker's repertoire of sounds (memory), the researcher wanted to know the first language ever-learned of each respondent. Based on the participant observation of these glossolalists and others, along with the researcher's own glossolalic "vocabulary of sounds," the researcher knows repetitious sounds made by glossolalists are often similar between glossolalists who may be English or

English-speaking, yet whose mother-tongue is French, Italian, Gaelic, Dutch, or German. Goodman (1972) found cross-cultural linguistic similarity. Despite past findings in the glossolalia literature reviewed, the researcher finds that while all glossolalists in her 'sample' speak English, there is a similarity in tongues between glossolalists that she believes is not learned, and that is not accounted for by present linguistic analysis or learning-theory (see Goodman, 1972a).

Data collected provides a broader base of information from which to assess the extant literature; interview data collected suggests that some glossolalists do "hear" their tongues as a foreign language.

Regarding educational backgrounds, 68.1% (or 15) respondents have post-secondary education. In fact, 40.9% or nine respondents have at least one-degree and 27.3% or six of these have graduate degrees. As mentioned previously, most respondents consider themselves to have a fairly good standard of living, regarding themselves as greater than 5, on a 10 point scale. The *mode* score on this question is 7.

Table 5.3 **Age, Years speaking in tongues, Frequency of tongues, and Place First Experience of tongues occurred for Respondents**

Code	Age	Years Tongue-speaking	Frequency Of Tongues	Place of respondents First Experience
M1	47	0	Never	Not tongue-speaker
M2	60	35	Daily	Private
M3	60	22	Daily	Private
M4	42	20	Daily	Public Meeting
M5	50	15	Daily	Private
M6	68	22	Daily	Private
M7	79	21	Daily	Small Group [4]
M8	57	26	Daily	Private
M9	62	10	Daily	Private
M10	41	20	Daily	Private
F1	56	15	Occasional	In a group
F2	44	0	Never	Not tongue-speaker
F3	56	3	Daily	Private
F4	48	15	Monthly	Private
F5	67	22	Daily	Private
F6	66	23	Weekly	In a group
F7	49	20	Weekly	Private
F8	65	56	Daily	Public Meeting
F9	41	20	Weekly	Private
F10	80	24	Occasional	Small Group [4]
F11	60	23	Daily	Conference
F12	49	24	Daily	Public Meeting

Table 5.3 provides details on the glossolalists that once more surprised the researcher. Each respondent's age is again included as a baseline comparison to the length of time that the respondent has engaged tongue-speaking. As reported previously, the median years as a tongue-speaker is 21.5, with a range of 54 years!⁷ The earliest reported age of tongue-speaking is nine years.⁸ The age range of the respondents is from 41 years of age to

⁷ The researcher is awed that between all glossolalists interviewed, the total years of tongue-speaking sum to 436 years.

⁸ Recall here the "little prophets of Cevennes" cited in chapter two. It is not unusual for children to speak in tongues; during data collected for this project, the researcher became

eighty years of age; the median age is 56.5 years. Twelve glossolalists (or sixty per cent) received tongues in private, while alone. Two glossolalists were in a small "bible-study" group of four persons when they received their "gift of tongues." Twenty-five per cent (5 persons) received tongues at a charismatic-type meeting – several of these being places where individuals were made aware of "Baptism in the Holy Spirit," with tongues expected to follow that experience (please refer to the glossary of terms for an explanation of "The Baptism").

Table 5.4 below, provides some further substantive data on each respondent. Such "variables" as ethnicity and a few details of family background (such as number of siblings, or the number of children) put "context" around the respondent's existence and life-world. During the interviews, for instance, the glossolalist often reported that he/she did not discuss glossolalia with family (meaning here, siblings and children). Given the fact that all but two glossolalists have children, and most have at least one living sibling, this could contribute toward an experience of *dissonance* in daily living.

aware that a young boy of five received tongues and it is not unusual for a child of nine to become glossolalic.

Table 5.4 Ethnicity, Number of Siblings, Number of Children and the Birth-order of all Respondents

Code	Ethnicity	Siblings	Number of Children	Birth Order ^(a)
M1	French	7	3	7
M2	Eng-Ger	2	3	2
M3	French	8	2	8
M4	Irish/Eng/Ger	4	4	1
M5	French	10	2	8
M6	English	Adopted	5	N/A
M7	English	3	6	1
M8	Can/Scot	2	5	2
M9	Ger/Swiss/Irish	4	2	2
M10	NativeAm/European	1	0	1
F1	Australian	6	4	1
F2	Somalia	11	4	1
F3	Irish/Eng	2	0	1
F4	German	1	0	1
F5	Czech/Slovak	1	5	2
F6	French	4	4	NR
F7	English	2	4	2
F8	Irish/Jewish	1	4	1
F9	English	3	4	3
F10	English	5	6	3
F11	French	5	0	1
F12	Dutch-Mennonite	2	1	1

^(a)The researcher asked this question out of personal interest. She herself is "first-born" and she wondered: Does birth-order make a difference? Is it possible that tongue-speakers are more likely to be "first-born?"

Conclusion

The mere form of the religious, artistic, or philosophical attitude brings stability and peace, and creates a bond, uniting the religious genius and the faithful, the master and the pupils, the philosophical personality and those who are subject to his power. (Dilthey, 1954: 40)

The above tables are presented to arm the reader with certain background detail; in this way, the reader can better understand and assess the findings of this research project. While the researcher speaks in tongues, prior to the start of the academic enterprize she did not feel she understood

the value of tongue-speaking; if, in fact, it had substantive value beyond a person's belief system; whether tongue-speaking only had meaning within the community of charismatics (such as suggested by linguistic analysis [see Chaika, 1990]) or, as suggested by Hine, that tongue-speaking is simply an act of "bridge-burning act" (i.e., with Catholic tongue-speakers); a non-pathological linguistic behaviour that functions in the context of the Pentecostal movement as one component generating commitment (1969: 225; see also McGuire, 1977). It appeared to this researcher that something "more" than a "commitment mechanism" was involved in tongue-speaking. The researcher sensed that something was missing both in discussions on glossolalia and the "charismatic."

The findings and experiences throughout the research process have awed and surprized the glossolalic-researcher. Chapter six elucidates findings from this *transpersonal mindfully attending* process.

CHAPTER SIX

RESEARCH FINDINGS

Overview

To understand a thing rightly we need to see it both out of its environment and in it, and to have acquaintance with the whole range of its variations.
William James, 1958: 35

Several aspects should be considered when examining the nature and subsequently, the *essence* of glossolalia. Glossolalia is perceived to have a polysemic and polyvalent nature. The tongue-speaking phenomenon is processual in nature and contributes toward the ongoing *spiritual evolution* of the individual. Glossolalia *is* power or energy; or one might say it is breath, wind or vapour (this is based on the analysis and experience coming out of in-depth interviews, participant observation, and personal glossolalic experiencing by the researcher). It is both a *spontaneous* (or unintended) experience and an *intentional* experience.

Based on the *natural typology* of tongues elucidated in this project (an analysis that also speaks to earlier typologies of non-Christian and Christian glossolalia), tongue-speaking consists of both intelligible and unintelligible utterances; both verbal and non-verbal sounds; and it has a range of meaningful expression(s). Speaking in tongues cannot be limited to, nor reduced to, the seemingly incoherent, unintelligible verbal expressions heard in public or private (referring here to that behavioural mode of speech described as “gibberish” or “babble” speech). By attending to the entire “body”

of the glossolalist, glossolalia is found to involve the central and peripheral nervous system, along with all that is the mind-brain-body of the human organism (it is here [within the typology and concomitant expressions found in the glossolalist's repertoire of behaviours] that we see a "reclaiming of the body," within the current up-surge of the Pentecostal form of spirituality -- the current charismatic movement).

Subsequent to the above considerations, there are different *types* of tongues. Coming out of the data collected for this project on tongue-speaking is a *typology* of tongue expression. The typology developed here is not to be considered either inclusive or exclusive; rather, it is a *natural typology*. The typology depicts real distinctions, which are useful for analysis and indicative of the complex experience of glossolalia.

A Note on Typology in the Social Sciences

"Classification is a very central process in all facets of our lives. It is so ubiquitous that not only do we generally fail to analyze it, we often even fail to recognize its very existence." (Bailey, 1994: 1) The approach taken to *classify* the types of tongues evident to the researcher, is to use a *natural* approach such as that used in animal taxonomy and biology (see Pankhurst, 1978; Simpson, 1961; Sokal and Sneath, 1963).¹ It is also a process used in ethnography.

¹ Bailey defines *natural classification* in this way: "The term *natural classification* has been used in a number of ways, particularly in biological classification (see Sneath & Sokal, 1973). Here we will use it to refer to a system that occurs naturally in the empirical world, as contrasted with an artificial system, which has no natural occurrence prior to its construction by the researcher." (1994: 8)

Classification is both a process and an end result (Bailey, 1994: 2). In biology, classification "means a way of grouping objects, on the basis of some relationship between them." (Pankhurst, 1978:1) "Classification," as used in this research project, means to systematically convey an ordering of glossolalic expression into a "group" based on a particular and distinctive form of manifest expression. It is a primitive step in classifying the [evolutionary] behaviour of the glossolalist; recalling here that the glossolalist is seen as a living organism (a member of the species *Homo sapien sapiens*), who also represents a microcosm of the macrocosm or universe.²

Typology is sometimes considered conceptual, while taxonomy is empirical (Bailey, 1994: 6). However, there are exceptions, such as identifying empirical cases for conceptual typologies. Ethnographic classification combines the conceptual/empirical taxonomic distinction.

Qualitative classifications are widely used in qualitatively oriented research paradigms such as field research (ethnography). Ethnographers often do not have a quantitative orientation. They often do not begin research with specific hypotheses, preferring to let hypotheses, if any, develop during the observation of empirical data via the method of 'grounded theory' (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). They also eschew reliance on statistical data analysis. Their data are often in the form of field notes. Some mechanism is needed for transforming these lengthy resource notes so that data, interpretations, and conclusions may be presented to readers. Typologies are admirably suited to this task. (Bailey, 1994: 79)

² According to Simpson, "The basic or one might say primitive step in classification is simply the grouping together of individual objects (or concepts) by some system of relationships (or associations) among them." (1961: 11)

Typology is the term more frequently used in the social sciences (Bailey, 1994: 6) and is generally multidimensional and conceptual; to be distinguished however, from *generic* classifications (Bailey, 1994: 3).³

Simpson argues that *systematics* is broader than taxonomy and includes taxonomy, as well as classification and nomenclature (1961: 1). "*Taxonomy is the theoretical study of classification, including its bases, principles, procedures, and rules.*" (Simpson, 1961: 11 [italics in original source]). Some enlarge this definition to include the theoretical study of identification (Sneath and Sokal 1973: 3; see also Bailey, 1994: 6). *Typology*, as used here, is an approach or conceptualization based on empirical "cases"; typology is understood to be a distinct school of taxonomy but one, which has a more pervasive use than that, used, by classical taxonomists.⁴

The basic concept of typology is this: every natural group of organisms, hence every natural taxon in classification, has an invariant generalized or idealized pattern shared by all members of the group. The pattern of a lower taxon is superimposed upon that of a higher taxon to which it belongs, without essentially modifying the higher pattern....Numerous different terms have been given to these idealized patterns, often simply 'type' but also 'archetype' 'Bauplan' or 'structural plan,' 'Morphotypus' or 'morphotype,' 'plan' and others.

...On typological principles any specimen of a species embodies its 'type,' and hence is adequate for defining the species and as a standard of comparison. No conflict and indeed usually no difference was perceived between using the same single specimen as a

³ "Generic classification" being defined by Bailey as the fundamental classification process of "simple divisions into groups." (Bailey, 1994: 3). Bailey notes that "empirical classification problems are seldom so simple" and that, "like theory and data analysis, they can encompass at least three levels of analysis...." (Bailey, 1994: 3) These levels are the conceptual, the empirical and the combined conceptual/empirical level.

⁴ Recall here that typology "stems from Plato and his sources and came into taxonomy along with Aristotelian, Neo-Platonic, scholastic, and Thomist philosophy and logic....Its basic concept has, however, been far more pervasive than the particular systems of the taxonomists named as the leading theoretical typologists." (Simpson, 1961:46)

morphological type and a nomenclatural [sic] type. ... (Simpson, 1961: 46,47)

Spradley uses the term *taxonomy* when representing categories emerging out of the analysis of ethnographic field notes (1980: 112). After identifying *cultural domains*, Spradley utilizes taxonomy to reveal subsets of cultural behaviour (what people do), cultural artifacts (the things people use and make), and cultural knowledge (what people know), and the way that these are related to “the whole.” (Spradley, 1980: 113). As can be seen, the terms taxonomy and typology are frequently used interchangeably,⁵ however, the subtle differences between these terms should be recognized.⁶

Typology of Tongue-speaking

And so [long pause] the tongues came back. But they came back stronger. And now I have more than one tongue, I know. I know that there's one like, when I'm doing warfare; and I know there's one when I'm blessing the Lord [pause] uh [pause] and I know there's one when I'm just seeking guidance. It's like I have three or four different [pause] tongues like [pause]. (F8:5)

Like, I said, sometimes it's aggressive. Sometimes it's mellow. Sometimes it's a repetitious [sic] of a certain phrase and other times it's a totally different phrase, ah, sometimes, it sounds like if I had to say something, it would sound German and other times it would sound English, other times it would sound French, I guess. I don't know, it's been different.... (M5:8)

Figure 6.1 below presents the classification of utterances emerging from the data. This is a *polythetic* classification; it contains “cases” that are not identical in all respects, but overall the manifest experiences depicted within

⁵ “As an end result, a taxonomy is similar to a typology, and in fact many people use the two terms interchangeably.” (Bailey, 1994:6)

⁶ According to Spradley, taxonomy is defined as “a set of categories organized on the basis of a single semantic relationship.” (1980:112) It shows how things are related and the “numerous relationships” that occur. He also notes that taxonomies have different levels (Spradley, 1980:115).

each category show greater similarity than dissimilarity. Due to the theoretical suppositions of the research project, this typology of utterances is considered a *diachronic* classification; it reveals *relationships* that appear to characterize [give evidence of] an evolutionary development in the spiritual progression or unfolding of the human psyche.

Glossolalic Utterances

- A. Vocal
 - 1. Doxa-speech
 - a. Singing
 - b. subvocalization
 - 2. Babbling
 - 3. Warring
 - 4. Comical
 - 5. Groaning
 - 6. Lamenting
 - 7. Screaming
- B. Subvocal
- C. Creature
- D. Anemos

FIGURE 6.1 Typology of Glossolalic Utterances

Under each glossolalic utterance type listed below, several examples are given to illustrate the particular form, content, and context of that specific utterance for a particular glossolalist. In this way, the reader will perceive the nuanced expression indicative of that particular category.

A. Vocal Glossolalic Utterance

The types of tongue-speaking in this classification are all verbally expressed speech or speech behaviour that is audible and heard. Each of the

following speech types uses the natural organs of speech (i.e., the lungs, tongue, and lips).

1. *Doxa-speech* refers to a liturgical-type of expression; it is frequently described as “praise to God,” by the glossolalist.⁷ This is a consonant sound to the glossolalist and other glossolalists hearing it; respondents often describe this as a pleasant and gentle speech. This type of glossolalia is directed both inwardly and outwardly.

The following are examples of doxa-speech utterances, which come out of the interviews with practicing charismatic glossolalists. “I” refers to the researcher [investigator] and the respondent is referenced by sex (“M” for male and “F” for female), by chronological interview number (e.g., the first female interviewed is designated “F1,” the second male interviewed is coded as “M2,” etc.), and by the transcript page number (locating the subsequent quote)

I: Now when you speak in tongues, pray in tongues, do you always do it verbally? [pause] Can you do it silently?

F3:5

I can, but it's not so effective for my mind. I have done it but, it seems a bit too jumbled. But, I don't speak out loud. I whisper. I mean, I'm whispering it most of the time, you know. And I don't shout out and I, no, it's mostly whispering. Or, talking quietly if I'm totally, totally on my own. But if, like there are people around in the house, I go up into my bedroom. I've got a little corner up in my bedroom which is my prayer corner with all little things around – you know, nice little pictures, and verses, and a cross and holy spirit pictures, and all kinds of things you know, and my bible and my books, all

⁷ *Doxology* comes from the middle French word *doxologia*, which comes from late Greek, from the Greek word *doxa* meaning “opinion, glory” (from *dokein* meaning “to seem, seem good”) and *logia* meaning “-logy” (from the Greek word *logos* meaning “word” [used to express doctrine, theory, or science]). It means a rite which is formulated as an expression of praise to God.

around there. And I have my worship music up there and [pause] and, again, worship music will trigger off a response very deeply within me.

F5:1

The tongues I speak, when I speak and I pray in tongues uh, to the Lord or whatever for my own is a nice gentle type of tongues. I'm not sure – sometimes I sense that there's some Latin or Spanish or [pause] Latin American words let's call them, I don't know, Ok? [pause] 'cause a lot of times I get the word teeahmoray and teeamo and stuff like that, so, when I'm talking to the Lord.

F6:3

If I have music on or, like it all depends what's happening. Like sometimes, if I'm watching a Christian Programme or something, it's – sometimes it just comes. You know you just feel like you want to pray in tongues. But it's not something that I do all the time. And I know probably we should get into the – I should get into the habit of doing that.

F6:4

The other day, just last week, I had an experience. I was watching [a Christian TV program] in the morning and I don't know if they were playing music or something but then all of a sudden, my whole – right in here – [points to solar plexus] – it just started to shake. You know it was just shaking right here. Like my spirit inside. And I've had that, I was just, you know - I just lifted my hand and telling the Lord how much I loved him. And I think I was speaking in tongues then. So actually then, that's what I'm saying, is that, it just seems to happen [pause] sometimes. It's not something that [pause]

I: It's almost as if for you it's quite spontaneous.

F6: Yeah. I think so. Yeah.

Another example from F6:4

F6: Some people shake their arms, but I was just, like, a shaking in here. And then, like a few days after that, I was in bed and I was listening to a tape – I was, I couldn't sleep, so I was listening to a worship tape where they were, you know, just [pause] telling the Lord about their love, the love of God. And again that happened. And it brought tears to my eyes, [pause] and again it was this shaking inside. It's like as if it's hit my spirit. I don't know where your spirit is [she laughs] but I think I would say it's the inner man. It's the whole being inside my other inner man. But it's the, I think the spirit of man is probably just right in here. [she points to the epigastric region or solar plexus area] [pause]

M2:2,3

Like, I would, I pray in tongues everyday. I don't have a time set aside, now I am going to pray in tongues for an hour. Although, some people do that, and it probably is good because they are edified and built up in the Lord that way. But I, if I am suddenly joyful about something, I might pray in tongues, just a little bit, a little phrase, especially if I am driving along in the car and listening to some worship music that edifies me, I might pray in tongues a little bit as kinda out of my praise and adoration to the Lord. If I feel frustrated or anxious about something, I'll pray in tongues because that relieves that anxiety, plus it

- I feel it opens me up to the spirit of God. Like if I have to go and visit somebody in the hospital who is dying or it's going to be a difficult case, where I am going to counsel somebody that I need to relate wisdom, I'll usually pray in tongues a little bit. I mean five minutes, two minutes - I don't know if I am driving in the car, you know before I get there, to just get tuned into the spirit. It helps me get tuned into the spirit, to the flow of the spirit. And so, in all of those ways. And I, especially during my own private worship, and in the formal worship service on Sunday morning, I would pray in tongues as a means of worship - an expression of worship.

M8:6

Obviously to me, it's in prayer. Like it's an enhancement to my prayer life. And I can sit back and just let go and pray in tongues; it's just, to me [pause] it's a special communion with God that I can't get any other way you know?

M9:2

And so [pause] each day I would just try mumbling words – speaking words that would come out of my mouth; not yet knowing how this should even sound – what it would be like. And I knew it was mumbling each day that I tried it. And, at the end of about thirty seconds, ten or sixty seconds, I knew this was just me. But, one day when I tried the same thing, I realized that what was coming out, was more than mumbling; that it was some kind of a language. I didn't know the language but having already studied Indonesian as a missionary, I realized there were many languages out there that could be said, and I would not pick up one word of it that would help me to know that it was a language. But I realized, that this was a language. And [pause] so it became a part of my daily talk with God. I began speaking in tongues whenever I would spend devotional time with him.

a. *Singing-in-tongues* is a glossolalic utterance that can occur *during* doxa-speech utterances; it can also occur on its own – spontaneously and often when the person is in an attitude of “worship.” It is frequently heard in corporate charismatic worship services. Many glossolalists will experience singing in tongues at one time or another in their practice of tongue-speaking. In the case of singing in tongues the doxa-speech is audible “tongue-speaking” that is sung.

F5:1

I also sing in tongues and I can sing almost any tune [pause] that comes up and it's mostly for my edification. Or, sometimes, if I don't know the song, I

just switch into tongues and I sing and I pick up even if I don't know the tune, the tune will still be there? But the tongues will be there.⁸

F8:6 [preferred to be referred to as 'D']

And last week [pause] it was really weird because I barely started [pause] praying in tongues and I got singing and I must have sang four or five songs. And then I got the English.

I: Is that new? Is that new to be singing?

D: I had it a few times. But it's becoming more [pause] often.

I: Ok. More frequent?

D: Yeah. And I'm saying Lord, if you want me to give these songs, and they're songs I know are not songs yet. And if you want me to give these songs, you're going to have to bring the tune and everything back. Like I start with no accompaniment at all. It just, it just comes. And it's in tongues; I'm singing in tongues. And I finished all of the songs last week, before any of the English came, and then I had, I think I had four songs. And they were three or four verse songs, with three or four lines in them.

I: You knew that they were verses?

D: Yeah. It's just – like I knew them. And I knew where the beat changed, and where the rhythm – well, when things changed, the notes changed. [pause] And [pause] every time, in each one of the songs, that I said, like holy or whatever, [pause] something to do with holy and pure or chaste.

I: Now did those words comes to you as you were singing in your mind? Like did you know that the word was holy? You're speaking in tongues right?

D: No, I didn't. You see I sang everything in tongues first.

I: First. Ok, so this came after?

D: And this, and then I just walked around and I just [she illustrates] and all of a sudden – the words just came. And when it was holy or pure or chaste or the virgin – I forget what all I sang last week; and when it came, they always were higher. It was like they were elevated. It was awesome. And I had the chills when I finished because, it was when it was glorifying the Lord and his ability to change us and stuff, that was the sense that I got. His ability to change us.

I: So, I just want to clarify. You were singing in tongues first [Mm] going around there, singing in tongues. When you're finished, you started singing in English?

D: I went around, I sang in tongues. And then I just kind of, I went around – I'm not sure if it was once or once and a half around the sanctuary, and I was just kind of more humming [again she illustrates – quite lovely on the tape]; I wasn't really singing anything, I wasn't getting any words. Then all of a sudden it just [she hits her hand on the table] came.

I: When it just came – was that in English?

D: Yeah. Yeah.

I: It was amazing eh?

D: It was awesome. And it was like [pause] it wasn't me, because how would I ever contain all this stuff? You know, like where does it come from. It has to

⁸ All glossolalic phrases used in the respondent's description or expressed [manifested] during the interview, are transcribed phonetically.

be from him because I've put myself in a prayer – attitude of prayer; and seeking his face.

F9:2

I: Ok. And what about singing?

F9: [long pause] these days, I don't often sing aloud often, if like if I'm out walking or something, in my head.

b. *Subvocalization* (as the noun) is the act or process of inaudibly articulating glossolalic speech using the speech organs (e.g., the tongue and lips). It can occur while the glossolalist is in any activity, including talking in his/her mother tongue to another person or a group of persons.

F7:3

I use it much more purposefully? And to just have it be personalized requires more of a lightness of heart than I usually would have.

I: Ok.

F7: I'm worn down by the cares of this life. I have four small children who are there immediately in the morning. You know there's just not that kind of space. However, I pray in the spirit [pause] before any encounter; [pause] during any encounter. If I'm talking with someone and their talking, I [don't] know what I'm going to say I will pray in the spirit while I listen to them. But it's in my head almost always. If I pray when I pray with someone I will pray in the spirit a little bit before I start to use English, just to listen for the words [that are expected to come from God].

F9:2

I: Oh, Ok speaking in tongues in your head?

F9: Yeah.

I: What about speaking in tongues verbally? Is it always an external utterance? Or do you hear it in your mind? Can you do it under your breath?

F9: [pause] I think [pause] that when I speak in tongues I'm usually either whispering, [pause] or [pause] kind of mouthing them silently. But I don't think that it's ever just been in my head [though she stated this earlier and now has clarified what it is she appears to do].

I: Ok. So when you say mouthing you actually will move your lips?

F9: Yeah. Yeah.

I: Ok. What happens with your tongue?

F9: [long pause] it moves. Yeah. It moves.

F10:6

I: When you do speak in tongues is it verbal?

F10: Always verbal.

I: Always verbal. Do you do it in your mind?

F10: I have. I mean [pause] I have whispered or under my breath, you know. Yeah.

I: Right. So, it can be both silent and verbal?

F10: Yeah.

F11:11

It overtakes me. Not the tongues particularly. Well the tongues and the mouth. Well, that's another thing, that's a warning of it; when my tongue starts to go by itself. There's no sound that comes; it's just the tongue. It's like the tongue moves. You know. So, that's kind of a sign that there's something behind it that's supernatural because I'm not doing that.

2. In the *babbling* form of glossolalic expression, the utterance sounds simply like meaningless and unintelligible sounds, presented in a repetitious manner. The sounds are short, often one syllable such as 'ba,' 'ba' or 'to,' 'to' and literally sound like a baby's attempt at speech. This is different from the one-syllable speech act made in *warring* glossolalic speech, where the sounds coming from the glossolalic utterance are not pleasant but directed outwardly in a harsh and dissonant-sounding matter. The warring 'babble' syllable is frequently noted as sounding like 'ta,ta,ta,' but comes out aggressively, and dissonant sounding, just like the "warring tongue."

It is not uncommon for the babbling form of speech to be the glossolalist's first type of expression in glossolalia. It can also be interspersed with other forms of glossolalic expression or can occur at the end of the glossolalist's time spent tongue-speaking.

Out of the mouths of babes
and infants
You have founded a bulwark
because of your foes,
to silence the enemy and the
avenger.
Psalm 8:2 [NRSV]

F3:3

I'll make little noises. Sometimes it really wouldn't be big words. Sometimes, it's a lot of little words and that's when I'm thinking to myself, "Boy is this really words or just sounds like a baby would make?"

I: Yes, babble.

F3: Yeah [she illustrates] But other times it's words that repeat. And then they repeat in different ways.

F12:2

Primarily I use it [tongue-speaking] in private because it is very private with me – talking or praying to and with God. My sense is that I have few words in English and sometimes I like to just let go, and see what the tongues will do...at times it just ends up sounding like the sounds made of a baby. Short little sounds that are pleasant and are just a syllable in length. Often, lately, this is happening when I've expressed myself more fully in my dialect of tongues I just sort of end up with these little soft sounds like to, to, to, to, or hoota, hoota, hoota, and then I just breathe in deeply and need to exhale. Also, it occasionally happens when I cannot sleep and I start to speak in tongues. Then these soothing, cooing sounds might appear and I fall asleep.

M3:11

... because I've heard so many different types of tongues and [pause] people will use a phrase that they associate with tongues and they say people go into the shambalabala or something like that [he chuckles] and they use a phrase that sounds common to them; but I've heard all kinds of things and my wife had two syllables for a year. And all she did was repeat those two syllables. And people would say, "What are you doing?" [and she answered] "Praying in tongues." [and they would reply] "Well, that's not [emphasis on "not"] tongues." So, "Well how do you know?" [he laughs] Well you know that's what God gave her.

3. The *warring* speech act is directed outwardly and these are dissonant sounds (both to the observer, other glossolalists and the glossolalist to whom it occurs). Often loud, it can sound like a "sub-machine gun" going off. It is a spontaneous outburst, that is, the glossolalist does not know this is going to be the type of tongue to be expressed until it suddenly appears, often without warning. In the following example, the reader will notice the difference between this form of glossolalic expression and doxa-speech, as articulated by the respondent and as experienced by the researcher herself.

F5:1

The other set of tongues I have is what I call my warring tongues. And when I usually have those, I know that someone [long pause] is in trouble or needs to be prayed for. [pause] I don't always know what the reason is [pause] or that there is a spirit of darkness, or the enemy or whatever you want to call it, a demonic spirit around somewhere [pause] and those tongues are like a machine-gun going off [pause]. So, it's very fast, very clip; it's like a tautautatau [she illustrates] almost, and I know [pause]. Sometimes when I get that I will, for instance I was thinking of our Pastor one, this was back before we moved here, and he was away in Cuba, and I was driving to meet my daughter-in-law – and all of a sudden his name came to mind. And the next thing I knew is automatically these tongues came. And when I asked him, because of interests sake; [he apparently tells her later that] after, he was in his room and fighting off some demonic powers or stuff you know, in the Hotel room or whatever. So, but I don't always know why.

I: You don't always know why?

F5: I don't always know why I use them. Another incident – one time a very good friend of ours was going before the congregation to tell of something in his life. The Pastor had asked him to divulge something to the congregation. I knew he was going to be there. And we walked into our church and like about quarter after eleven these tongues started. And I never finished till one o'clock. And that was about the time that he finished.

I: Were they verbal or did you do these in whisper-wise or was this your warring tongue?

F5: It was my warring tongues, and that's what I, yes, sometimes they get loud but I can keep them down quiet. Like, I mean, when I'm in church, that [previous time] when they started I didn't want to disturb anyone else, and so, that's what's happened to me.

I: And while you have these tongues – whether it's the gentle or singing, or the [pause] the machine [she laughs]

F5: Yeah, sub-machine gun.

I: It's a wonderful analogy, really is. [she laughing] What's going on in the rational mind – in the English thought?

F5: I can sometimes – I can be speaking in tongues, even in my prayer time, or singing time, it depends on how deep I want to go spiritually; if I'm not at a very deep spiritual level, I'm cognisant of what else is going on and I can almost think of other things at the same time. Yeah. Not so much with the warring tongues.

I: There you're very focused?

F5: There, there I'm very, very focused. [long pause] My mind does not go anywhere else. I may have the thought, if it slows down – and like that time with this friend of ours, where I went for two hours, I was exhausted. Because I never stopped. It never stopped.

I: Does your breathing change at all? [pause] Any physiology?

F5: I don't remember with that time, but another time we were doing a seminar in [name of town] – that was just about a year or, or two, maybe two – year and a-half two years at the most – and I was to give the pres- next presentation right after lunch. [pause] And there were a lot of people coming and going. [pause] Either coming in or going out to have a smoke and then

coming back in or whatever [she laughs]. And right after, I've, just b- I started – and these tongues came, just like that [she smacks her hands together]. So, I knew that there was probably a demonic spirit in there. That was my sense and that's what I felt. And uh, I don't, I don't - I can't stand still. [pause] So, what [husband's name here] did at the time, was, he said, "Something is wrong," [pause] "This is what [F5] gets when, you know, when things are not right." So, we just -

I: So where you moving around?

F5: Yeah, I move. I move. And even with the other chap there at church, I tried to sit quiet but I was [pause] antsy. Now when I prayed for the Pastor, I was driving, it wasn't as intense. When they are intense, I move. [long pause] It's almost like there's a [pause] [she breaths out] it's imperative that I do it or, and I can't stop and I can't stand still. Now, when I'm finished they'll just go – just like that. When the Lord has it, that's my belief, when the Lord feels that it's been enough, [chuckle] they just quit. Just like that [she has struck her hands together] - as quickly as they start.

I: Can you tell me how you recognize this as a warring tongue?

F5: I call it that. And I don't know.

I: So, it's your word?

F5: That's my word. I call it a warring tongue and usually my experience has been [pause], like in the case of this friend, I knew he was in trouble, and I knew there was a battle, not only here on earth but you know, mostly here on earth. I know there's a battle. Usually I know there is something wrong.

I: The experience of the warring tongues, and here I'm looking at feeling and consequences and what you actually do, that whole experience compared to your gentle tongues? Can you describe a bit more, the difference?

F5: The gentle tongues, like when I'm just in conversation with the Lord, or like, I get up in the morning, I wake up in the morning and I'll start speaking in tongues quietly, it's gentle, it's soothing, it's quiet; sometimes I get distracted, sometimes I don't, then I go back to them. [longer pause] yeah, there's no urgency, there's no, where the other, there is an urgency. That's the big difference between the two of them. And I feel almost agitated is not the right word, but I can [pause]

I: Hyperactivity?

F5: Hyper, yeah, hyper yeah, yeah would be a good word. Yeah.

F6:3

I can remember one time being at a prayer meeting. And coming home, and I forget what happened, I was driving the car, and I started. I was hitting the wheel and I was [she illustrates hitting the wheel and tongue-speaking] you know, really, really, really, like I was mad. I was angry. I was doing warfare. So, there is another aspect of speaking in tongues; where you can do warfare, and then I, all the way home. And then when I got home it just – chooo [she blows out] – it was gone. And that's happened a few times. You know?

F6:10

I remember one time I was alone at home. [clears throat] And I started to speak in tongues – I guess I was working, I don't know. And I had an experience – I felt really as if I was uplifted you know, and it was, that happened, I forget, if it happened once or twice but [pause] I think I took the

time to really, and then I was, again, I was doing it loud. [pause] And a lot of times [pause] if you're alone or there's other people around, you don't have that freedom to do it you know? So, like I say, just being alone in the house and it was just great. It was great. It's like in the car, you know, "weee let's go!" kind of, and so, I was at war I tell you.

F11:1

... but then it started to come as I started to be at prayer meetings and that. And I felt with my experience with tongues, [it] is a prayer language 'yes' like I mean, soft and gentle, but it was [also] of a warring tongue. Like it was always strong and I didn't know at the time that it was warring tongues, but I understood later it was. So, used it in prayer like that or in situations and it would just [pause] I would start speaking in a real warring tongue. ...

I: Ok. And then you started in a more warring tongue, which was a different manifestation for you in speaking in tongues?

F11: Yes, that's right. That's right. It was something I did though but as I said, I said those few words, [and] then it became really militant.

M5:4

... I would say that sometimes what I've noticed is sometimes it's different. Sometimes it's an, you're praying, and it's aggressive. Other times, it's really just mellow. When it's a, something from God like I say, it's something bubbling inside and it just comes out. It'll start most of the time aggressive – it's different.

M6:2

As a matter of fact, now I have three distinct languages that have been given to me. I cannot turn one on at the [pause] you know, I can't speak in one knowingly and then drift into another one. It's whatever [pause] what happens at the time, you know, come. With the exception of when we are in – my wife and I do a lot of ministry, a lot of counselling and we have been involved in a deliverance ministry from about year one, after our initial conversion. [pause] any time we were deliverance, where there's warfare taking place – you know demonic warfare, there's a different, I think, a different language, but it's very harsh, it's very [pause] it's very [pause] – what's the word I want now demanding. You know a very, very directive, I guess that's a better word, very directive.

I: Is it louder?

M6: Yes. Yeah. Yeah. [pause] And I, and we usually minister very gentle, so we are not loud yellers or screamers, or, you know.

I: Right. Right, so that there is a different force?

M6: Yeah, yeah yeah.

4. The *comical* utterance takes its form as an hilarious, spontaneous laughter. The expression is one where the glossolalist appears to

be experiencing a great joke or some 'thing' that is overwhelmingly laughable. This expression of unrestrained laughter is occasioned by nothing else than a spontaneous outburst experienced by the glossolalist (often seen/felt as uncontrollable). "*Comical* applies to that which arouses unrestrained spontaneous hilarity." (Merriam-Webster, 1994: 658)⁹

F3:7

F3: ... And also the very first time when I was doing it, I was speaking in tongues and laughing at the same time. It was like laughter and speaking in tongues. And an unbelievable feeling of - like the warmth and excitement and joy, you know. Yeah, I didn't mention joy. But joy was definitely there. And joy is there a number of times when I've spoken. And that's something I hadn't really talked about too much. But yeah, joy is definitely there. ...

F3:11 [at another point in the interview]

I: You talked about feeling the presence of the Lord. Can you just describe that a bit? What does that mean?

F3: It's different, different times. Sometimes, I've had this holy laughter thing. This joy, this deep, deep joy. And it's been like - it happened once when we were at church actually, and we had a prayer meeting. And we were all on the ground, just slain in the spirit, while the pastor and an elder was praying for us. And we had a really good prayer meeting up to that point, and we were just falling like flies. And I, suddenly I start[ed] laughing. I just started laughing and it was bubbling up just like a brook. It was bubbling up within me. And at first, I thought well I'm going to try and stop it, but I couldn't stop it. I started laughing. And they, everyone just ignored me. It's a real belly laugh. And the pastor's wife, came in, she had been teaching, and she just came in at that point, she hadn't seen anything, gone into any prayer - she came over to me and she touched me, and she started to say, "Oh, Lord give her more," and she fell down laughing at the same time. And three other people came up to me and touched me, and it was the same thing - they all fell down laughing. We had the best time, believe me. So, that was like a, I've probably forgotten your question now but [she laughs] we were bubbling up with this joy anyway.

M3:5

... Ah with me, it's more like in the emotions. And I have a tendency to either want to laugh or cry but it's the same. ...

I: Any other manifestations? Any groaning, crying, weeping, any sounds?

M5:14

Definitely laughing.

I: OK

⁹ Some glossolalists will refer to this expression as "holy laughter."

M5: For hours. [he chuckles] Definitely groaning for sure. Like, I think every manifestation you can mention.

I: Except the singing?

M5: Except the singing. I don't sing at all.

5. The description of the *groaning* type of glossolalic utterance comes directly from the meaning of the word "groan." It means "to utter a deep moan indicative of pain, grief, or annoyance; to make a harsh sound (as of creaking) under sudden or prolonged strain." (Merriam-Webster, 1994: 513) This sound can be indicative of several kinds of emotions, which are part of human experiencing; however, in the glossolalist's experience it is attributed to great travail in prayer for self or another person or persons, or for a particular [unknown] situation, or for an institution. It uses a great deal of the glossolalist's physical energy.

While I kept silence, my body
wasted away,
through my groaning all day
long.
For day and night your hand
Was heavy upon me;
My strength was dried up as
By the heat of summer.
Psalm 32:3-4 [NRSV]

As occurs with the lamenting utterance, the groaning utterance is a form of glossolalic speech-expression that is considered dissonant by others hearing it, especially when it occurs in a public service (even in the presence of glossolalists). It is a behaviour that frequently results in a form of "shunning" by the group, and not infrequently, causes the individual to practice it solely in private, thereby avoiding embarrassment or negative reaction from

others. In private, the glossolalist can simply allow the expression to take over. Some of these groaning type glossolalic utterances can blur into the category of utterances referred to as animal or creature utterances, as well as lamenting utterances.

F4:3

In terms of speaking in tongues, or feeling like I've got a special language [pause] I don't know. I, when I am totally at the end of myself [pause] and I enter into lamentations before God, [pause] I, sometimes have no words and just feel there is some groaning utterance that just comes from [pause] the bottom or the deepest part of my being. [pause] I sometimes am very aware that maybe "this weekend" will be an entering, a weeping for Jerusalem weekend, where I will spend the weekend in [pause] experiencing great sorrow and crying over the state of our city and the church - [pause] And in relation to the poor. [pause] so that is something that, that happens pretty automatically for me. And I just kind of go with that. I believe in the practice of lamentation [pause].

I: So, first of all, how would you get started in your practice of-

F4: The groaning?

I: The groaning – yes.

F4: Usually I'd be in prayer. I think that at some point in prayer I would dissociate. I would begin to dissociate, and [pause] and feel like my emotions are getting kicked in. Maybe I'm crying [pause] and [pause] and then it just kind of comes up.

F11:1

About [pause] I guess it was about ten years that I was a Christian, when, usually in tongues you have to open your mouth and you speak. You're willing speaking or not speaking. But all of a sudden in a powerful meeting, my tongue just started to move by itself. And that [was] a pretty kind of, in a way, weird experience because when I spoke with the Pastor and I said, "My tongue is moving by itself in my mouth." And he just said, "Well, go with that." So, and [pause] that was the beginning, after about two or three years, then I started to have more manifestations in that sense.

F11:4 [pause] Well, when I'm into [she illustrates – deep uh uh uh sound] – sometimes this is the way it goes you know. I feel victorious, powerful, it's like a plaiting [sic] I'm doing a battle. And that would be, as far as I know, the war. Other times, when I'm going into the groaning and the grunting, although I don't feel [pause] physical pain, like I know it's not mine, because there's nothing attached to it; my mind is blank, but I can actually feel physical pain. I cry. Sometimes I'll cry with tears, sometimes I cry with no tears, sometimes I'll get into a position of birthing even....

F11:5 But the tongues themselves, like as far as the warring tongues, since I have the manifestations of the roaring they call it roaring, which is the screeching, well people call it screaming, but anyway, since I've had that, I've

had less tongues because it manifests itself in that way. And I realize that, because it - now, lately, the tongues are coming back a little bit more, it's changing a bit. And I'll be in a warring tongue, and then this comes, so, I know definitely, that it's right after the other level of tongues.

6. The *lamenting* glossolalic expression has the sound of someone who is actually mourning; it is similar to someone experiencing tremendous heart-felt grief. It can be an extreme sound involving crying both with or without tears. This is both softly expressed or it can express as an extremely loud lament. Again, this expression can be considered dissonant by others hearing it, should it happen to occur spontaneously, in a public service.

F3:5

...And I'm really interceding on behalf of my part and what I have to do with my family. And, oh, the emotions are just something else, which I don't really want to get into, because I'll just cry, you know. But when it's things like that. And basically, when I do, get right into it, I cry - when I'm praying and crying. Then my spirit really does need something else to express all of these feelings. All of the problems, the thoughts, the emotions, that's when the tongues really, really come into play a lot. And I guess you could equally as well as say, that's the same for others. When their stories touch so much [pause] and the problems surrounding, maybe, what they've told me are so vast, which is some of these problems I have, and [they are] beyond me, beyond my scope of wisdom and understanding. If I really feel that I can't, I don't know the words to use, "So, Lord, I'm going to just use my language you've given me and leave all with you" you know, and it does, it helps to pray in tongues then.

F4:4-8

F4:... Because it's, to me, it's essentially the same process that happens. [pause] I mean if I go into sort of psychological clinical framework [pause] I've been diagnosed for years and years as post-traumatic stress with dissociative features. [pause] So, I've got that, which means I can zone, zone out. You know about dissociation?

I: Yeah. Yeah.

F4: So, entering into prayer or entering into a state [pause] you know, feels not, it doesn't feel a whole lot different than being in a dissociative state.

I: Yeah.

F4:10

F4: ... So, in terms of the uttering and groaning you know I get a sense that it's the spirit of God within me that [pause] you know, where there's no more words left. And I have no need to, nor do I seek out to necessarily know the

meaning of what that's about [long pause]. There's comfort in it and I just let go. [pause]

I: So, you have comfort despite the fact that you're really, really lamenting?

F4: Well, the comfort I have is knowing that I'm on a truthful path.

I: Ok.

F4: That [pause] that instead of feeling pain and running and hiding from it, that I have totally convinced myself that the great lessons of life are learnt through the pathway of pain. [pause] And it's certainly been that way in my life. So, not that I want to masochistically bring on pain to myself, but yeah, the truth is that some of the most difficult things in my life are when I'm willing to die, when I willing to, you know in these experiences, they are part of dying to self. It's part of, little more my own self-ego dying and letting God rise up within me.

7. The *screaming* utterances are a rarer form of glossolalic expression. A description of this is best left to one of the respondents. It should be mentioned that this expression is considered by many as a dissonant (or perhaps even a 'deviant' form of) glossolalia within a charismatic setting and can result in a great deal of misunderstanding. As will be discussed later in the dissertation, the groaning, lamenting, and screaming form of utterances can result in negative sanctions against the individual who experiences this type of glossolalia.

F6:4

But I mean, there's been some experiences like that, you know, through the years. There's lots cause I, [clears throat] when I first became a Christian [I was] all over the place. I was so hungry to know God, and things like that you know. But there's been a lot of experience[s]. Like when we used to have prayer meetings with _____, at – when we were at the other place, and like one time, we were just praying, and this scream came out of me, you know and I was just, I don't know if it was tongues associated with it or something, but it was just something that just came out. So, like, you know, like tongues to me is, it's not just speaking in tongues, there's – it can effect your whole being, you know. So I don't know [she chuckles] it's strange.

F11:1

. . . it's like a power comes upon me, and, and comes from within, and screams will come out or groans, or and that, and it can be screeching

sounds, as well as softer sounds or **grunting** or like a birthing process where you're **moaning or crying** or [pause] so that I have these screeches also, which are quite piercing. And uh I don't have any control over that. When it comes very powerfully, I can't stop it. . . . [emphasis by researcher]

B. The *subvocal* type of utterance is a form of speech that is not labial speech but rather, it is characterized by the occurrence in the brain of glossolalic-words in speech order, with or without inaudible articulation of the speech organs (e.g., the tongue or lips).

F5:8

It's almost like I can speak in tongues now and talk to you at the same time.

I: Yes. Yes.

F5: Or, I can speak in tongues now and think of what [pause] or what we're going to do in home group tonight. Or, I can speak quiet inside and speak, just speaking in tongues under my breath; this is not out loud or anything, and [pause] remember, 'Oh, gees, I've got to pay that bill tomorrow.'

I: Right.

F5: All the normal every-ordinary-day things, and that amazes me. [F5 emphasizes this last part of her sentence]

M6:4

...we do a lot of ministry with people, in the ministry of prayer- prayer ministry – where we are in the healing, intercessory, and [pause] again, these people belong to the Lord, so therefore, we're seeking what the Lord wants done in a person's life; we will say to them, you know, "Just relax and we're going to ask the Lord Jesus to take you to a memory or to an emotion or to something that has happened in your past, that is perpetrating the negative fruit we see in your life." [pause] Now, quite often the counselee will get a vision, or you know, all of a sudden, we had it happen yesterday – a man said to us, "You know, when I was five or six years old, 'so-and-so' happened and father, you know, really erupted, and, and there was a negative episode" in his life. That to me, is the answer to the question that we asked, so we go there. [he taps the table with his hands] When we went there my wife revealed to him that in her piece of paper, that she had in front of her, she had written down, when I asked the question, she wrote down 5-7 on her piece of paper [he demonstrates this on the table as we speak] And she says, " that confirms that, that the Lord was wanting you to go to about age five to seven, does that make sense?" Well, he said, "It's probably seven rather than six. Maybe five but around that time." So, that's a sort of confirmation. While we were doing this, [pause] this prayer language is going on in the spirit.

I: Within you? Silently?

M6: Within me. Yeah. Silently. And the same thing in my wife. So, we both use it quite often [pause]

The following, is an example of an individual's first experience with tongue-speaking/glossolalia. He has just expressed the fact [on taped interview] that he is on a spiritual retreat weekend and he is in a quiet, meditative experience.

M3:1

So, I was on my cot, very quiet and I was just trying to quiet my mind down, my spirit down. I just was talking to God, and I don't remember the gist of what I was praying, or what I was saying, but I started getting this gibberish in my mind and I thought, "What is this garbage?" And I just cleared my mind again, and start praying again, and talking to God, and this would come back again. Finally, I said, "God you're going to have to get rid of this garbage so I can [chuckle] talk with you." Because I had no idea what was going on. And, that was all that happened there. I didn't flow in it in any great way. It was just there.

This individual now also uses this as follows:

M3:2 Well, I see it now as I use it as a tool or instrument. When I know what it does in the spirit realm, like in my spirit. For instance, if I set down to pray with someone, and I don't know what to pray, you know, I will just quietly slip into tongues, you know. Like I'll say, "Lord, I don't know what to pray for here. You are going to have to help me."

I: Do you do that in your mind or do you verbally do this?

M3: Yeah, in my mind. And just pray silently in tongues. And very often the Lord will reveal something to me. But it is through that. So I was able to, or I am able to communicate if you will. It's a communication with the spirit.

C. *Animal or creature-like* glossolalic utterances are sounds that are similar to various animal sounds and noises occurring in nature (other than the 'sound' of the wind). The name for this category of manifest expression, comes from the meaning of the word "creature." It means something created, either animate or inanimate (such as a lower form of animal than *Homo sapiens* but could also be a form of *sound* originating in a human being). The sounds expressed here can also be described as being of an anomalous or

uncertain nature. These sounds or noises can be soft or loud and are found in both personal and public expressions of glossolalia.

M2:11

I think when the renewal came to the Toronto Airport Christian Fellowship 1994 on; some of those manifestation of barking dogs, and people going around barking and roaring like a lion and that, I think those were controllable but it seemed like they weren't; it was more easy to yield to that desire to do that, because of the experience you were under at the time. But if you really wanted to stop, you could stop. I mean, I experience that myself. I mean the roaring and all that; I had been there [TACF] the first year; at first I thought these people were way off the deep end. And but when I finally did experience that myself, I found that I could stop it, but it was like scratching an itch. You know what I mean? It just felt like I wanted to do this, I don't know why? But I wanted to do it – 'till later I realized it was the prophetic symbolism of Jesus marking his territory – taking back what the enemy had stolen – prophetically.

F1:1

Since then [that is her first experience where she spontaneously spoke in tongues for twenty minutes] I have occasionally spontaneously made sounds during a kinesiology treatment.

F1:2 ...usually I start to move my arms and body with the energy, then sometimes sounds come. Different from the first experience that was just voice.

F11:1

... it's like a power comes upon me ... as well as softer sounds or grunting . .

F12:1

I have one that I kind of call it my language because I know it's me, it's my tongue. But frequently, other streams will come, yeah. And then I will, uh often uh, not well often, yes, I'll make noises, depending on – for instance the other night. I was having difficulty sleeping. So my tongues went into a kind of, I call it my chipmunk; it makes this soothing little sound, you know?

F12 :2 [continues] Like, I'm in bed at night. I can't sleep and I'll use my tongue. And all kinds of things happen. Sometimes I'll get some animal sounds and it will be so soothing ... it just lulls me to sleep.

D. In the *anemos* utterance, literally and physically, the glossolalist blows out his/her breath. Breath is also sucked in and forced out of the glossolalist's lungs through the mouth, sometimes gently and sometimes with considerable

force. Tracing the etymology of the English word “animate” reveals an important aspect of this form of glossolalic expression. Anemos comes from the Greek and literally means “wind.” It is part of the etymology of the current [adjective or intransitive verb] English word “animate.” *Animate* comes from the Middle English, from the Latin word *animatus*, past participle of *animare* which means “to give life to”, from the word *anima* which means “breath, soul;” akin to the Old English word *āthian*, meaning “to breathe”, and the Latin word *animus* meaning “spirit;” coming from the Greek word *anemos* meaning “wind,” from the Sanskrit word *aniti* meaning “he breathes.” (Merriam-Webster, 1994: 46)

F12:3

And so I've been practicing speaking in tongues more, and just letting it happen. And just [pause] all kinds of strange things happen to me because, I think with me, there's something about the breathing. I actually get extremely breathless and I gasp for breath and I'll have to stop and start [speaking in tongues] again. . . . I sometimes, now, blow out and breathe in; it's like something inside of me almost beyond my control. Sometimes I need to blow out and then I'll take a deep breath in. It's like a deep inner need and sometimes I feel it's God's spirit just breathing through me or making me breath deeply so to symbolically take in God For me, it's Spirit taking me; it's not because I don't know how to breath...Because once I do have the difficulty breathing though, I feel so relaxed afterwards. It's like I had to get all that out you know? Taking this deep breath and it's probably, in a way, forcing me to do deep breathing and focuses me on breath.

Glossolalia as Experienced by Glossolalists Studied: Glossolalia

Exhumed

In elucidating the typology of glossolalic utterances, the reader sees a range of expression. Not apparent however, are some of the concomitant experiences of the glossolalist. These experiences are highlighted in Figure

6.2. The subsequent discussion will again make use of examples from the transcribed interviews, in order to explicitly illustrate some of these experiences for the reader.

Systematic representation such as Figure 6.2, is necessary, in order to capture and highlight the “wholistic” nature/essence of the glossolalic existence.

- A. Body
 - 1. hand signing/clapping
 - 2. stomping of feet/toe-tapping/jumping
 - 3. pacing
 - 4. rhythmic swaying/rocking
 - 5. dancing
 - 6. crying – with or without tears
 - 7. fragrances (e.g., smelling roses)
- B. Physiology
 - 1. "rumbling" in solar plexus area
 - 2. feelings/sensations around the heart/bodily vibration and shaking
 - 3. hyperactivity/feeling "agitated"
 - 4. tingling of head and especially hands
 - 5. heat in the hands
 - 6. exhaustion
 - 7. physical healing
 - 8. ecstasy
- C. Automatism
 - 1. automatic writing/journalizing
 - 2. music/singing/artwork
 - 3. extemporaneous speech
- D. Mental
 - 1. "psi-like" experiences such as knowledge, and foreknowledge (could be considered clairaudience, telepathy, and clairvoyance)
 - 2. dreams/day-dreams
 - 3. hearing voices/word[s]/messages
 - 4. visions/pictures/mental movies
 - 5. psychic healing
 - 6. writing in journal (questions-answers received immediately/while in prayer experience)
 - 7. out-of-body experiences
- E. Catatonic
 - 1. "slain in the spirit" experience
 - 2. remaining in any one position (immovable)
- F. Aesthetic
 - 1. experiencing "beauty" (diamonds, angels, geometry)
 - 2. brilliant light (coloured or white)
 - 3. heightened emotions ("feeling" in the mind and body)
 - 4. feeling of "bliss"
- G. Creative
 - 1. music
 - 2. poetry
 - 3. art/painting
 - 4. pottery
 - 5. writing

FIGURE 6.2 Concomitant Experiential Aspects of Glossolalic Behaviour

The concomitant dimensions of glossolalia listed above are consciously evident to the glossolalist and reported during the interview process; they are also experienced by the self-conscious transpersonal researcher. Many of these behaviours are noticeable to an [outside] observer when they occur in a charismatic meeting. Each dimension listed above has various characteristic expression. Figure 6.2 is not to be considered an inclusive or exclusive array of the behavioural dimensions related to glossolalic expression.

Of the glossolalists interviewed, not all associate the experiences adumbrated in Figure 6.2 directly with tongue-speaking. Upon probing and questioning during the interview, all glossolalists elucidate other experiences occurring just prior to, at, or after the time of glossolalia.¹⁰

With continued use of tongue-speaking, the glossolalist becomes much more “relaxed” in using tongues and subsequently, things “change.” The following quote highlights this research finding more overtly.

M9:2,3

I: So, has your experience in tongues changed since that initial [tongue] speaking?

M9:

Oh yes. It's become much more relaxed [sic] in using it, I use it every day. Probably, four or five times a day. [clears throat] The Apostle Paul says in one point, that it's just as important for him to speak with his mind as it is with his spirit. And I found that perfectly true; that I sometimes didn't know how to pray or what to pray. And I found the gift of tongues enabled me to pray about subjects, or people, or circumstances that I just didn't know how to pray in those circumstances.

¹⁰ Without deprecating any of the reported experiences uncovered in this research project, mention needs to be made of the fact that in some areas of the glossolalist's experience, there are areas that are articulated more clearly than others.

... So the gifts, speaking in tongues, was part of that at all time[s] before counselling with people, after counselling with people. I was constantly using that gift to help me understand what I was facing, what I could think about, what the situation was after the event and made some notes.

The above type of quote was repeated many times in interviews with other glossolalists, despite the fact that the answer to the question: "Has your experience in tongues changed?" might be prefaced with: "No not really. . . ." It also became apparent that glossolalia is experienced and viewed as a "natural" part of the person's lived daily experience. Over and over again the researcher heard something similar to the following quotes.

M9:6

... the gift of tongues is something I use many times in the day. . . .

M2:3

Like I would, I pray in tongues everyday. I don't have a time set aside, "Now I am going to pray in tongues for an hour." Although some people do that and it probably is good because they are edified and built up in the Lord that way.

M4:2

My prayer time tend to be fairly short and in pieces through the day. So, I'm not one to sit and, very rarely in my Christian walk have I ever sat and felt a burden to pray for something for hours. . . . I mean that's not me. I'm really along the lines of express what is on my heart to express and saying it again is not going to change anything. So I just move on. Ah, and so as part of my dialogue with God during the day, which would come and go, I would usually speak in English but may also [pause] So, I guess the tongues would accompany something else in terms of a dialogue with, or something you know, an expression to God. The tongues would accompany that as opposed to beginning with that.

M5:6

So when I feel this [previously speaking about "when I feel the presence of God"] and I am praying for someone, most of that time I will speak in tongues. Man! You're asking me questions I never even – it just comes so natural, I just don't think about [it].

M6:2

... and ever since then [his first experience 22 years ago] I have easily and you know it flows at any time I want.

M6:19

. . . It is automatic. I was going to say it's like driving a car. It's automatic. It's there all the time. It's not all the time, it's there, all of a sudden you sort of realize that you're whispering or praying in the spirit in your prayer language.

F6:8

Like I pray every day. I read my word and then I pray and [pause] often, a lot of times - and like when I pray around the church, once a week [pause] like I usually come on Friday and I pray for at least an hour, and I don't speak in hardly any English. [pause] English is just all I say is one or two sentences [pause] and when I'm praying over the seats and stuff, I might say, I say usually, I say, "supply all their needs according to your riches in glory, through Christ Jesus," but he's had me, lately he's had me saying that uh [pause] "Bring those who, whose hearts are empty and are heavy, and they really need a touch from you. Draw them, draw them in Lord," and then the tongues come. That's usually, but that's not till after I've walked around at least seven times or so. And then I start. . . . And I, last week when I was here, [pause] I didn't even hardly get to say anything at first. Like I prayed over the instruments I pray over the sound equipment, and all the instruments and all the banners, and then I walk around and I ask for his purpose and his agenda, and I ask what he wants to do, you know, brought forth and stuff. And last week, uh, [pause] it was really weird because I barely started [pause] praying in tongues and I got singing and I must have sang four or five songs. And then I got the English.

F5:11,12

I really surprize myself sometimes and think "Oh, no!" You know I'm doing something and all of a sudden I start speaking in tongues. I mean it's not I don't even think about it, I don't you know? It's as natural as getting dressed in the morning. . . . It's almost, like natural like breathing.

These glossolalists use tongue-speaking regularly (as noted above), and experience many of the aspects listed in Figure 6.2. Some of these experiences are spontaneously occurring and others are intended; that is, they come in response to a desire, expressed in terms of wanting to "know more of God," or "wanting all that God has to offer." Examples of how this desire is expressed is highlighted by the following two quotations.

F4:3

. . . Because in fact, in terms of charismatic or believing in God's gifts and all that the spirit is willing to give us, I believe and want anything that God wants to give. And I believe that God can do anything he wants to do in terms of

[pause] in terms of you know gifts of the spirit and healings and miracles, all that. I've seen amazing things.

M9:3

. . . And one of the things I had said to the Lord when I was going through this struggle was if the nine supernatural gifts of the spirit are for the church today, then I want to experience everyone of them. And over that period of a year, in learning how to use them and then working as a pastor in ministry, I found I experienced every one of the nine supernatural gifts of the spirit within that one year period.¹¹

It would take another volume to adequately portray the many rich experiences of these glossolalists. In order that the reader gain an understanding of a fuller glossolalic experience than has been forthcoming in the extant literature, several interesting examples follow; these highlight the natural experiences and the *[life]*world of *[these]* glossolalists.¹²

It is noted that the experiences transcribed here are not "corporate" experiences *per se*. Rather, they are part of the everyday lifeworld of the practicing charismatic Christian; though these are and can be experienced in the corporate charismatic setting. The reader is again reminded that these respondents are persons who are considered to be psycho-spiritual organisms who are responding to a world inhabited by visible and invisible beings. That information comes *to* and *directs* the person to act, respond, say, or do a particular thing, is a result of *mindfully* attending to the "inner life," or as the

¹¹ The "nine gifts" referred to here are those listed in The New Testament Scriptures, in the book of first Corinthians (1 Cor. 12: 1-11). These are: *utterance of wisdom, utterance of knowledge, faith, gifts of healing, working miracles, prophecy, discernment of spirits, various kinds of tongues, and interpretation of tongues.*

¹² In fact, as will be discussed further in the dissertation, the characteristic aspects listed in Figure 6.2, are normal actualities in the glossolalist's existence. Overall, they are not static examples of "one-off" experiences. Rather, at any time the glossolalist can break out in tongues (singing or speaking), begin to "travail," laugh with "joy," or simply "rest in the Spirit,"

glossolalist might respond, "listening for the voice of God" or "listening to the Holy Spirit." The consequence of such an attention to the "spiritual" is discussed in the following chapter.

"Individuals within a sociocultural system interpret their own altered-state-of-consciousness experiences within the perspectives of that system." (Arden, 1998: 111); cross-cultural studies make this point (see Bourguignon, 1973; 1989; Geertz, 1973; Goodman, 1972a; Hale, 1997; Lex, 1976). "In other words, there is a profound interaction between one's cultural experience and one's interpretation of subjective experience." (Arden, 1998: 112; see also Spradley, 1980; and Persinger, 1989)

The *natural world* for these glossolalists is a world inhabited by "Spirit;" or, stated another way, it is the "spirit-filled world," populated by angels, demons, higher-beings and lower spirits.¹³ As is readily apparent, the charismatic Christian has a special *language* (a distinctive vocabulary with which to describe the events taking place in his/her life); along with language, there are certain behavioural expressions that are part of this community. In other words, what we have here is a *culture*; the group has distinctive *cultural behaviour*, *cultural knowledge*, and *cultural artifacts*. Using Spradley's succinct and cogent definition, culture is here defined as: "the acquired knowledge people use to interpret experience and generate behaviour."

and find herself experiencing a vision, a special song, some insight, a message of some sort, or some other 'spiritual' occurrence.

¹³ In the cosmology of the Christian there is "God and his legions of angels," and there is also "Satan/Devil and his angels."

(1980:7) Implicit in these glossolalists' accounts, are not only the encoded linguistic forms of language, but also encoded culture-bound assumptions, and explicit and tacit knowledge. "Both explicit and tacit cultural knowledge are revealed through speech, whether in casual comments or lengthy interviews." (Spradley, 1980: 12)

While it is recognized that the narratives that follow are a transcribed account of a reflected-upon, recounted experience during a formal interview process, it is hoped that the reader will be open to a *vicarious* experiencing of the respondent's account.¹⁴ Many of the experiences recalled by the respondents were initially of such an impact in its original experiencing, that details most often remain as vivid and fresh as if the experience had just occurred.

SELECTED EXAMPLES OF CONCOMITANT EXPERIENCES OF THE GLOSSOLALIST

Body Dimensions

F7:4

In my early days, when I was alone, as I said, I used to get up and pray for an hour in the morning before going to work for 530am. I use to sing as I went to work; I would pray. I did [pause] I spent a lot of time in prayer in the first couple of years [pause]. And I saw visions. I saw a number of visions. I have a book that I've written of the visions. But now [pause] I rarely [pause] have enough space to really, to really enter into that kind of contact. . . . When I was able to - when I was part of the prayer group and could sing there with other people, that was very meaningful. I used to dance sometimes, I would just sing in the spirit and dance to it. . . .

Physiological Changes

M6:12

What I get when, I don't know if we're off subject here, but we're talking about the anointing; any time the anointing is around, the healing anointing for instance, Ok? I can get it, and it will show up sometimes first in my hands, my left hand especially will get pin-and-needles hot. And sometimes it goes to both. At that time, if any, if there's ministry to take place and I go anywhere near people or touch them, they will go out in the spirit – they will just go out under the power of the Lord. Now that's, the Lord, I guess getting ready for, to do things through me, I don't know. That is similar to the anointing that comes, in, that I know, in my knower. The anointing that comes through my knower can come without the hot hands, but it also can be with the hot hands. Now, what's related to that is the prayer language in me, in the spirit, is almost continuous. It's almost, like you don't know that it's there – it's like driving the car, you don't know you're driving a car, but you're driving the car – you are doing things automatically. Well the same thing happens. But you will find, I find myself, speaking in tongues.

F8:12

I know when he's showing me when I have to do something. Like I know – it's very strong in my spirit. It's like something burning. It's like it's burning, it's like when I have -

I: Inside of you? You actually can feel the burning in your body?

D: Oh yeah. I can feel it. I feel like I'm beat red. I feel that because of the heat I feel in my body. I feel like I should be beat red.

I: Alright. And interpret that for me again. When you feel this heat?

D: I know that God wants me to say something, or do something or [pause] and usually [pause] it's after I've been praying for a period of time, I'd say twenty minutes or half an hour.

I: In tongues?

D: Yeah.

I: Ok. Ok.

D: Like I say, I have trouble talking in English to pray. [pause] I really do. I don't know why.

F11:2,3

F11: Well, that's something else. The militant tongues started first. But I guess in 1983, again at a conference; it seems to be when these things begin, 'cause there's more power there; and it started shaking.

I: Your body started shaking?

F11: Yeah, mostly my hand. One hand, then the other hand, and then I guess the arms. And sometimes, vibrating. My body will vibrate. But the vibration of the body started a few years later. Like things came gradually. Yeah, I guess it was in about 90 or 91, that I was at a conference that really spoke to me. And again, it was speaking about warfare. And my whole body

¹⁴ Spradley writes, "Every ethnographer makes use of what people say in seeking to describe their culture." (1980: 12)

was vibrating. Like there was such an experience of knowing this is it; and this is right and my whole body, not only my hands shaking, it was a vibration throughout my body.

I: Ok. This vibration, aside from seeing it outside, you could see things shake?

F11: I'm not sure you could that time.

I: Ok.

F11: I don't know. This might have been inside.

I: So you felt it? You felt it inside?

F11: Oh, yeah really did.

I: Just describe this a bit more. What's happening inside your body when this happens?

F11: How can I describe that? I guess I could say – just a vibration. It was just like, - it's like there was definitely a power that I felt upon me; then this vibration within. It was like something like this, like everything was, it was a nice feeling. It was not a feeling of fear, like you shake with fear? No – it was like [a] warm vibration.

I: Ok. Would it be tingling at all? [pause] I'm trying to just relate to it.

F11: Mm. Yeah, I guess you could say it would be. Yeah. Yeah.

I: Did it start at any particular location of your body that you know of?

F11: Mostly around my chest, around my heart [she illustrates]

I: Around here – your chest, your heart?

F11: Yeah, I would say that's what it is yeah. Around that.

I: And how long? Do you still have this manifestation?

F11: Uh, n[o]. Well, sometimes, but not really. I think it was pretty well – one time deal that. And it had to do – although I do get that sort of thing when there's a word spoken or something. It's like a confirmation, that happens in my body. It doesn't happen in my head; it doesn't happen in my feelings; my body responds to a word. And at first I thought this is weird. But I realize that [with] someone my body responds; when the word, I feel I guess or I would say even the word is of God, like I vibrate with it. And that's happened after, yeah.

I: Ok. No, this is good. A word that we have in my methodology that I am using when I analyze all these tapes, it's called "sympathetic resonance."

F11: [she quickly responds] That's it! That's resonance. Resonance. Exactly. Exactly that's the word I didn't know. But.

I: Mm. It's a good. I think it describes it.

F11: It describes it perfectly. Perfectly.

A Healing of Agoraphobia

M5:4,5

I think the best time in tongues – I think my son was suffering from acrophobia and he was only seven or eight years old then. I have to think – how old was he, yeah, so it's been longer than that, that I've been speaking in tongues, because he's twenty-five now, yeah I've been speaking in tongues a long time, because I believe he was, well, he might have been nine years old, ten

years old. It's about fifteen years ago. Because, I remember, he was suffering from agoraphobia and he was just a young kid and he couldn't go anywhere. Like, he would go to his friends and he wouldn't make it. And I say, he'd say, "Dad, I want to try. I want to try and sleep-over to see if I'll make it." And, he kept getting panic attacks and fear during the night and stuff. I kept praying for him for that. One night I was in my office and I was just reading [the book in the NT] "Mark," and all of a sudden he called me to pick him up. It was about one o'clock in the morning. And he says, "Dad, I'm so scared," he says, "I'm running out of the house. Everybody's sleeping here now. Pick me up." And it happened somewhere on a rural street. I says, "no, no wait there, I'm coming, I'm coming". So, I jumped into the car and something inside of me - I was so upset. It felt like something evil was hurting him. And causing him these problems so, then, it just started in tongues, really strong. And by the time I got there he was sitting on the porch and he was right at peace. And I came, I drove in. He said, "It's Ok Dad. Nobody woke up. Nobody heard me." But he says, "I'm totally Ok now." He says, "Can I stay here?" I said, "Yeah sure." And I said, "Don't forget Dad's still there if you want to call me, call me." And from that day forth he never had agoraphobia.

Heightened Sensitivity

M7:4

. . . The tongues are only an evidence of the Holy Spirit within you and as I became sensitive to what the holy spirit wanted in my life, I became aware of people I had to ask forgiveness of. [pause] I became more concerned for other people. [pause] And I became more open to expressing the Father's love for other people. I've been able to walk through an office or a mall or something and see someone in spiritual need or I assume they're in spiritual need, or in a doctor's office. I'd go over and touch someone on the shoulder and say, "May I pray for you?" And have them respond positively and had the freedom to pray and touch their lives. And it's remarkably for an old guy to go up to a young lady and say, 'I would like to pray for you.' It's pretty bold and yet I haven't been turned down yet. And yet, every time I feel impressed with the Holy Spirit.

I: So, you feel something before you do this?

M7: Oh yeah, yeah definitely.

I: Can you describe that feeling for me?

M7: Ah, [long pause] it's almost, I don't hear a voice, but I feel the impact of what the voice wants to say to me and I believe it's hearing the voice of God, but it's understanding what he is trying to tell me to do.

I: And where do you get that understanding? Is it something in your body, is it something you feel in your mind?

M7: Well, it's more than, it's more than in my mind. It's right within my very being. . . .

M7:5 [a little further in the interview]

M7: Now something that happens when I'm in a meeting praising the Lord, I raise my hands, to praise and to worship him and I feel like a pressure on my hands? Like, an air pressure on my hands.

I: Ok. This is when your hands are raised?

M7: Yeah. Mm. And not always. It depends on how intentionally I am praising and worshipping him.

Automatism

F12:15

F12: . . . So anyway, I had done this automatic writing. I had all these thoughts. I couldn't get them down fast enough. And then I drew a picture of what came to my mind. It was the brain that was very important - with the left hemisphere of the brain and the right hemisphere of the brain along with the corpus colossum, and I sense that this is very important . . . and I had all these words come to me, and the strongest word, after all these things, including love, was the idea of vapour. And for years I have felt that I was a vapour. And I didn't quite know where I was going with this but this was really important. . . .

Mental Phenomena

M9:5

I: This coloured picture ah, that you would get, would you say it's something inside your head? Do you see it outside of yourself?

M9: Both.

I: Both?

M9: At the beginning, I only would see it if I closed my eyes.

I: Oh, Ok.

M9: If I closed my eyes and invited the Holy Spirit, now, [clears throat] I had gone through a whole lot of teaching before that. About [clear throat] about believing first of all, that it's important to deal with your own life. To be clean before God. And I came through that, a lot of that through inner healing, because I didn't realize there was people who hurt me; that I needed to forgive. I didn't even believe they hurt me, but they did. And so I had to go through a cleansing time and of course that is a continual process, but I needed to go through that. But that I needed to be in a special close relationship with the Lord. I expected that he was going to give me anything. And so it began with [pause] sometimes, it was just a feeling. Like [teacher's name] would teach sometimes you're just going to get a feeling in your spirit. Sometimes you're going to get a picture, and strangely enough, God works in different ways, the holy spirit works in different ways with different believers, and some only go one way with it and others go a different way. For me, it was if I'd close my eyes, and I, by faith believed and asked the holy spirit to give me something, I believed he would give me a good picture. That was very important. Because, I felt before him, my heart was clean. I felt that it was something he was asking me to do. Therefore, Jesus said, he's not going to give you a stone if you ask him for a good thing. So, believe for a good thing. And believe that the picture that you see, it's got some good in it. And from that picture he's going to say something good. So [pause] I would begin, and

I began to see pictures, could be just scenery, [pause] it could be, sometimes, it was just a jumble of coloured forms that I had no idea of what it was I couldn't tell. But, if I just waited long enough, usually this picture, one picture came into focus. And then I sensed the Lord was saying something of what that picture meant. And then from that picture I would then try to minister to the person whom I was counselling, as to what I thought the Lord was saying for that person.

I: This sensing M9, when you say you are sensing something, does the sensing come first as a whole thought or as a phrase or, words, actual words, like a typewriter in your head, or how would you say you're sensing? I am just pushing your physiology here.

M9: Ah, sensing, ok, [pause] it was in my mind. It would start out just with a word, something small. And [long pause] later on, I took . . . [a] course in communing with God, . . . which is very good in teaching you how to journal in your quiet time. So I began to write out what I thought the Lord was saying to me. And the words were intuited, sort of, I didn't see the words. I saw the picture but the words just came up from within or up into my mind, but I'll be actually seeing them. And I had a sense the Lord was saying something. And so I would start writing or speaking what I thought he was saying. And then . . . I realized that flesh gets in the way at all time and so that anything that I did sense the Lord was saying, or that I would write down, maybe 80 per cent was of the Lord, but 20 per cent of it could be of me. So, ah, just to try and not take myself too seriously because, I am a vessel through which this is coming through, but it can be affected by coming through me, so I would be very careful that I don't declare something as God's will [pause] when I may have 80 per cent right but not the whole 100 per cent. So I would write down or minister out of what I did sense, and when it comes to prophecy I found I may get a word of knowledge or a picture of something but it would only be [pause] a word or two to get started with. And usually the other words came only when I opened my mouth and began speaking or began writing with my pen.

I: So, really it was nothing was premeditated?

M9: No.

M9 experiences a dramatic vision after a traumatic loss

M9:10,11

One of the most dramatic [experiences] that I have related to tongues, is, that about four years ago, five years ago, I have five brothers, and three of them were working on my brother's farms. And they were working on heavy equipment – moving earth. And my one brother was driving a dump truck and my other brother was driving - they call it a pay-loader; it's got one of the big scoops out front. He was driving that, and my other brother was driving a dump truck, the other was using an excavator. Well the one in the dump truck got stuck. So, he had been stuck a number of times that day, in the same place, so he would get out and my brother with the pay-loader would pull up near him and he would take the chain out of his truck, tie it around the bumper and then tie one around the top, or front pay-loader. Then, he'd get back in his truck and my brother would pull him out of the mud. Well, he went to do this at one point, and [pause] for an unknown reason, his truck started moving

towards him. And my brother in the pay-loader was trying to wave to my brother down below. But because of the roar of the motors, he never heard it and the truck crushed my brother [pause] and killed him. [pause and clears throat] And I was at home in the basement that night, working, doing some work in my basement, and my older brother had got the message first – the fact that it had happened; didn't know yet the full details. So, he called me and he said, "There's been a serious accident at [brother's] farm and right now [brother] is seriously hurt, injured, that's all we know." [pause] So, he hung up and immediately I began praying in tongues. I didn't know what to pray in that circumstance. And I prayed maybe ten minutes. And then I stopped, and after twenty minutes from the original call my brother called me again. He says, "He was killed." And, again, I began speaking in tongues. Not knowing what can I pray [M9 breaths out] And it never went through my head at the time, but it certainly did a little later, should I be praying that he be raised from the dead, because that is a possibility. But anyway, I just didn't. I just went right to speaking in tongues and no sooner had I started speaking in tongues, than I had a vision. [pause] In the vision I saw my brother who had been killed. And he was dressed in white, riding a white horse, and this was in heaven. And, he came into the scene and he was talking to two people, whom I didn't see but I knew who they were – [pause] they were my mother and father; they had both died. And, I could see, or sense, I couldn't see them, but I could sense that they were so glad to see their son but they couldn't understand why he was there. And he was glad to see them but he said, "Sorry I can't stop and talk with you right now. Jesus has told me to come and say 'Hello' but I have to go back because of the large battle about to begin and I need to go back and get ready for the battle." In the vision [huh – M9 breathes out deeply]. about that night - I left home that night and drove right to the brother who had been driving the pay-loader, and arrived at his place about three in the morning; and of course, he was really broken up about what happened. And when I told him that experience that I had, he realized it [the accident just related] wasn't his fault. [pause]

I: He had been blaming himself?

M9: Yeah, he was blaming himself. They had gone the next day, to the OPP and the Department of Labour; whenever there is an accident, they go and investigate it. They said, "There is no natural explanation as to why this accident happened. It wasn't as though he left it in gear and then went out, because if he had left it in gear, it would have started moving immediately. It wasn't until he was up there, had tied the chain and was almost ready to go back, the truck moved and crushed him." And I think it was the enemy. Now, I think, like nowadays, Satan doesn't have Herod's going around with swords to cut our heads off. But he's got lots of other ways of killing lots of people who are witnessing for him. And [brother] [pause] he had come into the fullness of the spirit as a missionary, and he had attempted to share with the church in [City], where he would go sometimes. And they completely put him off. They were afraid of this charismatic stuff his big brother had got him into. [pause] And, I just felt that the enemy was attacking him in here, and somehow that this was going to be a witness, to his faith. [pause] So, for one thing, it was a great relief to my younger brother who had been driving the machine, that this wasn't his fault. And I felt it was the enemy. And the next day at the funeral, I

think it was so funny – [he smiles] because about twelve people came up, stood up to talk about him and to say things about him, and one of the texts that somebody read – now, I don't know who all, but my brother told some of the close family members about what I had shared with him the night before, but one of the ladies who stood up, read that text from revelation about the
I: The white horse?

M9: The white horse dressed in white [he laughs] Yeah. And so, when I started my sermon, I started off with the vision that I had. And I just wish I could, every sermon that I ever preached that I had a vision like that to start off with 'cause I had my audience, like right away [pause]. And it was so powerful that this was from God. And God gave it to us to help us get through a terrible time; it was very terrible, he was the youngest of my brothers that had been killed.

Mental, Physical, Aesthetic and Creative Dimensions

F4:3

. . . I, when I am totally at the end of myself [pause] and I enter into lamentations before God, [pause] I, sometimes have no words and just feel there is some groaning utterance that just comes from [pause] the bottom or the deepest part of my being. [pause] I sometimes am very aware that maybe "this weekend" will be an entering, a weeping for Jerusalem weekend, where I will spend the weekend in uh [pause] experiencing great sorrow and uh crying over the state of our city and the church - [pause] and in relation to the poor [pause] so that is something that happens pretty automatically for me. And I just kind of go with that. I believe in the practice of lamentation [pause] Sometimes wonder, you know, in the church when we want to praise the Lord, why we don't praise in the same way as Jesus did. Because Jesus used the Psalms, and the majority of the Psalms are about lamentation. They are about "Where are you God?" you know, "What's happening God?" You know, it's not all the happy, clappy stuff. It's not all the victorious stuff. I know we need that probably more to encourage ourselves than to actually praise God. You know we probably need to sing some of that stuff just to keep ourselves encouraged. [pause] But I think that God's big enough that he can handle our lamentation and our crying out to him [pause] and I find that as I press in deeper, you know, in my knowledge of who God is in me, and what he would have me, what part he would have me play, the more I'm able to [pause] sit in the middle of that balance between joy and sorrow, and realize that the journey is definitely all about both. . . .

I: So, first of all, how would you get started in your, this practice of [the groaning?] the groaning, yes?

F4: Usually I'd be in prayer. I think that at some point in prayer I would dissociate. I would begin to dissociate. And [pause] and feel like my emotions are getting kicked in. Maybe I'm crying, [pause] and [pause] then it just kind of comes up.

I: Do you let it simply take it's course? Can you stop it, if you wanted too?

F4: Oh yeah, usually I plan it. Yeah, because usually it's like [pause] Ok, I feel a need to grieve. I'm going to take time and space here to grieve or I'm going to take time and space here in adoration or, so, [pause] it's, because [pause] in order to have a safe place to be able to really enter into the space.

I: And know that you won't be disturbed?

F4: Mm.

I: Would you know how often you do this? [pause] You don't have to quantify it if you don't want to, but it's just...

F4: I hadn't thought of it. [pause] But, I'm sure it's at least monthly.

I: Ok. And how long to you think it lasts? How long to you allow yourself?

F4: Sometimes it can last for a couple of days.

I: Ok. [pause] Are we talking [she beings again] sorry.

F4: And in the midst of that then I can receive visions [pause] and [pause] I'm a very visual person and I can see solutions or envision new things or new directions or sense a new imperative from God [pause]

I: And you see a very clear?

F4: I see it.

I: Like a movie in your mind?

F4: Yeah. I can paint it. I do a lot of art -work and sometimes you know, if I get a very clear, clear vision then I'll draw it out [long pause].

From the many respondent responses, practicing glossolalia assists in coping with life experiences; especially under difficult circumstances. The following narrative highlights another example of the glossolalic expression in the "extraordinary" existence of this respondent.

I: Is there any particular experience that stands out for you, that you can talk about to me?

F4:12

[long pause and she takes a deep breath] Yeah. Yeah.

I'll try to find one that's not a long one. But, yeah, actually this woman here [she points across the room to a picture on the wall], I worked with this woman and she – middle picture, and she was a hard-core street-kid. [pause] She'd been raised in a home where her father impregnated her; she gave birth at 14 to the baby; her father murdered the baby; her father is in an institution, and she ran to the streets and went into prostitution. And when I met her she was tough, tough as nails. Tough as any guy on the streets. Would just fight dirty and nasty. Got to know her well; she was heavily drug-addicted and was living in a crack-house; the place was full of vermin and roaches. She lived with a bunch of other folks in this house. I go in regularly into this house as well as others, but I go into this house to see if there's nursing care, see if anyone wants prayer, this sort of thing. So, I do a regular rotation. She began to get ill, HIV – went into full-blown AIDS; she was 39 years old, she had Hepatitis C, cirrhosis of the liver – so there were times when she would be coughing up frank blood, and her stomach was distended so she looked like

she was nine-months pregnant, and that was actually her liver, that was so inflamed. As she was dying and she refused medical care, she wanted to die at that house. So, we were able to get her a bed – a nice bed [pause]. I couldn't get public health to go into that building, [pause] because if any officials went to that building, they went with police escort, because the people were considered quite violent in that building. They weren't violent to me – I've known them for more than ten years, and I know them well. And I never felt any fear for my safety. Or, you know, my partner who I'd bring in with me. [pause] so, I couldn't do all the nursing care, and I didn't have volunteers that I could send in there, safely enough – because any time I went in, everybody would be injecting drugs, and doing drugs, everything right around there [pause] that I began to train the people in the house. [pause] And they would take shifts of sobriety – so they could wash her; so that they could change her diapers, so that when she became incontinent then, so they could help her. [pause] Her boyfriend had been with her, in a off-on-off-on way for about six years – anyway, I guess it was three weeks before she died that [pause] she gave her heart to the Lord. And [pause] she wanted a priest; a priest in robes and everything, to come and bless her room, so she could die safely. So, we found a priest in robes to come and do that. It didn't matter to her that I was ordained, it had to be a priest with a hat and robe and the whole bit and, but anyway, I did perform the marriage between her and _____. And they got married about a week before she died. In the days before her death then I spent [pause], spent three days and three nights with her, until she died. We all did, we were all around the bed with her. And she had a good death. [pause] When we did her funeral, [pause] it took us about a week to raise the money to get her mom to come for the funeral from down east. Her mom was in poverty, but living in sobriety and [pause] . . . I didn't have any time to grieve or anything, because I was busy helping to facilitate the grieving process for the folks in this community. Uh, when we got to the funeral home, _____ had been dead now about 12 days, in the coffin and the mother wanted to see her daughter. She hadn't seen her daughter in many, many years, and [pause] so we opened the coffin, and _____[she] was there all decomposed and everything, and that was pretty rough. And I, then had to do the funeral [pause]. I did the funeral service and everything and helped out. And it was only afterwards that I [pause] felt so much grief; that I had gotten quite attached to her [pause] and I couldn't get out of my head the picture of her in the coffin, being decomposed, and it just - the whole bit. And I found that the groaning came up. [pause] And, that was a source of comfort for me, in that. [pause] But I didn't have much, much of a chance, maybe I had just a couple of days, 'cause a few days later her boyfriend committed suicide, and I had to do his funeral too then. So [pause] so they're both dead now. . . . If I didn't take these times I wouldn't be able to do this [long pause]. And the fact of the matter is that there are few people who can do this for any great length of time. . . .

Out-of-Body Experience

F8:3 ['D']

But [pause] it'll be 21 years next month [that] I got deathly sick. I had a[n] internal strep virus [pause] and I should have died. The other people that had it died. And I'm the only one of all of them that had it, there was about 37 people that had it.

I: And where were you at this time?

D: In _____. And they all died and I lived. And I had a higher fever for a longer period of time – and I lived. And all my life, since I was nine years old, I've had people telling me, that when I had grey hair they knew I was going to be preaching and they knew I was going to be bringing a lot of people to the Lord. And I have had seven out of body experiences. Like, I got right to heaven's gate and my grandma told me I couldn't come in because [pause] I hadn't even started my job yet. [pause] I hadn't even started my ministry. So [pause], I said, "I don't wanna go back." Cause I had had so much abuse and everything. And they said, "Every time - that - turn around and look behind you." And I looked behind me, and I saw masses of people. [pause] And I said, "What's that got to do with me?" They said, "if you come in now, none of those people will ever get to be here." [pause] And I said, "Don't put that on me." And they said, "No, I'm serious," they said, "One on one, two on two, four and four, six and six, eight and eight." They counted up like that. Like, two and two is four, four and four is eight – and as I touch different people, they're going to be able to touch and that's how. And I said, "Oh, alright, I'll go back." But, I, I didn't come back willingly, really. And 21 years ago, December 17, I gave my [pause] heart back to the Lord and I said, "I've really tried Lord." I was trying to get back off the alcohol, and I'd already given up the drugs. [pause] And [pause] I had been trying to give up alcohol for a couple of years already. [pause] And, I just said, "I've tried Lord." And he said, "Yes. On your strength. Now, let go and let me." . . . But [pause] as soon as I gave my heart back to the Lord, well as soon as I came out of the coma and I [pause] and I gave my heart to the Lord. And when I came out of my coma and soon as I started praying my tongues came back, and I've had it ever since.

...
I: You said earlier that you had, or you talked about prophecy, a word from the Lord; you talked about having visions; you've had your out of body experiences. [pause] When you have a vision does this come after you speak in tongues, at the same time you speak in tongues, [pause], I'd like to know just a bit more about the chronology and when that might happen? Or how that might happen?

D: [pause] Sometimes, I'm just praying.

I: In English or in tongues?

D: [pause] Both. [pause] What happens usually is I start in English and I don't know [pause] there's something in my spirit, that's bubbling? And then I start in tongues and that's when I – and most of the time, it's [pause] a picture here and maybe a name, or a word. [pause] And it's like I got this great big computer, like I got, I don't know how many bytes in there, and it's like [pause]

I know that I'm not going to have it all together right away. It's like [pause] a piece here and a piece there – it's like a jig-saw puzzle?

I: Mm. Mm.

D: And [pause] it's when I'm quiet before him [pause]. And he'll [pause]. People look at me when I try to tell them this. He'll say, "You need to just sit down and write about" and he'll tell me what he wants me to write about. And it'll have something to do with a picture, or a word or something he's given me previously.

More about visions and a dramatic example of 9/11

F8 ['D']:12-13

D: . . . And [pause] there are things that from time to time, God shows some people that, like he shows me some pretty nasty things some times.

I: In your head? Or as a thought?

D: In my spirit.

I: Can you describe that for me?

D: When I'm praying in tongues [pause] I get like a picture. [pause] It's usually a picture of something or somebody, something some place, somewhere, and I see something happening. Like I saw [pause] twenty years ago, I saw what happened with the twin towers. And I'd written it down but I wasn't able to find it. And when it happened – that happened on a Tuesday, and on the Sunday before that, I started fasting that Sunday morning, and I didn't know why. And I had, I felt like [pause] my legs and my chest was being crushed.

I: This is on the Sunday?

D: That started on the Sunday. And like hot oil was pouring over me. I felt like black oil was flowing over me – burning me. Scalding me. I felt that – because I've been burnt, and I felt the pain as being, [pause] having my skin burnt. And I felt that until that [9/11] happened.

I: So you felt that [burning] from Sunday until the two planes crashed into the tower? And then what happened?

D: And it started in church. I was in church when it started on Sunday morning. And I was supposed to teach Sunday School.

I: So, what happened when – so the towers came down, did your pain stop? Did that feeling stop after it happened.

D: Yeah.

I: If finished on Tuesday?

D: It finished – like [pause] it must have been when the last plane hit [long pause] And very distinctly after – I hadn't even heard because, I was, I didn't have the TV or radio on, [pause] and I don't buy the paper. [pause] It stopped and the Lord said, "You're not to listen to any TV you're not to listen to any radio, and you're not to pick up a newspaper till you write out what I've shown you. And I showed you that twenty years ago."

I: Really?

D: So, I did it. [pause] And the devil put everything in the way so I couldn't get it done. And I finally got it done. And Pastor ____ got it in the file. Then I was allowed to look at the picture. I never saw the planes hitting the towers. I just saw from the middle of the towers the big hole and I saw them all

crumbling and I saw little black things falling out of the sky, which I know now, were people. And I saw this hole and then I saw this big explosion and everything just falling down like it did. [pause] And it was like I saw red hot and I saw black.

I: Did you know when you saw that vision, twenty years ago, that it was in New York?

D: No. I didn't know where it was.

I: You didn't know where it was but you saw it – it was two towers?

D: I didn't - yeah, I thought it was the end of the world.

I: Ok.

D: I was in _____ then [pause] and [pause] I had just came back to the Lord. [pause] And [pause] I said, "what is this?" And I thought it was the end of the world, cause I saw red, as in fire – inflamed and black, as the oil – a burning. But I saw these two - I didn't know it was the twin towers, and I didn't see any planes. [long pause] But I also, besides that, if I'm not mistaken, I saw [pause] a hillside gouged out with something, I didn't know what it was. And I saw all kinds of rubble but I couldn't identify it. And I thought it was the end of the world. And I thought because of what happened with those towers, that like the waves are supposed to come, and I never saw no waves. [pause] Other times I've seen like Tsunamis coming in my vision.

I: You've seen what?

D: Tsunamis.

I: What's that?

D: Huge 40 foot tidal waves over-taking the land. [pause] Like from violent hurricanes [long pause] I've seen them more than once. I've seen a lot of ugly stuff. And sometimes when I go to write it out I figure – like why write? And he said, "It's because you're willing to do something. You're willing to warn people." And I've told people that they shouldn't do something. And I told a girl she shouldn't be where she was and she ended up murdered sometime ago. It was quite awhile ago, yeah. [pause]

An 'interpretation' of what 'D' experiences

I: I'd like to get at, a bit more, what you might be experiencing in your body? Can you talk a little bit about that. If you feel any physical changes? You talked about pictures, you talked about actually having the word, feeling stuff, it being hot? Can you tell me anything more about your body? Head, mind?

D: [pause] I'd have to kind of say my head – it's clear of everything exactly what he wants me to do. It's like when I'm speaking in tongues I know when I'm going to have an interpretation. But he has got me to the place where I wait and see if somebody else is going to walk out in an interpretation. I give someone else a chance; 'cause I said, Lord, I don't have to do it all the time.

I: So, this would be when you're with others?

D: Yeah.

I: What about yourself? When you're with your self? Or maybe two or three others? A small?

D: I usually wait, I can't tell you the period of time that I wait. But I wait. I know when I've waited long enough for someone to come up with something.

I: And when you're by yourself?

D: Uh, it just comes. I start in tongues and then if there is going to be an interpretation – during the time I do tongues, I often get pictures or words.

I: Ok. That is what happens to me too.

D: I usually get pictures or words.

I: Do you ever have any colours? Or, do you see the pictures in colour?

D: I see the pictures mostly in colour.

I: Ok. [pause]

D: Pretty well everything I see, I see in colour. And it's intensified [pause] letting me know that it's important.

I: Oh?

D: That he's going to bring it back to me when he wants. And he'll tell me, like he'll say "Tomorrow you're going to church and work on your vision."

I: You know this, or you hear that voice or you just feel it?

D: No, I know it. It's like someone is talking to me. [pause] And it confirms in my spirit. Like, deep –

I: You keep pointing to your epigastric region – the gut region. Do you feel something in there?

D: Yeah. I feel a rumbling.

I: A rumbling?

D: Yeah. And depending on how [long pause] how intense it is, is how much it rumbles.

I: Ok. What about dreams?

D: [pause]

I: I know you have visions. Do you experience anything at night.

D: Sometimes.

I: Something you could identify that this is a dream but God had spoken to you in this dream?

D: Yeah, sometimes. Sometimes, not as much as when I've been in a prayerful attitude and waiting on him. Not as much. I used to have dreams – like that's how I had the dream about the world-tower, or twin towers and stuff. It was in – at night time. But since I've come here and really started work – walking more in the spiritual thing; like back home, I was a baby and nobody was teaching me anything. So, I thought I was [she blows out] sometimes, I thought I [had] lost it. . . . and all these funny feelings I was getting, "Am I hungry?" like [these feelings] I got, but it's like I said before, now I know. Because if it's just myself thinking this, it's like my hands are cold, like I'm cold. I have no emotion about it. It's just words. It's just a picture.

I: Right.

D: And it usually fades out and I don't ever get it back again [pause] most of the time. But when it's going to be something important it's like, it sometimes wakes me up. Like I have – it's not even, it's a pain but it's not a pain. It's like something wakes me up - real sharp. [pause] And I'll, like I know I wasn't dreaming. But things start to come to me and I start praying, and I don't even speak in English I just stay on my bed and I just pray. And I know that I have to get another book and, right beside my bed because – well, I just know it.

Hand-signing and Dancing

F9:3

F9: I don't know if there's anything physical that I would associate with tongues, necessarily. But in my prayer times in general, I have, in my worship times, which I haven't had lately [she means here that which she is about to describe], but in the past [pause] you know there have been times of dancing. There's been hand-signing.

I: What is hand-signing?

F9: Oh just using the hands, even if I don't know the signs. And [pause] I do, in quiet times, get visions and I feel, if the Lord speaks to me, he'll do things, which I write down.

I: You write them down. So, how do you know these? Do you hear an audible? Do you hear a voice inside?

F9: Not so much a voice. It's a just a thought comes.

I: It's a thought?

F9: Yeah. And the thought, and the thoughts, when they come they ring they ring so true, you know that, uh.

I: You're pointing to your chest here.

F9: Yeah.

I: So do you feel anything there? Or do you just have a knowing?

F9: A knowing. Yeah. Nothing physical. I just, well the way I've heard it put, and so I would describe it that way – it just feels right in my spirit. You know, so I guess that's where I locate it. [she laughs]

New Perspectives, Less Legalistic

F12:6

F-12: . . . Personally, it affects my worldview and that affects my lifestyle. I no longer feel as lonely and insecure as I once did. Also, it gives me these wonderful visions, thoughts and encouraging people along my way. I don't like to worship publicly in a very flamboyant way, but I do appreciate what others do and experience. I have become much more tolerant of ways of worship as well as less judgmental about others whether they believe in Jesus the way I do, or not. In fact, I have begun to understand Eastern religion much more and recognize that we, in the Western Christian tradition have missed the boat on much of what Christ's teachings were all about. So, has it changed me yes, it has changed me internally and given my life a greater depth and richness that it didn't have before. Also, it isn't so much about pleasing a big-father God, as it is about appropriating the power from which I have come and to which I will again return.

. . . Anyway, it has made me less legalistic and also more conscious of what does and does not bring me peace. Overall, it means that I have more freedom in my life than I ever thought possible as a Christian.

M5:13

M5: To me, it's all of a sudden – I don't know, you've got more compassion, you've got more, and you understand and you're more forgiving, you're more

loving, you're more uh, it's not all black and white and it's not all regimented and like in, I don't know, you seem to understand more [pause] I guess I got less legalistic.

I: Ok.

M5: But I think like now I've got to watch 'cause I think I went too much the other way. I'm not legalistic at all, like, I don't know if you understand what I mean, by legalistic. But to me, it's like, somebody would say, "Are you religious?" I'd say, "No. I'm not."

Aesthetic Dimension

F3:11-12

F3: And I think I have been in the Lord's presence and I have experienced different aspects of the Lord's emotions - laughter being one. I've experienced sorrow - really deep sorrow. But it's, like, I've been listening to worship music and sometimes, I've heard sometimes the same piece of music on other occasions and it hasn't touched me. But sometimes the Lord has really deeply touched me and it's been sorrowful. And I've cried and cried with certain things he's trying to do, and the words of expressing what he's been doing. So, I've sensed [pause] I guess, when I say the presence of the Lord, it's like sensing the emotions of the Lord.

I: So, these emotions are not yours?

F3: No, because I haven't felt, no, because when I was laughing I wasn't necessarily any happier at that point, when it started. When I'd gone and been worshipping the Lord and listening to music, [pause] it hasn't been, my emotions haven't been sorrowful, and yet they've come up. I've felt a deep sorrow from the Lord. And there's been other things. [long pause] I think mostly it's been joy and sorrow. Other things have been peace though. I've had the peace [pause]. And then I've had the experience of beauty; there's beauty, and then I've had fragrance to. So, that's been other things.

I: The fragrance - [pause] and the beauty, can you describe those a bit?

F3: The beauty is a light; it's like rainbow light - like diamonds. I've had like - you know if you look into a diamond you've got all the colours of the rainbow. It's bright, bright light and it's diamond light. And I've had brilliance. I've had that [pause] [sense of] the serenity - just around me.

I: Ok. So, the light enfolded you?

F3: [pause and looking for words] It surrounded me. It's been like wings - like white wings around me. It's been beautiful. . . .

F3: And what about the fragrance? Can you identify it?

F3: Yes. I've smelled [pause] kind of, it's flowers - it's like roses and violet type of flower, it's a little bit indescribable. But it's been more than that, but it's been that and it's been very, very nice. [pause] It's, really, really pleasant.

I: I've heard people say that when you smell a fragrance of roses -

F3: I've smelled that.

I: that it's angels presence with you. That's been one interpretation. I have smelled the roses.

F3: Oh. Yeah, I've had - the roses are lovely. I have the roses. Roses and violets and lavender - all those types of beautiful old-fashioned smells you

know. But I've really looked around, thinking it's been someone, you know. And in fact, one time when we left the prayer meeting, our worship rehearsal Wednesday night, _____ hugged me and said, "Oh, you smell lovely." And I said, "I haven't got anything on." She said, "Really?" I says, "Yes." I didn't have any perfume. And I said, "It's good on the sweat." Because I'd been building up a sweat doing my drums, you know. But she said, "No," she felt something around so, that's kind of interesting. It wasn't me. . . .

And I'll tell you something else that happened to me here. I was - I decided to anoint the house, all the different things in the house - cleanse it, anoint it, in different areas. And I went around to different rooms and started putting crosses on the doors with anointing oil. And well, I'm praying in every room and I fell in three rooms. Completely on my own. And I fell over in three rooms. . . .

[further in the interview]

I: And then you have the beauty, which in your case was - light? [pause] Of the diamonds?

F3: Yeah. I've had the lights. When, I have the slain in the spirit experience I've had lights around a lot of times. I've seen lights, yeah.

I: The beauty comes, does the light and the sense of beauty, does it come primarily when you're slain? Is that the experience? Do you have to be slain in the spirit?

F3: Mostly. Mostly it comes then, yes.

I: Ok. And you were going to tell me about another?

F3: The other aspect though of the beauty is [pause] in my imagination. And it's not, like all in my thoughts? I can get [a] picture of the Lord and his beauty surrounding - especially the picture in Revelation that John gave - the revelation of the Lord being seated on his throne high on his throne, with the emerald rainbow around him and the crystal sea?

I: So you actually get a picture of that?

F3: Well, I try. [she laughs] I sometimes get little imagines, not the whole thing, not clearly. But it does to me though, when I try and focus on it, is very beautiful. It's like I don't see the beauty but it gives me an aspect of beauty. Yeah, do you understand what I mean?

Catatonic Dimension

M5:6

M5: I've had manifestations where, like I've been slain in the spirit. I remember in this church I was, I think I was the first one, and I didn't even know what it was. And I had never even seen it at that point.

I: So, you were one of the first ones here?

M5: Mm.

I: Ok.

M5: And I just felt there was a gentle thing that happened to me. And I just went down, backwards and then it was more confusing than anything else, and I asked at the time. "It's Ok, Ok." He [Pastor] says, "it's just the presence of God." And I says, "No, I'm not scared, I just think it's neat." And then, it's just again, something I was trying to understand that doesn't make sense, with

my head. So the next few times when the presence of God would touch me, that I'd be stuck – can't move in the position, let's say – I remember one time, for about an hour, just standing up, I was just walking towards my seat at a conference and I just got stuck there in the aisle. And stayed there for the whole conference, almost. The message of the person, for 45 to an hour, I just [slight pause]

I: Did you hear things going on?

M5: Oh yeah, I knew what was going on but I just couldn't get my body to follow. I just, I was just there. And other times I've been bent in two, and stayed in that position and I couldn't straighten out, so. But when these things happen, I speak in tongues a lot more so, at that time.

Creative Dimension

M3:12

M3: You know and my level of happiness is based on a relationship with God. And part of my communion with Him, is through the gift of tongues.

I: Mm

M3: And knowing that, then I know I can communicate. I can ask Him questions. And I can sit and spend time praying in tongues and feel his presence. And another thing I have learned, you know, some people say it is 'Caseyism' but you'll sit down, God never moves my hand, but I'll sit there with a pen and I'll ask, I'll write a question down.

I: Mm

M3: And I'll wait. And again, that thought will come to my mind. Then I write it out. Whereas, with Caseyism – I think he went into a trance and wrote something. But this is just – I'll sit there and pray quietly. Pray in tongues. And like I'll write a question down first. And I get an answer. And then, write a question. And then get another answer.

I: Mm

M3: And believe it or not he answers; he answers every question.

F4:10-11

F4: . . . In the same way as my drawings do the same thing. You see there is a whole language in the art as well, that can be similar to the groanings. Because I can, you know, just get, have that urge. I got to have paper-pencil. And I don't know what's going to come out of it, but it'll, you know, it'll create itself. Or, I have a clump of clay, and I go to the studio every week to work with clay and the clay will express itself to me. [pause] And it's, and I hear, I actually hear artists and musicians using a similar language – that similar language of their relationship to their creativity you know, which I think is an incredibly sacred connection to the creator; and that in itself can become another type of disassociative prayer-worship experience. [pause] Because it totally bypasses the consciousness. When I enter into that state, then it will create itself. And, if I don't create [pause] I'll get sick. If I don't take time to move with the urgings of the spirit, I'll get sick. Then I'll start getting flash-backs again; then I'll start getting mentally sick. [pause]

I: So there is a real emotional, psychological healing?

F4: Well, nothing's in a vacuum eh?

Conclusion

In the practice of glossolalia, a plethora of experiences highlight the complexity of this unintelligible "speech" phenomenon. The examples given in this chapter, along with many more that cannot be further elucidated here, are noteworthy for several reasons.

First, the practice of tongue-speaking is *more* than the incoherent babbling of *Holy-Rollers* or those designated as charismatic Christians. Given that every glossolalic respondent in this study related additional experiences during or around the practicing of tongues, social scientists can no longer ignore the complex of glossolalic expressiveness. Linguistic analysis simply does not reveal the wide ranging physical and psycho-social effects of this practice; nor do the previous closed-ended questionnaires of sociology assist in elucidating what glossolalia means. While this project is an initial attempt to fill the phenomenological gap of [charismatic] glossolalic expression within the glossolalia literature, this research project is potentially useful for subsequent survey research; e.g., determining the extent of these glossolalic behaviours in various cultural domains. Future survey research into Christian and non-Christian tongue-speaking, can be better informed from this intensive uncovering of the wide range of experiences encountered by tongue-speakers.

Second, the glossolalist does not always realize the full extent of tongue-speaking in his/her own life. It is significant that a number of respondents felt

their lives did not change as a result of speaking in tongues. Upon further probing, however, the researcher hears that all respondents would not *want* to live their life without tongue-speaking. Perhaps loyalty to certain Christian dogma and creeds (and charismatic teaching) may account for some of the reluctance on the part of these respondents to shy away from attributing to glossolalia more direct credit for the effects that appear to occur as a [direct] result of tongue-speaking. Other consequences of tongue-speaking are adumbrated in the following chapter.

Third, it is evident to this researcher, that the *naturalness* of speaking in tongues can account for some of the hesitation on the part of these respondents to *consciously* admit to concomitant experiences found by this researcher, upon further probing and then directly experienced by the glossolalic researcher.

The interviews are rich in examples of experiences that effect personal affect, enriching the lives of these respondents and others they know. Mumford (1996) also finds in her research that the tongue-speaker attributes these changes and effects to "the Divine;" coming as a result of time spent in prayer with tongue-speaking.

The glossolalist refers to tongue-speaking most frequently as prayer and the reader now sees that it is used in an intentioned and unintentioned manner. However, the glossolalist has *disciplined* the self with certain behaviours that provide the *context* or place for tongue-speaking. The context of tongue-speaking is often the private devotional times in the morning, or at

various points in the day, as well as the times during the week and weekend, where the glossolalist enjoins corporate expressions of charismatic worship. There are also other circumstances that call upon tongue-speaking-prayer as a response; such times of joy or periods of stress, ill-health, family concerns, or work. As the reader has also noted, tongue-speakers go quickly into and out of tongues without always consciously recognizing they are doing so. Upon further questioning, all respondents admit to consequences and to benefits of tongue-speaking. These are now explored in chapter seven.

CHAPTER SEVEN

AN INTERPRETATION OF GLOSSOLALIA

Introduction

Whatever else it is, religious experience is dangerous. Its dangers are reduced and routinized by means of institutionalization.
Berger, 1979: 50

I: I'm just curious. You say that it is so natural for you to speak in tongues; maybe at some time and when you're praying, it seems to be this way. You could do it easier than speaking in English, with it being so natural. [pause] What significance does that have to you? How do you interpret this?

M4: That it, well, the way that I interpret it, was that, it was just a gift. It's something that was given to me, that it wasn't something that I had to learn. It, the fact, the way that it happened in that service, where it just, I couldn't and then I could, it was a [pause] sovereign experience. God just sovereignly did that – and I can't explain it. . . . (M4:7)

What is traditionally regarded as “religion” is not induced by an *experience, per se*. Religion, it can be argued, “interprets” the [*religious*] *spiritual* encounter. Interpretation puts “substance” upon that which is experienced and felt via the symbolic expression of the cultural system[s] imposed upon the experience. Repeated experiences may serve to legitimate the imposition of linguistic explanation, but in itself, linguistic explanation is not *the* experience; though it can point to the experience and possibly facilitate the move into the experience.

What is usually and generally called ‘religion’ is to such an amazing degree a substitute that I ask myself seriously whether this kind of ‘religion,’ which I prefer to call a creed, has not an important function in human society. The substitution has the obvious purpose of replacing immediate experience by a choice of suitable symbols invested in a solidly organized dogma and ritual. The Catholic church maintains them by her indisputable authority, the Protestant church (if this term is

still applicable) by the insistence upon faith and the evangelical message. As long as those two principles work, people are effectively defended and shielded against immediate religious experience. Even if something of the sort should happen to them, they can refer to the church, for it would know whether the experience came from God or from the devil, whether it was to be accepted or to be rejected. (Jung, 1938: 52-53)

The researcher argues that glossolalia expresses its *existence* via material substance -- the human organism. Medium of glossolalic expression is more than vocal linguistic behaviour. The body speaks by using every part of its organism,¹ from the cellular to an entire system; it is *Spirit* or energy encoded within the body-spirit of *H.s.s.*. This energy is in the process of *transmuting* the entire human organism through its ability to raise the level of consciousness within *H.s.s.*. What is the evidence of such a transformation, which the researcher sees evincing an *evolutionary* [raising of] *consciousness*? How is it possible that persons within Euroamerican society do not know or understand their own consciousness? ²

This chapter provides evidence that glossolalia is something more than a tongue "speaking." Glossolalia *is* the expression of an immanent dimension of what might objectively be termed, "*I-Thou*," but it is primarily the *unfurling* of *that created*, encoded and enfolded, manifested, but within a person; it is something which is intra- and interpersonal. Glossolalia is a *process* that is reclaiming *body*, symbolically and linguistically, and it is a transformation and

¹ Please refer to the typology of glossolalia and concomitant expressions, chapter six.

² As Hawkins cogently notes: "Society constantly expends its effort to correct *effects* instead of *causes*, which is one reason why the development of human consciousness proceeds so slowly." (2002/1995: 26)

elevation of all that is consciousness. This complex process is referred to as *spiritual transmutation*.

The above proposition is framed within several cultural domains. These are:

1. The *body-expressive*;
2. The *heart-expressive*;
3. The *cognitive-expressive*;
4. The *socioreligious expressive*
5. The *spiritual-expressive*.

These domains are hereafter referred to as a *pentarchy of expressive attributes* (see Figure 7.1); these express the context, form, and content of our living existence. The *movement* is toward ultimate unity or union with the greater consciousness – the source of living existence (see Blasius, 1976/1973; Bentov, 1977; Pearsall, 1998; Hawkins, 2002/1995). A direct experience of this is the state of bliss that can be experienced by the glossolalist (also referred to as “beauty,” light,” and “slain in the spirit”).

Glossolalia expresses an intelligence that moves “heaven and earth,” or mind and body; it expresses itself through a *complex* known as “speaking in tongues.” Tongue-speaking is a phenomenon of such proportion that until it is better understood, its consciousness-raising potential cannot rationally be grasped. The researcher finds that something of *awesome* proportion is occurring when “tongues of fire descend.” Stifling recognition of what glossolalia *is*, thus what it *means*, are limited [interpretive] frameworks, both religiously imposed and those coming from within social science.

I: In terms of speaking in tongues do you feel that speaking in tongues is something just for Christians?

M4: So, speaking in tongues is something that Christians that is offered to Christians. Whether other people can do it or not, I, don't have a personal opinion. I don't [pause] I guess what my experience tells me is that, you know, almost anything we experience as Christians is experienced by non-Christians, and so my conclusion would be that sure, there [are] probably lots of non-Christians who have spoken in tongues, and there are probably, whether it's [pause] yeah, I won't go on. Almost every Christian experience that I'm aware of, non-Christians have done or seen do.

I: So what makes it different for the Christian, do you think?

M4: I think the only explanation I can have, is that as a Christian, I believe that it's a gift of God. And it's a way of allowing the Holy Spirit to express something through me. But [pause] you know, for a non-Christian I would wonder, what the motivation, what the motivator was; so, is there a spiritual motivation that is not God? Is it a personal motivation – that they are just very creative? Is it you know,...I would be left wondering what the motivator is. But, I don't know, my only understanding of it, is my own personal experience, and I can't project myself.

What is glossolalia?

. . . Well, now, my faith system has changed. So, like, at that point in my journey it was very experiential. Whereas, now, my understanding of receiving the gifts of the Holy Spirit is that when we are laid hands on for the gift of the Holy Spirit, that we get the whole Holy Spirit, not just get aspects of it. Like light, you put it through a prism and it breaks out into many other colours, but, I think the gifts of the Holy Spirit are that way. You get them all, embedded within the white light, but if you put it through the prism you would see them in gifts but it's whenever they're called forth within us [pause] so, there's times in my life where different gifts are called forth for different people at certain times, depending on what the situations are. (M8:5)

Glossolalia /s! There is a universal dimension resident within every

H.s.s., past, present, and future that "seeks" union with each and every *H.s.s.*

M8:6

I went out and I read all kinds of books about other people's experiences and about how this happens because I wasn't speaking in tongues at that time. And intellectually it just didn't happen for me. It was only when I allowed that intellect to be put aside and say, "Come out of my head, and into my heart." And, when I was able to do that, that's when that manifestation comes. So, when I'm speaking in tongues, I just try to get my mind out of the way. Now, you can't stop it, my mind is very active and it likes to go, you know, from pillar to post. But the experience of tongues is not an intellectual experience

for me. It's purely, just allowing something within me, to take over and pray to God, without passing through my intellect.

Within the charismatic Christian, a union is believed accomplished by an acknowledgement of the need for "personal salvation." That is, Christian tradition states there is a barrier between God and man; an inability to unite with "God," due to "sinfulness." Upon confession of sin, and the inviting of Jesus, the "Son of God," into his/her life/heart, the individual is "born-again." This is the only way for the Christian to attain the assurance of personal salvation and eternal life with God; the Christian can now look forward to the charismatic experience of the "third person of The Trinity," the [Holy] Spirit, through "The Baptism in the Holy Spirit." It is the Christian belief system, handed-down in various forms through 2000 years of dogma, creed, and dare it be said bloodshed, through which the experience of the "gift of tongues" is explained.

M2:8

I always associate speaking, well I usually always couple the experience of speaking in tongues with the fact that I have been baptized in the spirit. Because when you're baptized in the spirit, the spirit is released within you, out of your spirit. The spirit, the Holy Spirit is released into your soul and your body so that you can, so that you're spirit man, can exercise control over your body and over your soul, which is your mind, [heart] and emotions. And that's where the sanctification thing comes in. And [clears throat] so in that sense the baptism of the spirit, that releases the spirit, enables you, if you lead to the lordship of the spirit in your life, enables you to walk in the spirit more and in the flesh less.

F7:18

F7: I would say, I do say, because I don't like the baptism in the Holy Spirit?

I: You don't? You do not like?

F7: In speaking in terms of being baptised in the Holy Spirit. We have all received the Holy Spirit. We celebrate that in our baptism. We are all children of God. We celebrate that in our baptism. What I talk about is opening to the power of God within. And that these things are manifestations of that power.

So, to me, tongues was the initial sign of the opening of that door and is also a means by which I open the door on an ongoing basis. God's power working in me and through me. And God's power works in things like love and joy and peace and whatever they are, I should know. . . .

Yet, it is the interpretation of the experience that is the cognitive-ego-structure, which enmeshes glossolalia as "gift of tongues" for the "believer" only.³

F4:10

. . . So, not that I want to masochistically bring on pain to myself, but yeah, the truth is that some of the most difficult things in my life are when I'm willing to die, when I [am] willing to, you know in these experiences, they are part of dying to self. It's part of, little more my own self-ego dying and letting God rise up within me.

I: So, really you lose your ego?

F4: I believe so.

I: Yeah.

F4: Well, you put it in its proper place I think. I don't know if you ever lose it, but I think . . . yeah, it's definitely to the unconscious.

This project reveals the efficacy of tongue-speaking. Glossolalia also evidences a striking resemblance to *H.s.s. as Body-Mind-Spirit*, there is striking evidence of *personality*.⁴

M8:7

. . . the best description if I tried to get it, is that I kind of feel like God's embracing me, he's putting his arms around me.

I: Is this like a hug, you actually ?

M8: Yeah, like to me, it's not a physical hug, Ok.

I: Ok.

M8: Like more of a, it's the sense that comes with it. I don't feel arms around me but yet, somehow I feel the result of having arms put around me. If you can kind of relate to it that way? And I just feel very much as if I'm in my Father's arms [longer pause]. For what that's worth. And, I mean, we all seek out peace and serenity. And, it just seems to be at those times where I feel most one with God, that's when I feel closest to him I feel a closeness [pause]. And it's, I don't know, I've never measured my heartbeat or anything like that, I would imagine that it would just, it would slow down. Because, it's just a very,

³ Anyone else who experiences this is, according to some Christians, not experiencing the "real thing;" there is the position that there are "counterfeit tongues."

⁴ Upper-case letters (in this case 'B' for Body, 'M' for Mind, and 'S' for Spirit) are meant to denote that which might also be referred to as "God," "Holy Spirit," or Absolute Unitary Being (AUB) (see d'Aquili, 1993; d'Aquili and Newberg, 1993).

very special moment of peace, where there is tranquillity and quietness, and a sense of being loved [pause] by God our Father.

The evidence expressed by and through glossolalists and the researcher's own experience, reveals and gives evidence to the fact that glossolalia is an expression of *unity with particularity*.

M9:5

M9: If I closed my eyes and invited the Holy Spirit, now [clears throat] I had gone through a whole lot of teaching before that. About [clear throat] believing first of all, that it's important to deal with your own life. To be clean before God. And I came through that, a lot of that through inner healing, because I didn't realize there was people who hurt me; that I needed to forgive. I didn't even believe they hurt me, but they did. And so I had to go through a cleansing time – and of course, that is a continual process, but I needed to go through that. But that I needed to be in a special close relationship with the Lord. I expected that he was going to give me anything. And so it began with [pause] sometimes, it was just a feeling. Like "M" would teach sometimes you're just going to get a feeling in your spirit. Sometimes you're going to get a picture and strangely enough, God works in different ways, the Holy Spirit works in different ways with different believers, and some only go one way with it and others go a different way. For me, it was, if I'd close my eyes, and I, by faith believed and asked the Holy Spirit to give me something, I believed he would give me a good picture. That was very important. Because, I felt before him, my heart was clean. I felt that it was something he was asking me to do. Therefore, Jesus said, he's not going to give you a stone if you ask him for a good thing. So, believe for a good thing. And believe that the picture that you see, it's got some good in it. And from that picture he's going to say something good. So [pause] I would begin, and I begin to see pictures – could be just scenery [pause] it could be, sometimes, it was just a jumble of coloured forms that I had no idea of what it was, I couldn't tell. But, if I just waited long enough, usually this picture, one picture came into focus. And then I sensed the Lord was saying something of what that picture meant. And then from that picture I would then try to minister to the person whom I was counselling, as to what I thought the Lord was saying for that person.

The experience – *glossolalia* – evinces a power or energy, through the organism as *animus* or *anemos* in this *expressiveness*.

M2:7

M2:. . . I believe when we pray in tongues it is like plugging you in, like when you stick the plug in the wall, all [of] the sudden you are connected to 110V. Right? I believe that when you start praying in tongues it is connecting you to the Holy Spirit's 110V. That *dunamis*, that dynamite of God. You are connected. So all of a sudden when you are connected like that, you are

more open to receive from the Holy Spirit whether it's discerning of spirits, whether it's to go pray for someone for healing, whether it's word of knowledge or interpretation of the tongues that you are doing right then, whatever it is. In fact I don't think it is always clear what it is. It could be word of knowledge, or it could be you're interpreting your own tongues. And I don't think it matters, as long as it's functional.

None of what is said regarding energy or *anemos* denies the Christian's "Absolute" creation of Jesus as a saviour of the human race. This thesis is not about theology, though the implication for revisiting theology is, of course, enormous. It does give absolute expression to that which is called "Spirit."⁵ But Spirit is in and without *H.s.s.*, not unlike the mirror resembling or reflecting the body-face before it. The reflection *is*, and it is the person – these two are one and the same. The personal attempt to "know God" is the charismatic creature's attempt to understand the image in which he/she has been conceived and in which he/she lives or exists.

M9:2

M9: Ok. What, I mean, the step itself, by faith receiving the Holy Spirit, was an emotional experience. To me, it was equivalent to [pause] inviting Jesus to come into my life, to be my saviour and to help me change my life, turn my life in a different direction. And receiving the Holy Spirit, I had the sense was just as important as that. Even though I didn't get acknowledged as to what this would lead to, emotionally I felt it was very significant to me. [clears throat] And, it was frustrating, when I couldn't speak with, speak in tongues at the beginning. That was a real surprise; didn't anger me, it surprised me. I was really surprised because I thought I could call on God, to [do] whatever I wanted, and he had to jump [he laughs] and give me the gifts that he promised. And I found that he was still the giver of the gifts, and it was up to him, when it would be the most appropriate time for me to receive that. And so [pause] each day I would just try mumbling words, speaking words that would come out of my mouth; not yet knowing how this should even sound, what it would be like. And I knew it was mumbling, each day that I tried it. And, at the end of about thirty seconds, ten or sixty seconds, I knew this was

⁵ The distinction is made between lower-case 's' and upper-case 'S' where lower-case 'spirit' refers to the personal spirit or life (consciousness/psyche) of each *H.s.s.* and upper-case 'Spirit' refers to the life-force, *anemos* or *animus* of the cosmos (also known as 'flow,' the *élan vital*, God, cosmic consciousness).

just me. But, one day, when I tried the same thing, I realized that what was coming out, was more than mumbling. That it was some kind of a language, I didn't know the language, but having already studied Indonesian as a missionary, I realized there were many languages out there that could be said, and I would not pick up one word of it, that would help me to know that it was a language. But I realized, that this was a language. And [pause] so it became a part of my daily talk with God. I began speaking in tongues whenever I would spend devotional time with him.

Recall the complexity of tongues and concomitant expressions presented in chapter six. The charismatic glossolalic makes conscious to himself or herself, through consciousness, of *being*; that is, of something more than material substance. Within Judeo-Christian expression this conscious recognition occurs via a *yielding* of personal ego ("will") and rationality, and a decision to "accept Jesus into his/her life." On occasion, this has been after a dramatic "Damascus experience" in which the glossolalist can no longer doubt a Supreme Being called "God."

M8:1 [bolded emphasis by researcher]

I: Ok, so, I want to learn about your experience speaking in tongues. So, I'm asking you to describe for me when you first spoke in tongues. And then, you can take this where you want to go.

M8: I guess it was in 1976. I was in a [pause] instructing a course in the States, in the United States, [pause] and there was a particular night where they wanted to go for a party, and I struggled with that. I chose not to go to that party, because I knew that it wouldn't be Christ-centered. So, instead, I went back to my room and spending some time reading the Bible. I had previously been to a *Life In The Spirit Seminar*, so, I had been laid on hands, to pray for the baptism of the Holy Spirit. But there hadn't been a manifestation of tongues at that time. Anyway, I went into my room and I was reading scripture. And at some point [pause] during that evening in prayer I just was **struggling with intellectualization** at the time, especially with the gift of tongues. And so I said, "Lord, I think it's time you come out of my head and come into my heart." And, at that point it was very much **like a hand had kind of pressed me to the floor**. And I was laying prostrate before the Lord. And all of a sudden I just burst out in tongues, this language that I had never experienced before. [pause] That was my very first experience. . . .

I: Had you ever felt that sensation of, you said it was like a hand pressing you?

M8: Yeah, but I felt that before, but I have to go back to part of my other story to express that, because it wasn't from, I was involved with the occult. So, I experienced similar things with the occult prior to that. But I had not felt that kind of normal physical part with God before. That was the first.

I: So, when you say "that physical part with God" what exactly do you mean?

M8: Well it felt like there was literally, it felt like there was a hand on my back, you know kind of gently pressing me to the floor. So, it felt like there was a hand there, so, I say physical in terms of what I felt.

The "dark side of the moon" lies in the fact that the union and recognition with "Spirit" is reflected upon and interpreted. Only unenlightened, though often well-intentioned persons, "force" recognition upon another.⁶ How the charismatic glossolalist and charismatic community explain manifested tongues and bodily expressions are paramount to how the individual interprets and finds *meaning* in tongues. The glossolalist "learns" the cultural domain's interpretations; but it is not the case that the glossolalist learns tongues, *tout court*.

M2:9

M2: . . . I feel like the minute I pray for a person to receive the baptism of the spirit, that at that instant they can speak in tongues, if they will. Sometimes they don't know how. And so critics of speaking in tongues say "Well, you teach them how to do the gibber-jabber," you know, "so it's really not a gift, you're teaching them to do it." "No," I say, "it isn't." I said it's just like pouring a glass of, when I am on the farm, because the gasket on our pump was dry, we always saved a can of water outside the pump, when we got done pumping, we always take the last pump and fill the cup with water and set it there. So the next time you wanted to pump, the gasket was dry, all you had to do was pour the water in the top and pump the handle two or three times, and then it would grab a hold, and then it would draw water again. So, to me, all I was doing is priming the pump, or showing a person how, you know, they're not use to speaking that language which is, could be the language of men or angels, it could be a known language, it could be an unknown language. Scripture says it could be the language of men or angels, and it sounds like French but it might not be French, and at other times you can receive a different tongue, you can receive an actual language for that given

⁶ Space prohibits a discussion of "forced" spiritual experiences, contrived to elicit certain Christian expressions, but the point here is to underscore the large role of "interpretation" in talking about and reflecting upon the *spiritual-expressive*.

occasion. I don't think that person, the people that I know that have spoke perfect French, perfect Mandarin, Chinese, happened on occasion but it never, it didn't happen regularly. And that was a tongue God gave them for that particular person who spoke Mandarin Chinese out there in the audience that night who needed to hear that God was real, that neither one of them know anything about. But that person was never Mandarin Chinese again after that.

F4:1

F4: And so, people would just tell me, you know just open your mouth and just loosen your tongue and let it come out. And you know make some sounds and they'd all put their hands on me and shake me, and shake me.

I: Shake? You mean physically.

F4: Physically shake me to loosen the spirit to speak in tongues. I mean, like I said, I came off the street, I was an addict and suffered from what they now call post-traumatic stress from having grown up in terror, and abuse, violence. And so later I needed healing from my early days in the Church because it felt like it replicated some of the violence I experienced growing up. [pause] So then somebody, and because I couldn't do it, I mean I just couldn't do.

I: You couldn't do the speaking in tongues?

F4: I couldn't do the speaking in tongues. I asked God to let me do it and I just couldn't do it because [pause] it just didn't happen to me. It became apparent to me that I better learn how to do it or I was going to be put out of this group. But, if I was put out of this group, where would I go because I had been taught that everything outside of the group was "Satan" and you know I would be sure to die a new type of horror worse than what I experienced on the streets. So [pause] someone came along, a kindly soul, and taught me how to speak in tongues and said, "I bought a Honda . She bought a Honda." And say that really fast, I bought a Honda, she bought a Honda, I bought a Honda, she bought a Honda. Just say that and they'd get off your back. So, the next time, it was like, you know time for F4s session. They all shook, they were shaking me. That's exactly what I did. And they all backed off and praised the Lord, and [pause] nobody questioned me again. And when ever someone came near or somebody I knew that there was an expectation that I would have to speak in tongues, that's what I did. I even developed a new one, "I tied a bow-tie." You know, I changed it around so that I could at least get something out of my mouth. And it was because I was now in a new type of culture of fear [pause] in the church.

The *efficacy* of tongues for most Christian charismatic glossolalists is found in the doctrine of "The Baptism by [in/of] the Holy Spirit." Concomitant expressions of tongues are then vilified, nullified, or ignored if explanations are insufficient (or misinterpreted, as applied to glossolalia) to explain charismatic behaviours and consequences. Individual ego and control within the cultural

community complicate this. Reasons for an anti-glossolalia stance are arguments to be taken seriously because they point to the concern of making any one expression or explanation sole arbiter of a person's faith or religion; or, for that matter, experience. Yet, anti-glossolalia arguments negate and disparage the *experiential* via the cognitive/rational intellect; the same problem confronting Western scientific dualism. The following quote highlights an opposing opinion to that taken by Christian charismatic glossolalists.

. . . The gift of tongues is not a sign of the Spirit's baptism. In the same chapter, Paul declares that not everyone shall speak in tongues, but that *all* are baptized of the Holy Spirit (compare I Cor. 12:10, 30 with v.13). The point is here clearly settled: in no way are tongues a sign of the Spirit's baptism. If this were otherwise, all would have to receive them since all believers without exception are baptized of the Spirit. . . .

The various principles studied above are more than ever of importance in this our age, when the question of speaking with tongues is so frequently met with. Let us, moreover, note that what we read in the Bible has nothing in common with certain manifestations, so prevalent today. When the search for gifts is carried on in a mechanical fashion and that, with this aim in view, hands are laid upon those who are converted, for hours or weeks or months or even longer, while saying to them: "Let yourself go, let your tongue say 'Abba, abba, abba, abba . . . ' for as long as you can," for they say that when the Spirit enters into us He cries "Abba," that is to say "Father"; when speech with tongues is accompanied by an excited state of mind, by cries, contortions and among some by a thoroughly unbalanced nervous state; when, as occasionally happens, it is supplemented by "holy laughter" or "spiritual singing" (a sort of inarticulate recitative chanted, as if in a trance, by one person or a whole assembly); in short, when we witness one or other of these phenomena (which occur only too frequently) we are deeply troubled, for we cannot perceive in these the Spirit's gift, and we are again compelled to think of those subtle or debased counterfeits that the enemy is so clever at producing in the field of our emotions. (Pache, 1954: 194-195)

The interpretation of the tongue-speaking experience is the potential nemesis of *phenomenological truth* inherent in the charismatic Christian's experiencing of "the word became flesh."

F7:14

F7: You see, I have a question, which I have never had answered as I'll probably never will about whether or not, everyone that opens to the power of the spirit, what we call the baptism of the spirit will speak a prayer language? I've known people, I know one person, a priest very strong in the spirit, who had not, as he said { – tape unclear - spoken} in tongues. And I don't know whether to just accept that; well I should just accept that because he said it or whether it's just that, he just couldn't let go of that. Does everyone receive it or not?

The glossolalic expressiveness, as evidenced in the typology of glossolalia, reveals, stripped of the cosmology of Christian dogmatic interpretation, a universal *flow*, energy *sui generis*, the *élan vital*, *Absolute Unitary Being*, *God*, whom the Christian charismatic believes to be seeking ['His'] expression and union within and without *H.s.s.*; this is its body (see Dilthey, 1985; Bergson, 1944; James, 1958; and Durkheim, 1995/1912; see also Csikszentmihalyi, 1990).

Here are a few respondents' comments containing the idea of *flow*.

M2:8

M2: . . . where you are seeing things hopefully from the Lord's perspective, you're willing to bear the stripes of another, instead of retaliation, because you're motivated by the Spirit and not by what you feel. And that's always a process, and it's, you always have a choice of yielding to the Spirit or yielding to the flesh and it's a life-long process. I think the tongues part, the speaking in tongues, then helps activate that somehow. It helps us to flow in that [clears throat]. But I can't separate the baptism of the spirit from tongues, 'cause I don't think, "Well I want tongues but not the baptism of the spirit. Or where I want the baptism of the spirit but leave the tongues part off." And when people come up to me and say I want this baptism of the spirit, I want this dynamite of God, but I don't-do I have to speak in tongues?" And I said, "No, you don't have to. You get to."

F7:18

. . . It's, just that when you know that God is, and that God is working with us, open to the power of God's spirit, then you see that when something happens like that you can see that God is doing something. Because it was the song that was actually needed by that person at that point in time, and the chances of that being a co-incidence are very nil. But it's true natural means. And the same thing with healing. [pause] I have known people who you lay hands on and they're just, you know, healed [pause] however, as I was! You know, when I met Jesus, I was healed. However, I then ended up in counselling and spent years on what it meant to be a child of an alcoholic; I'm still working through all this stuff So, I wasn't cured over-night. I was healed I wasn't cured. So, God works in me. There you go, once again, the long answer.

F3:3

I: So, you've been speaking in tongues for about?

F3: Now?

I: About three years?

F3: Yes, about three years yeah. [pause]

I: So, has your experience in speaking in tongues, changed over this period?

F3: [pause] I don't, it doesn't come out quite as fast now. I can slow it down, if you know what I mean?

I: So you can kind of control it?

F3: Oh yes. I can control more. I can, oh yeah. I can't control what words come out, because I tried. It's a strange thing. Just as in an experimental way, because I'm very analytical and I've tried, "Ok, Lord I want to" maybe say this word or that word, I heard someone, it doesn't work in. I put it in, like I may hear a word that someone says and I say, "I'm going try that." But, it doesn't flow. It be like, if I was talking in my language and invited a French word in, yet, it may not make sense to the context of what I'm saying, you know? So, I don't, I just tend to just let it flow. And I find that when I'm doing it, it's best not to think about what I'm doing, just let it come out.

Glossolalists evidence a dialogical relationship of intimacy with "God" and in this relationship, they believe "God" speaks (see Mumford, 1996; Samarin, 1972b). This "speaking to" aspect of the dialectic points to a *personality* that evidences more than anthropomorphic description.⁷ The researcher makes the following distinction about this dialogical *relating*. There is a "*speaking to*"; there is a "*speaking with*"; and there is a "*speaking from*"

⁷ Anthropomorphic descriptions of "God" can create difficulties within the charismatic community. The researcher believes that it is possible for the self-reflective glossolalist to invite a "testing" of all that is experienced, as indeed some of these glossolalists expressed in

'God.' These processes involve different aspects of glossolalic expressiveness.

M9:13

M9: . . . And that when I do use it, I found God speaking true to his character – things of love, of kindness, forgiveness, and true to the Holy Spirit's character of bringing comfort and encouragement and help to meet the people. [pause] And so, [pause] it's just right up the top there, as one of the practical things, practical experiences of Christianity that I use everyday. [researcher underlined emphasis]

F3:11

F3: . . . So, it was basically the joy of the Lord I was experiencing. And I think I have been in the Lord's presence and I have experienced different aspects of the Lord's emotions. Laughter being one. I've experienced sorrow, really deep sorrow. But it's, like, I've been listening to worship music, and sometimes, I've heard the same piece of music on other occasions and it hasn't touched me. But sometimes the Lord has really deeply touched me, and it's been sorrowful. And I've cried and cried with certain things he's trying to do, and the words [to] express what he's been doing. So, I've sensed [pause] I guess, when I say the presence of the Lord, it's like sensing the emotions of the Lord.

I: So, these emotions are not yours?

F3: No, because I haven't felt. No, because when I was laughing, I wasn't necessarily any happier at that point, when it started. When I'd gone and been worshipping the Lord and listening to music [pause] it hasn't been, my emotions haven't been sorrowful, and yet they've come up. I've felt deep sorrow from the Lord. And there's been other things [long pause]. I think mostly it's been joy and sorrow. Other things have been peace though; I've had the peace [pause]. And then I've had the experience of beauty; there's beauty, and then I've had fragrance too. So, there's been other things.

Neither an outside observer nor the Subject who undergoes the process can explain fully how particular experiences are able to change one's centre of energy so decisively, or why they so often have to bide their hour to do so. We have a thought, or we perform an act, repeatedly, but on a certain day the real meaning of the thought peals through us for the first time, or the act has suddenly turned into a moral impossibility. (James, 1958:162)

M8:7

I: So, if I ask you to put into your words, just what speaking in tongues means to you, what will you say to me?

the interviews. Again, the researcher must sort out the cosmological explanation from the direct experience.

M8: Well, to me, as I'm speaking to you, it's the kind of the expression of my [pause] mind [pause], speaking in tongues is really the expression of my spirit, I think, yeah. We feed our spirit, we feed our bodies, we nourish our bodies, we nourish our spirit, we speak, we are who we profess. We profess of what we believe and to me, that's the profession of my belief in God, you know? [pause] For myself, and for those people around me [pause] it allows me to put my mind aside and let the Holy Spirit work. [pause] The best expression I think, that I could put out, is when I put my own mind aside and let God take over in my life.

M9:8

M9: . . . And so, in almost everything I pray, I pray what I know about it, from my mind, and then I always pray in the spirit about things, about something. And it gives me a peace to know that the Father knows about what I've been talking about, and he can minister to me, through the speaking in tongues according to my need even though I may not know exactly what that need is.

I: So, for you the speaking in tongues is [pause] the Spirit ministering to you, that's the word you used?

M9: [he agrees by nodding] And also [pause] I've found it's a great [pause] preparatory [sic] strengthening, before going into any circumstance, whether it would be preaching a sermon, whether it's doing my job [pause] I believe that if I pray in the spirit, before I do that circumstance, God's going to have prepared me to know how to handle myself when I get there.

The organism, *H.s.s.*, becomes *individuated* within a process of socialization (Mead, 1934; Jung, 1973/1968). As a socio-historical organism however, *H.s.s.* has consciousness dulled until the "veil" is lifted by repeated attempts to "know thyself."⁸

Regardless of what branch of inquiry one starts from – philosophy, political theory, theology – all avenues of investigation eventually converge at a common meeting point: the quest for an organized understanding of the nature of pure consciousness. . . .

The thesis of the present work derives from combining these several scientific disciplines into a methodology both elegantly simple and rewarding. We have thereby found that consciousness can indeed be investigated. Although no road maps for such a study have thus far been available, research into the subject has produced its own design, and with it, the context needed to comprehend its findings. (Hawkins, 2002 :44)

⁸ "Know thyself" was inscribed on the Temple of Apollo at Delphi (Fillmore, 1995/1953: 38)

While Hawkins (quote above) is speaking about the critical advances in such fields as kinesiology and non-linear dynamics, his “map of the energy fields of consciousness,” correlates with the interpretation of glossolalic expressiveness uncovered by this researcher. Quoting once more from Hawkins:

Inasmuch as everything in the universe is connected with everything else, it isn't surprising that one of the primary objectives of this study – a map of the energy fields of consciousness – would correlate with, and be corroborated by, all other avenues of investigation, uniting the diversity of human experience and its expressions in an all-encompassing paradigm. Such an insight can bypass the artificial dichotomy between subject and object, transcending the limited viewpoint that creates the illusion of duality. The subjective and objective are, in fact, one and the same, as can be demonstrated without resorting to nonlinear equations or computer graphics. (Hawkins, 2002: 44)

F8:1

D: Just the very same time I gave my heart to the Lord, during this time of emotional upheaval, when I was so [pause] I didn't know what was going on; and nobody said anything to me. They just took me to the front and told me how to give my heart to the Lord and left me there. And I was crying because I had felt so guilty because of all the horrible things that had happened to me. And it was just like all of a sudden, these funny words started coming. But it gave me such a comfort and such a peace and I felt so good in my heart. And I tried to keep that, but like with nobody telling you how to walk with the Lord? And all of that time before I started to turn away from the Lord, because people didn't accept me, because of the way I was dressed and because of my family situation, I, over the years after that I [pause] I got away from the Lord. I just, I didn't want to go to church.

. . . as soon as I gave my heart to the Lord, and I repented, the tongues would come back. But I didn't understand [pause] about the kind of language it could be; I didn't understand a lot of things. But it seemed to be almost the same kind of a language all the time. And I think it was more [pause] it's looking back, I think a lot of it was just asking the Lord to help me, and to be there for me. But I never really felt like he was [pause] had a peace but yet it wasn't a peace. It was, it's hard to explain. And I knew I was doing things I shouldn't [pause]. But I had nobody to teach me. I had nobody to show me. Nobody was interested in helping me. My mother wasn't capable of helping me. She couldn't even look after herself; so how could she teach me anything. And so I just kind of bobbed up and down like a cork on a [pause] big body of water. I, like I, was trying to stay above; and I was trying to figure

it out. Nobody was willing to teach me. So, while my children were small I had a really hard time because [pause] I really, like had nobody in my corner for many years. And I was single woman; I got married and my husband [pause] there was a lot of circumstances behind that, that I'd rather not go into but when my children were small I took them to Sunday school and I had them in the cradle roll; and I did pretty well until my kids started getting older, and then they didn't want to go to church [pause] and I had [pause] severe periods of alcoholism and prescription drug addiction; I was emotionally disturbed. And I know it [pause] because of the lack of love and affection and attention, and [pause] the things that every child needs to grow up, I was still, I was a woman in a woman's body, but I was a little girl in my mind and in my emotions, 'cause things had never been dealt with. And, but the Lord always gave me back the tongues.

Cosmology points a way to reality, much as the finger points to the moon in the old Zen adage; or, cosmology can point away from reality. There is a need to recognize the mind-heart-body of the organism as *being* seeking union or *consummation* with an ultimate Mind-Heart-Body.⁹ This *unity with particularity* [as evidenced in the respondent's quotations] is more than metaphysical assumption or speculation, despite cultural interpretation within a given cultural domain.

. . . After all, living things react positively to what is life-supportive and negatively to what is not; this is a fundamental mechanism of survival. Inherent in all life forms is the capacity to detect change and react correctively – thus, trees become smaller at higher elevations as the oxygen in the atmosphere becomes scarcer. Human protoplasm is far more sensitive than that of a tree. (Hawkins, 2002: 45)

The contamination of “pristine” spiritual expression and subsequently its explanation, come in many ways, but the focus here is on the cultural experience of *consonance*, *dissonance*, and *neutrality*, as the glossolalist exists in community and socially in the wider society.

⁹ Respondents repeatedly talked about heart, mind, emotions, and pointed to their solar-plexus or heart area when describing certain felt experiences or beliefs.

Cultural Consonance, Dissonance, Neutrality

Cultural consonance refers to the harmonious agreement of all individuals and component systems in the cultural domain. It is a state of "concord;" it is also a sympathetic vibration of the systems or resonance. It refers to speech sounds; just as it does to the cultural domain in which speech occurs. When speaking here of *consonance*, *dissonance*, and *neutrality*, we are referring to all levels and systems that make up the environment of *H.s.s.* These aspects reflect external and internal, tacit and explicit, organic and inorganic systems.

In the typology of tongues elucidated, the reader becomes aware of several types that as speech sounds are deemed pleasant and soothing. Recall the description given by one of the respondents (an example of *doxa-utterance*).

F5:3 . . . The gentle tongues like when I'm just in conversation with the Lord, or like, I get up in the morning, I wake up in the morning and I'll start speaking in tongues quietly, it's gentle, it's soothing, it's quiet; sometimes I get distracted, sometimes I don't, then I go back to them [longer pause] yeah, there's no urgency, there's no - where the other, there is an urgency.

These vocalized speech sounds are found to be consonant sounding to the glossolalist; when they occur in the corporate setting they are also considered consonant. Occurring in a state of cultural consonance this glossolalic expression is considered to "edify," that is "build up" the spiritual life of the individual. In the corporate setting this can occur if a *translation* of a public glossolalic expression occurs. Interpretation of this "word from God"

encourages the group corporately. These expressions are seen as the "movement," or "showing up" of the [Holy] Spirit.

The organized structure and order of service largely determine the place and time given to tongue-speaking in the corporate charismatic meeting. In the charismatic services observed by the researcher, one hour was devoted to musical worship, this facilitated observation and participation in tongues, along with the observation of concomitant experiences. The tongues observed were generally of a personal type of expression, by individuals who are able to enter into a contemplative worshipful expression within a corporate milieu, as a "worship team" (a group of musicians) performs various upbeat or more tranquil music. Speaking in tongues before an entire congregation by one glossolalist was seldom observed, rather, tongue-speaking might occur profusely within a small group setting (perhaps of two to five individuals).¹⁰ Charismatic phenomena occurring among the congregants, as music continues during this first hour, is a continual occurrence. In the charismatic community the interpretation of any verbalized glossolalic expression into the mother-tongue of the congregation, is itself, considered "a gift;" this type of

¹⁰ Speaking in tongues to the congregation was not a common event, although occasionally a congregant went to the public microphone, after first checking with an elder or an individual considered responsible and discerning, to relate a message or vision received and felt coming from God. This might be occasioned with loud praises of "thank you LORD," clapping, other human noises and cheering, and sometimes frenetic activity (such as running around the sanctuary and waving flags, blowing horns, etc.).

expression of tongues and its interpretation is often considered separate

from that which many of these charismatic glossolalists refer to as “tongues.”¹¹

M2:6

M2: . . . And I believe that everyone, everyone that's in the body of Christ, that is a Christian, has the authority and power to pray for healing. But I believe that not everybody has a ministry of healing. And ah, but still we do it. But [vocal emphasis on “but”] tongues I believe is for everybody, but not everybody has the “gift of tongues.” In other words, the divine unction that would come out of a person to speak out loud as if they were addressing the whole congregation and do it in tongues and then everyone's quiet, and then they're quiet because they're waiting for an interpretation that's I Cor. 14 where Paul talks about if you are going to speak in tongues in church in that way, then wait for an interpretation. And so that's why people get confused. They start making these rules about tongues and they don't understand it, they don't differentiate between tongues as a sign of the Holy Spirit, which is the devotional language, you and I are talking about, versus, tongues as a gift which functions as, it functions in the same purpose as the gift of prophesy, if it is accompanied with speaking in tongues or with interpretation. You have to have interpretation. One, is offering something to God and it's our devotional language and the other a gift of the spirit, tongues as a gift, is God speaking through us to bring a message to somebody else, when it is accompanied with interpretation. And in that sense, it should always be interpreted unless you're praying in your own devotional language. I think you can pray in your own devotional language and God can bring a gift of tongues, by which you will all of a sudden interpret it, or a certain thought will come to your mind as a result of that and that could be the gift of tongues, and you're getting the interpretation but you don't recognize that as going on.

What is culturally consonant to the glossolalist's community in worship, however, may not be consonant within the glossolalist's other social domains. Most glossolalists are able to speak in tongues uninhibited, only within their own immediate personal and church environment; they would not do so in situations where tongues would be considered inappropriate or discouraged (unless of course the glossolalist is expressing *subvocal* tongues); neither would these glossolalists speak to others about tongue-speaking, if these

¹¹ Recall here the scripture verses, which list the nine gifts of the Spirit. The charismatic Christians refer to this when referring to the “gifts of the Spirit.”

others were not glossolalists, or had not asked about glossolalia. This includes avoiding the topic of tongue-speaking with other Christians who do not speak in tongues.

M2:8

I: Whom would you speak to about speaking in tongues?

M2: Who would I or who did I?

I: Who would you?

M2: Somebody that I thought was open to hearing about it.

I: Ok

M2: Either with the idea of encouraging them to enter into the experience through the baptism of the spirit. Or, just to fellowship, like we are. Two people who are into that realm and can talk freely without worrying about being branded one way or the other.

M3:17

M3: I try not to use what we call "Christianese."

I: Mmm.

M3: So when I meet somebody who doesn't know anything about the Lord and they show an interest, then I try to explain to them what is happening, in terms they would understand, especially when you are talking about praying in tongues.

Say, "what about all that gibberish?" And I'll say, "Well, if you understand what is happening, you know, it's a language that God gives you." and that, so, occasionally that does happen where it's usually someone that's an acquaintance, as a rule.

I: Ok, ok.

M3: And they're curious. And then I've had to learn to answer their questions.

I: Mm?

M3: And not start force-feeding.

I: Mm

M3: You know, so that when they stop asking questions that means they've stopped receiving. And if you keep pushing them then you're going to turn them off.

M4:10

I: If you were speaking about speaking in tongues, who would you be most likely to be talking to?

M4: If I am going to talk to somebody about that experience?

I: Yeah, who would you?

M4: [pause] I would most likely be gonna talk to somebody with whom I had been present when one of us spoke in tongues. It would not be something that I would introduce as a topic with somebody who had never had the experience.

F10:7

I: Ok. So, you know others, obviously who speak in tongues?

F10: Oh, yes.

I: Ok. And your relationship to them is?

F10: Fine.

I: Ok. Do you think your relationship is affected by the fact that you can speak in tongues?

F10: [long pause] I wouldn't think so. Except with the kids.

I: Ok.

F10: They're a little bit afraid of it. [she laughs]

I: Oh? Ok.

F10: Oh yes. The grandchildren, even our children are [pause] pretty wary about it. [pause]

I: So, you wouldn't really speak to others about speaking in tongues?

F10: Not unless they asked me a question.

I: Not unless they asked. Ok. [long pause] So, it would have to be someone who asks a question. What has been the reaction, like with people that you speak to, if they ask you a question, what has been their reaction?

F10: I can't [pause] I use to talk to my daughter-in-law a lot about speaking in tongues before I got baptized in the Holy Spirit. And since then, we've never talked about it. But I think at one time she was interested [pause] but our family, are just [pause]

I: Closed off?

F10: Yeah. [pause] I just can't remember any that has asked us any questions. My granddaughter used to come here, but then she got scared about the manifestation; so she won't come here any more. [pause] Most of them are pretty afraid of it.

Dissonance is the opposite state of affairs from that of cultural consonance. Personal and cultural dissonance occurs when there is a lack of agreement between individuals or between an individual's actions and individual belief (*cognitive dissonance*). Again, speech sounds, similar to musical sounds, can also be discordant and clash with the Christian cultural milieu.

F4:7

F4: It would be a heck of a lot easier [not to practice the lamenting/groaning utterances]. You know [pause] on the other hand you know, God's called us, we, me, to be lights in a world that's dying. To be life in a world that's dying. And I don't think that the call to serve God has anything to do with being happy, or with [pause] or whether you experience sorrow or any of that. I think it's about joy. And I think the joy is just knowing who you belong too, and where you are going. [pause] But otherwise, I think that God [pause] you know

will sacrifice our emotional health in order to gain our spiritual health. I think we see that in Job. And so, that the whole notion that we should always be happy or we should always have joy, or always have victory or whatever, I don't see that in scripture. [pause] I don't see that as being, or prosperity or this kind of, I see it as a heresy. Now, you wouldn't necessarily hear me preach that in your church or something. You know, or in some churches, but then, my message to the church is to say [pause] You are looking for a blessing from God? [pause] And I'm telling you I know where the blessing is [pause] you know [pause] and, it's not the place that'll make you happy, it's a place that will bring you into joy. You know, and it's a place where you'll meet some of the true prophets of God [long pause] you know, and some of these true prophets of God, [pause] well the Pastors in the city would never invite them to play golf, or join the old-boy's club. But they still are out there like John the Baptist, you know, dressing weird, eating weird, and coming out with gems of gold [pause]

I: Mm. That's always been a bit of my problem too, is, I tend to be, I don't know alternate, between periods of joy and periods of, I've always felt joy and happiness were different, but you just kind of confirmed that for me now. But also, I'm not always this happy go-lucky person with, 'specially when I'm in my silence. [Yep] When, I'm with others, I'm okay. You know, I can manage, but I'm not a clapper. I'm not a real you know, outwardly charismatic individual [pause] for me, I always thought the charisma was inside [I chuckle – she answers "Me too."] And I've never, you know I've never really been able to balance this, I don't think, as well as you. [pause] Or, accomplish what you've accomplished.

F4: Part of it, is not allowing yourself to get coerced. You know, because sometimes, well-intentioned zealous leaders will actually [be] trying to coerce performance. And so, "everybody get up and raise your hands, and stomp your feet for Jesus," you know, it's like, if that's not really going on in my heart; and you know, if that's truly not what's going on, and it's not just me, for valiant sake, then I want to have the freedom to sit there and not participate [pause] or, everybody turn to your neighbour and give them a hug. You know, please!

M5:10

I: Now is there anything that surprises you about speaking in tongues?

M5: [pause] Sometimes I hear it and I don't like it.

I: Mmm?

M5: From other people. So, that confuses me. [pause]

I: So, this is hearing what someone else is doing, speaking in tongues?

M5: Speaking in tongues sometimes, it is like music to my ears.

I: Ok?

M5: Sometimes, it's like [pause] it doesn't do absolutely nothing. Other times, it's like I just want to join in, like in an harmony.

I: Ok.

M5: But other times, it's like I wanna put my hand on the person's mouth – and so that confuses me. And I say, "Why is that?" So, but I don't, I guess I never pushed it any further, and always, you know I think we always tend to blame ourselves, and say, "Oh, maybe there's something wrong with me. And

I can't accept that word," or whatever. I don't know. But that's the only thing that confuses me, I'd say about it. And most of the time, it will always be it's just one word, being repeated which, I don't know, maybe it's always the same thing they say. It's not even, like it's maybe one or two syllables. But even then, it's not always that but sometimes it does irritate me.

I: So, is there anything you do when you feel irritated like that? About something that you hold as so special.

M5: Well, most of the time, I'll touch the person and I'll pray for them. If I see that it does that. Either when we're praying and it's another person beside me that does this. I'll touch them and I'll pray at the same time.

I: Do you go into tongues yourself?

M5: Yeah, I won't say anything. I'll definitely go into tongues. I will not, I don't think 'cause, I'm not sure and I don't want to offend anybody and I'm not gonna tell them there's something wrong with your tongues (short chuckle) so, I will pray in tongues and then I'll pray for them. Most of the time I'm okay after.

F11:11

I: If I were to ask you if your experience in tongue-speaking has changed since you first spoke in tongues?

F11: Oh yeah. Yeah.

I: It has, okay. The other thing I like to ask people, can you live your life without speaking in tongues? And I'm talking here about all the manifestations?

F11: Myself personally, I tried to turn my back on it. Because I had so much pain from it. So much rejection, I could not go to church for awhile anywhere. No one would have me. [pause] I did, I was angry at God. I tried to turn my back on it, but you know, I mean, like I believe that God doesn't take you over without your will. I've given him my will. I've yielded. And He knew that well, that it was the pressure I was under. So, He never did leave me. And He never did take it away. So, could I live without it? Well, you know what's happened? When I wasn't being used in that way, so much, intercession in the last year and a half, I lost the purpose for my life. Because we're retired and it was like it was alright, I felt loved, I felt accepted, I felt [pause] I didn't, you know when, God has a purpose for you and when you're not walking in it, it's like you're empty. And that's the way I felt. Although, what God did then, He brought me more to the natural things? I started to [pause] oh, we started to raise chickens and rabbits, I live in the country. So, I get into more of that sort of thing and ignored the spiritual for awhile. Like He kind of gave me a holiday, like I say. But, I, there's no way I'd walk away from God. But it wasn't, spirituality and God is my whole being. My whole purpose, my whole, it was always since I came to him. I came like St. Paul, thrown off my horse. And since then, I've spent a year and a half more in the natural, and it was different. But I felt that I was more empty at the same time. Like, you know, God had me where He wanted me, I am sure. Because I think we have to be happy wherever. But the thing that made me the saddest, was when I couldn't go to church. And yet, even that I accept. I mean church is important and we should go, but if I can't go, well, God is everywhere. So, it's not that important

He is. So, I came around to that. I'll tell you, can I live without tongues, can I live with God, no. And that's part of it.

The foregoing quotes serve to show that glossolalists experience a range of personal and cultural dissonance. The most difficult is the psychic pain of rejection and an unwillingness on the part of the cultural [charismatic Christian] community to accept glossolalic expressions emerging that are different from previously accepted charismatic behaviour within the group. It should be remembered that some of the glossolalists actually experience physical pain, migraine headaches, and exhaustion from the type of manifested glossolalic expressions they experience. The situation is even more heart-wrenching, as "F11" cogently notes; she experienced "*so much rejection*" that *she "could not go to church for awhile anywhere."*

The first thing to bear in mind (especially if we ourselves belong to the clerico-academic-scientific type, the officially and conventionally 'correct' type, 'the deadly respectable' type, for which to ignore others is a besetting temptation) is that nothing can be more stupid than to bar out phenomena from our notice, merely because we are incapable of taking part in anything like them ourselves (James, 1958:98). . . . They *know*, for they have actually *felt* the higher powers, in giving up the tension of their personal will. (James, 1958: 99)

Within the lifeworld of the glossolalist, ministers, friends, family, spouses and partners officially contribute to or inhibit the practice of tongues and concomitant manifestations.

F7:3

I: One of the things I'm finding when I'm talking to people about their speaking in tongue experiences, is that they're actually doing it more frequently than they realize. And when I start probing with these different questions, all of a sudden they'll reflect; someone will reflect and sometimes I reflect it back to them by what I say they're doing it constantly some of these individuals, daily. You know, they wake up in the morning and they're in tongues; they have a

prayer time they're in tongues, and they don't even realize it 'til after I've asked them, you know. And they start reflecting on their daily schedule or they'll be thinking about things they do during the week and before you realize it, they are almost doing it constantly.

F7: Yeah, no.

I: Do you have that?

F7: No, I don't [long pause] I use it much more purposefully? And to just have it be personalized requires more of a lightness of heart than I usually would have.

I: Ok.

F7: I'm worn down by the cares of this life. I have four small children who are there immediately in the morning. You know, there's just not that kind of space.

F10:2

F10: But I don't use it much. I had asked [husband] in the past if he would use it in our quiet time in the morning, and it lasts about a week and goes away. So, as far as I'm concerned I don't use tongues very much.¹²

F10:4

I: So in your words what is most meaningful about speaking in tongues?

F10: I suppose that I know it's there and that I can. [pause] That it's available. We don't talk to anybody in the family about it because they don't want to hear it. [pause] We're the only ones in the family who are a little [pause]

I: Different eh?

F10: Different. [we laugh]

Neutrality is the state of being neutral. In politics, for instance, *neutrality* is a refusal to take part in a war between powers. In the cultural domains of the glossolalist, neutrality is a state of indifference, that is, no conscious response really presents itself with the occurrence of a certain glossolalic expression. As regards speech utterances, neutrality occurs within the utterance itself, such that the tongue is in a position of rest as breathe and sound pass over it. Neutrality also refers to the effect that a particular glossolalic expression has upon the glossolalist. Just as certain speech acts

¹² In this particular quote, "F10" has really expressed the desire to pray in tongues together with her husband, and to do this daily. He however, has not been responsive to her, in this way.

themselves are *intransitive* (that is, neither active or passive speech), so is the possible effect upon *affect* itself; considering once again that it is a cognitively interpreted event.

F3:6

I: So, how does speaking in tongues make you feel?

F3: [long pause] Sometimes it doesn't make me feel anything much. I will say that. But sometimes, because also I got to think of what I bring into it. Sometimes, I just sort of do it. How can I put it? And it's not that meaningful to me. Because maybe it's the mood I'm in, or I just do it, because I've felt, let's try speaking in tongues because of this situation, and my heart is not totally right with the Lord on some of those occasions, either. Because you know, your whole feelings come into play. And sometimes, you know, you're in a grumpy mood and you're just going try it out to see if it's going to work for you, and make you feel better? You understand? And other times [pause] I'm more in the Lord's presence. I've come into the Lord's presence in what I would call, "a better way." You know, with praise and thanksgiving. And there is nothing between me and him. There's nothing, no blocks. And then speaking in tongues makes me feel very, very good.

F5:11

F5: I really surprise myself sometimes and think, oh no! You know, I'm doing something and all of a sudden I start speaking in tongues, I mean, it's not, I don't even think about it, I don't you know?

F9:9

I: Can you describe for me, what that means a little bit more? Why is it so natural?

F9: Why is it natural? Because I don't think about it much. I, your question about have you ever had trouble speaking in tongues is an interesting one, because I've never considered that [she laughs] you know, so I don't. I don't have any trouble speaking in tongues, just sort of seems to be there, you know, you do it like breathing [pause] yeah, I don't plan ahead to do it. [pause] It's you know, quite possibly it's something like with anything that's natural, you can always improve. You can always improve the physical shape you're in I think. I know that there was one teacher that came through who [pause] who spoke to our congregation many years ago, who said that he felt that our congregation could - I guess he used the word "mature." Mature our speaking in tongues ability, by practicing more, and by trying different sounds. Which I thought was very intriguing. I tried it for awhile but I didn't keep it up. You know trying different sounds, practising more. And so, it all comes naturally to me. Whether I'm using it to it's full extent [pause] I doubt. You know [pause] in the same way I probably am not using my body to its full extent.

M3:21

I: So, all your experiences, everytime you've used tongue-speaking, it's always been a good experience?

M3: Well, no.

I: You have had something that's not?

M3: Sometimes, it has been neutral. In other words,

I: Ok ok.

M3: I've prayed in tongues and nothing has happened. That has happened. But it's never been a negative experience.

I: Ok. That's ok.

M3: It's either been (pause) well, I don't think it's been neutral, but my feel or the result, the physical or the manifested result was neutral.

I: Ok.

M3: I didn't sense anything. I didn't feel or you know, hear anything. But I also believe that what I feel, like we don't go by feeling,

I: mm.

M3: Something has happened. You know.

I: So, you know, you have a knowing?

M3: Yeah, what happens is, we use tongues for edification.

I: mm

M3: Edification or building up the Bible says. So, that if I pray in tongues, and nothing seems to be happening, it's like my gas tank was empty. And I'm starting to put gas in it.

Cultural domain affects both interpretation and acceptance of glossolalic expressiveness. *Groaning, screaming, and creature utterances* are often considered dissonant speech expression by others. If these and concomitant body-expressive behaviour jar or clash with other glossolalists, the glossolalic event becomes an experience of *primary dissonance*. While the initial experience may cause cognitive dissonance, it is the continued expression of the presumed dissonant speech act that causes rejection and ultimately, marginalization or shunning in the cultural domain. The following, somewhat lengthy quote, describes (using the cultural language of the respondent) just what happens within the cultural domain when manifestations of glossolalic expressiveness appear, which are regarded as "unacceptable."

F11:7

I: So, I would ask you then, would you say the context, the place, the people that you met effect the manifestations?

F11: Well, I could give you an example and you could?

I: Ok.

F11: This church I was at, the service went on. And after the service [pause] like I was leading the intercession group. Most of the time, I get leading the intercession group, although I get attacked but anyway, so [pause] [she breaths out] we were [pause] there and then the worship team kept playing. And all of a sudden, this intercession came upon me. And there was a few others, so we gathered together and we started to pray. And we started into war, it was incredible. Now, I must say, that throughout the service there had been a bit of a manifestation so after the service, and everything was over, I was speaking with someone, and apparently during the time that was happening, that the intercessors were really, we were praying for unity and we were praying for people to be loving and not to put each other down; I mean all these things were coming not from me you see, because that's the thing; the travail, it's like a woman in childbirth – you need a midwife. So, you need somebody that really prays through what you're going through. So, when you have a group, then you have some people with those gifts. So, they were doing that, while I was doing the manifestations. There were others too, that manifested. But anyway, so, after, we found out that there was two people downstairs, at one of the leaders [talking] about me, and a couple of other intercessors, that they didn't like what was happening and all this stuff. So [pause] I didn't know, but the spirit knew, and he had us counteract what was happening down there. So, in that sense, I don't know where I was going with that?

I: No, you're giving me an example of how the atmosphere, the climate effects.

F11: Affects that's right. It doesn't affect me. But the Spirit knows. You see, I think that's the thing that people don't realize; is that the Holy Spirit knows what's going to happen and prepares the way. . . . The atmosphere changes?

F4:8 [F4 practices lamenting, groaning utterances]

I: Okay, so what I would like you to do, is to just tell me what you do.

F4: Should I tell you about my first introduction – to this whole thing?

I: Yeah. Probably when you start – when you started it.

F4: So, I was scooped off the streets, unchurched. I had no church background. Was scooped into [pause] a church community that I'd now characterize as being charismatic, ultra-fundamentalist, in the sense that it was very exclusive. It was very much, considered itself the remnant church. You know, we were saved "they" weren't. And salvation was not something you could count on, but something that you had to keep working on keeping. And definitely speaking in tongues was something you had to do, as a sign that you were filled with the Spirit. If you didn't speak in tongues, you'd be ostracised from the group. The group practices shunning. And since I didn't know anything about Christianity – well, Christianity is one thing, the way we do church is another thing. But I thought that this was the way. It was

definitely that Jesus had come into my life and I knew of no other way of doing church.

Regarding behaviour within the cultural domain, in this case "Church" and its charismatic social behaviours, this respondent and interviewer are talking about the phenomenon of *hugging*.

F4: Please, don't hug me unless you ask permission. And besides [pause] it's terribly violating. [pause] And if you have a survivor of abuse, it can be triggering.

I: And I don't know how to deal with that. . . . [pause] That is the hardest thing for me to deal with, are the hugs. . . . I have been in groups where I feel, that, that, have not been sincere and I've seen inappropriate touching in groups, and that bothers me. . . . [pause] I felt that I had to allow them to express themselves. It's like -

F4: At your expense?

I: Yes. [I laugh] Yes.

F4: Well, where are you? Where's Irene in this [she laughs with me]?

I: That's the difficulty I'm having. I mean, it's not a huge difficulty, I can deal with it, you know, I have.

F4: Well, I think they could learn too that this, is a cultural thing. This is a Christian cultural thing. It's like I got asked to speak at a particular church. Well, I walked into the front door of the church the Pastor met me, and he kissed me on both cheeks. And it took me back, eh? But, as I walked in [pause] this woman grabbed me and kissed me. Man, it was like walking the gauntlet. You know, everybody grabbing and kissing each other, because they greeted with a holy kiss. Like, nothing like taking a scripture and hanging your hat on it, plucking it out of context. Well [pause] I just say "No."

I: How do you handle it. You physically say "No?"

F4: I say "No." Or, I'll just you know, come into a group with my hands up like this [across her upper chest] so my hands can go out and I'll just, sometimes I can let it happen. I mean I hug people I know that I like, that we have relationship. Otherwise I shake hands.

F3:7

I: . . . **Just what [does] speaking in tongues mean to you?**

F3: It means that I can communicate with the Lord [e]ffectively. And, in a language that is, as I'm told, is a heavenly language. And that sometimes, in my own weak way of speaking, I may say the wrong things, I may express things the wrong way, but that when I put it into my heavenly language it clears up some of the mistakes I make. Some of the faults in my speech. Some of the wrong expressions and some of the ways that I don't even know how to say things. So, that it makes me feel that I'm doing it right. That I'm getting it right with the Lord. [pause] And expressing things the right way. . . .

I: But for you it's important to feel that you've got it right? Is this it?

F3: Not, no, no not always. It's not that important to feel that I've got it right. Because I, [pause] but it's always a completion. Yeah, I guess that's a better way of puttin' it. Once I've made, maybe [pause] tried this way, and tried that way to express things, and I go into tongues then, it's almost like, [she chuckles] it's almost like a last resort, should be maybe the first sometimes. But then I think [pause] that's it, that's the final thing on it, you know? . . . It's the way, the best way to express what I can't otherwise express. [longer pause] And I feel expresses deeper things of the spirit that I really wouldn't ever know how to express.

The question of how the profound changes in the character of religion in modern society affect individual existence, however, touches upon matters of personal concern to everyone. (Luckmann, 1967: 115)

The purpose for considering the state of consonance, dissonance, and neutrality within a physical organism or human community, is that these states reflect a phase of *unity* or disunity; or one might say a phase of equilibrium or disequilibrium within a dialogical process.

The simplest definition of unity is that it is a quality of not being multiple (Merriam-Webster, 1994). To attain unity or equilibrium within the organism or human community, there must be "oneness" and harmony; one might well argue, there is equanimity, balance, and symmetry. The Christian community would describe this as all persons "being of one heart and mind." This quality of unity applies to micro- and macro-systems, as well as to the ecological environment of *H.s.s.*¹³ Dialogical interactions negotiate all these systems. Dialectical engagement occurs at all system levels and is carried on within the pentarchy of expressive attributes (see Figure 7.1). It is this inter-, intra-, and trans-dialectic that is effected by the appearance of glossolalia. Glossolalia

¹³ Again, this refers to all that is within the social environment or social field of the organism; all that is organic and inorganic. Life is seen to desire equilibrium, but there are stages or

focuses energy within and through the organism (this is both intended and unintended or controlled and uncontrolled).

M2:10

I: So, would you say that you can start and stop on occasion?

M2: Absolutely. All the time. I can start praying in tongues now, tell me when 60 seconds is up, and I'll stop or 59 seconds, or whatever.

I: Ok that's been my experience too.

M2: Because if it isn't controllable, God never violates our will, so I don't think he just takes us over where we are out of control, you know. And I think we can have an experience that's emotional or traumatic and we're somewhat out of control. I think when the renewal came to the Toronto Airport Christian Fellowship 1994 on; some of those manifestation of barking dogs, and people going around barking and roaring like a lion and that, I think those were controllable but it seemed like they weren't; it was more easy to yield to that desire to do that, because of the experience you were under at the time. But if you really wanted to stop, you could stop.¹⁴

phases through which it will move (one of these being *bifurcation*) (see Bergson, 1944; Blasius, 1976/1973; Laszlo, 1991; Arden, 1998)

¹⁴ Most glossolalists state that they can control the tongue-speaking, however, there are types of glossolalic utterances that may suddenly "come upon" an individual and are more spontaneous expressions that are not as controllable.

Interpretation of Glossolalia

The typology of tongues elucidated, and the concomitant expressions associated with this experience (and let it be noted, *replicated* with the researcher's own experience), reveal that tongue-speaking or glossolalia is the manifest perception and bodily-felt relating to a direct encounter with cosmic energy, mediated by neurophysical and neurochemical processes and changes.

Recall here that critical advances in many disciplines now show that the human organism "possesses a computer far more advanced than the most elaborate artificial intelligence machine available, one that's available at any time – the human mind itself." (Hawkins, 2002: 45) Since scientific experiments reveal that the body can discern and signal change, any scientific endeavor investigating human behaviour can no longer ignore the mindbrain and body of the human organism (see Tart, 1987/1986; Freeman, 2001; Schantz, 2001; Hawkins, 2002; as well as the work in *transpersonal anthropology* by the anthropologist Charles Laughlin). The concomitant expressions of glossolalic utterance give evidence to the fact that the entire [human] organism engages this spiritual experience; however, each glossolalist may not always, or with each experience, utilize the entire body or mindbrain.

What the research here uncovers is a broad range of both verbal and non-verbal glossae, with a broad range of physical expression – many of these are somatic manifestations, which are observable to any participant observer.

While others have also noted physicality (see for example May, 1956; Nouvet, 2001; Winkelman, 2002), sometimes expressed by observers as *emotionalism*, this researcher notes that these mental and physical representations are indeed part of the experience of glossolalia – she has experienced these manifestations herself.

In sum, the manifestation of glossolalia is a range of unintelligible utterances, including vocalized speech sounds; there is a range of vocal and motor experiences, which have non-semantic meaning to the glossolalist. These utterances are of varying intensity and are both inner and outer experience, involving inter-, intra-, and transpersonal *knowledge*. The practice varies, but for those persons using glossolalia weekly or even “unceasingly,” personal power is derived through it, transmuting the organism’s level of consciousness.¹⁵

M9:13

I: So, in your own words, can you just describe for me, what speaking in tongues means to you?

M9: [long pause] It is one of the best proofs of a supernatural connection with God [pause] because, I know that this is not just my gibberish. I can tell the difference; it’s a supernatural, and that’s why I can see where the Pentecostals fell into that trap of making it the only way of knowing is that unique experience of the filling of the spirit. But [clears throat] beyond that, it is one of those things that confirms to me more than anything else [pause] that I can be connected with the supernatural.

M10:2

This contention with other believers (and with the Truth) [sic] escalated until I was almost ready to opine and contend that speaking in tongues was demonic. I did my very best to prove that speaking in tongues wasn’t

¹⁵ This includes the fact that physical changes are occurring; however, it acknowledges that percipients are not necessarily *conscious* of their increased level of consciousness. Their increased “power” is referred back to the “host experience,” which makes this all possible for the charismatic Christian, namely, “Baptism in the Holy Spirit.” Again, this underscores the importance given to the role of cultural interpretation.

necessary, used all of my best 'scriptural' arguments, but alas! the only arguments that supported this position were unfounded - they were derived from religious tradition and not found in the Scriptures at all. Try as I might, the issue of glossolalia would not go away. One night, I was outside walking through the college campus, in prayer. The Spirit of God said to me essentially that I would not be filled with the Spirit without speaking in tongues. He showed me directly that it was the will of God that I speak in tongues and revealed the inner rebellion of my heart that had prevented me from believing and receiving the Spirit of God. I said, "Okay". Then I started to speak in a language which I had never heard before and noticed a slight alteration in my consciousness. I continued praying in this language over the next couple of days.

"Search for meaning is the search for an order to which one can relate experiences and events." (Mol, 1983: 20) "Meaning" is a relation[ship] between concordant and discordant experiences in the social field; the right or wrong, peace or strife, harmony or discord, love or fear arising out of phenomenal experiences within the cultural domains (see Blasius, 1976/1973 for a discussion on the polar aspects of various phenomenon).

In examples cited in the Evangelical and Orthodox Dutch religious controversies in eighteenth century New York and New Jersey, Hans Mol observes: "'Meaning' had to do with the wholeness of their most crucial identities, whether family, community, country, occupation, or their personal places." (1983: 21) In the Dutch Reformed situation, explanation of acts and events were separated from these acts and events. Again, the brain's intellect bifurcating head and heart, fragmenting rather than retaining wholeness. "The 'spiritual' had become differentiated (separated out from) the 'ordinary.'" (Mol, 1983: 21) We see a case where religion put God out there [objectified]; an object to be reached by "faith" and then only could order and wholeness be attained within and without. While not peculiar to the Dutch Reformed, we see

religion and religious beliefs through recent history, separating the "whole" into the "worldly" and "otherworldly." While this dichotomous position allows manipulation in separate spheres, a "void" results because the spheres are fragmented and the requisite relationship incomplete. Just as the mindbrain requires complete neural networks and establishes connections to function in equilibrium, so too, the persons in a given social field require relationships to function in a fashion that inhibits or controls the level of disorder (*"chaos"*), or transforms "change" into order or equanimity. When faith maintains a status quo existence, its object, "God" becomes "the safe guarantor of a specific time and place." (Mol, 1983: 23)

Meaning, is a human asset in our struggle to "solidify the place of the species in the ecosystem" (Mol, 1983). Humankind is always striving for an interpretation that is rooted in time, place or cosmos that renders coherent and consistent that which is perceived and *prehended* in the world. It appears that meaning takes on qualities and aspects applied by the mindbrain, as it "circuits" or "entrains" fragments of information; interpretation resulting from the meaning systems inherent to its neurognostic and socially constructed systems.

The construction of *identity*, begun at the level of the neonate, develops dynamically as the ego-self engages human experiencing. As social theorists remind us, an individual does not live in isolation (see Mead, 1967/1934; Durkheim, 1995/1912; Bergson, 1944/1911; Simmel, 1997). Within human society, the individual must learn his/her part: "In human society, on the

contrary, fabrication and action are of variable form, and moreover, each individual must learn his part, because he [sic] is not preordained to it by his structure." (Bergson, 1944/1911: 174)

Glossolalia and The Brain

The most important development for the emergence of human societies was the enlargement of the frontal lobes and the temporal lobes of the brain (Persinger, 1987; Arden, 1998; Joseph, 2001). With the emergence of the frontal lobes came the capacity both to inhibit and anticipate (Persinger, 1987: 10). "Accompanying this anticipation was the experience of time." (Persinger, 1987: 10) It is the temporal lobe that contained an area where sound could be experienced and understood in space or in time (Persinger, 1987: 11).¹⁶ Through connections to the frontal lobe and other portions of the brain, regions of the temporal lobe contributed to speech.¹⁷ Finally, this capacity to speak was correlated with the ability to think and subsequently, the

¹⁶ Massey notes: "Language emerged not to give humans a capacity for rational or abstract analysis per se -- rational thought was more of a by-product -- but to enhance their *social intelligence* to enable them to get along in large groups (Dunbar, 1996; Maryanski, 1996)." (Massey, 2002: 8)

¹⁷ d'Aquili and Newberg postulate that there are four tertiary association areas in the brain that function in the genesis of various mystical states, the subjective sense of the divine, and the subjective experience of God. These cortical regions are referred to as: the inferior temporal lobe; the inferior parietal lobule; the posterior superior parietal lobule; and the prefrontal cortex (d'Aquili and Newberg, 1993: 180-181). During meditative or sustained attention, the prefrontal area exhibits electrophysiological activity and research indicates also, that the limbic system is involved when there is attention or concentration (see d'Aquili and Newberg, 1993; Joseph, 2001).

phenomenon known as awareness and experience appeared (Persinger, 1987: 1; see Arden, 1998: 31; Massey, 2002).¹⁸

Michael Persinger has hypothesized the presence of *temporal lobe transients* (TLT) as a correlate to religious phenomenon, including speaking in tongues (Henderson, 1997). Persinger's [early] data provides evidence pointing to the temporal lobe as significant for religious experience and in particular, glossolalic experience (Persinger, 1987). "Those who were 'spontaneous' glossolalics showed temporal lobe spikes. Those who learned by imitation did not show these transients."¹⁹

Neuroscience research and anthropological cross-cultural studies leave little doubt that religious experiencing is associated with changes in the mindbrain (see Bourguignon, 1973, 1989; Laughlin and d'Aquili, 1974; Laughlin, 1995; d'Aquili and Newberg, 1993; Ashbrook, 1989; Winkelman, 2000, 2002; Joseph, 2001; Teske, 2001). Glossolalia is a "spiritual experience" in an alternative phase of consciousness; it is one that is a "willed" and intended encounter, but it is also a spontaneous or *responding to* experience.²⁰ While some glossolalists advance other types of glossolalic expressiveness not considered "acceptable" in the charismatic community,

¹⁸ At this stage, the hippocampus and amygdala migrated deeper within the brain, both into the temporal lobe. Within the temporal lobe, the properties of the experience of remembering and evaluation occurred and subsequently the labeling of experiences (Persinger, 1987: 11).

¹⁹ Personal communication, through electronic mail, July 4, 2002.

²⁰ It should be remembered that the neomammalian brain of *Homo sapien sapiens* represents a *major transformation* of consciousness (see Arden, 1998:31; see also Bourguignon, 1973; Grof, 1975, 1998; Campbell, 1981; Goleman, 1995; Winkelman, 2000; Joseph, 2001; Ratey, 2002).

he/she may actually be responding to “something cosmically Other” (expressed as “something just took me over,” or “it just comes upon me”).²¹

Human beings did not, nor do we develop in isolation from other beings. We are social and biological creatures. At all stages of phylogenetic evolutionary development, *H.s.s.* interacted with the physical environment and other species. Language is a part of this development.

Language is the ultimate social arbiter, allowing people to maintain interpersonal relationships through conversation, to monitor the social interactions of others through gossip, and to reach collective decisions through discussion. ...

Language is far more efficient than grooming as a means of maintaining social contact and monitoring interpersonal relationships, for the simple reason that we can talk to more than one person at a time. (Massey, 2002: 8-9)

With the proliferation of scientific information in all disciplines, we now know that the individual is a dynamic microcosm of interactive energy (e.g., neuronal activities and neurotransmitters function to promote cellular and system life), within complex systems and subsystems that are interacting and *communicating* (see Turner, 1983; d'Aquili, 1983; Ashbrook, 1989; d'Aquili and Newberg, 1993; Joseph, 2001; Sulis, 2001). The relations established when the individual experiences the environment of the social field tap into the *flow* of dialectical processes. In these processes, there is *dialogue* through *dialogic interactions* and *dialectic change(s)* (see Riegel, 1976).

The dialectical process engages living beings in an interactive social field. It partners with human consciousness and experience in a cyclical

²¹ This also includes that called nonconsciousness and Jung's “collective unconscious.”

fashion which changes *self* and world (see Laughlin and d'Aquili, 1974; Laughlin, 1995; Jahn and Dunne, 2001). This dynamic process begins with foetal and infant development and is affected by genetic and environmental factors.

We now have evidence that object awareness, as well as awareness of movement and interaction, are "already there" in the perception of the perinatal human being. ...The visual system of the infant, although it is the last to begin developing in the womb, is nonetheless fairly precocious at birth (Haith, 1980). ...In other words, the newborn is already prepared to explore its environment, and detect, explore and model objects and relations found there. Some researchers go so far as to suggest that object perception develops early and that the infant at, or near, birth is perceiving the world out of a single mechanism, an already mature "object concept" (Streri and Spelke 1988) from which it explores the surfaces and movements of objects in its environment. (Laughlin, 1992: 40)

This researcher eschews both a static conception of "traits, abilities, and competencies" of individual and/or group, as well as the simple notion of *H.s.s.* striving for equanimity. In most human interaction, individuals speak. In speaking we engage a dialogue in which speakers alternate their verbal presentations.

M4:2

M4: My prayer time tend to be fairly short and in pieces through the day. So, I'm not one to sit and, very rarely in my Christian walk have I ever, sat and felt a burden to pray for something for hours the way that you know, you go to a prayer conference, and they'll say, "Oh yeah I prayed for that for an hour." I mean that's not me. I'm really along the lines of express what is on my heart to express and saying it again is not going to change anything. So, I just move on. and so, as part of a dialogue with God during the day, which would come and go, I would usually speak in English but may also [pause] So, I guess the tongues would accompany something else, in terms of a dialogue with, or something you know, an expression to God. The tongues would accompany that, as opposed to beginning with that.

I: Right. Yeah, no, basically what I am trying to tease out is your part in the experience. And what I hear you saying, is that speaking in tongues is a part of your way of dialoguing with God.

M4: Right, if I am out of words, and I still want to say something else, that would be a part of what I would do. And it would generally be you know, a sentence – in terms of, I'm just trying to express a duration and not a lot, I wouldn't go on and on and on. It would just be, that.

The researcher's field note regarding her experience:

At times it seems that in my experience of glossolalia, I transcend my congealed body and that I also make an attempt to escape my thinking brain. However, as long as I hold breath and consciousness within my body, I cannot escape all that is internal or external in the time and space of my experiencing.²² How do I reconcile disparate experiences in my lifeworld?

There is a temporal structure - each utterance made must reflect the speaker's view or at least parallel the other's point of view or reflect another view on the topic at hand. Not to do so is to engage a monologue (see Riegel, 1976).

M9:10

I: Do you always get an interpretation to your tongue?

M9: I ask for it usually.

I: You do. And how does the interpretation come? Is it while you're speaking the tongues, the babble, is it after?

M9: Usually it just comes in a very brief part of the tongue. When I'm moving from tongues to a word of knowledge, there will be a word.

I: So, it's sequential? The way this is happening?

M9: Oh yes. Yes. Yes. The tongues would have to be first. Yeah. Now, mind you, I think you can get a prophetic word without the tongue, as well. But if I start out in tongues, and then especially if I want to minister to someone I'll find a word will come up, and then I'll go to the word, speak it, vocally, and as I'm speaking another word will come in and another word, and another word, till I sense that's all the Lord's said, don't say anymore.

I: Ok.

M9: And that is sort of the sequence.

Apparent also in the temporal ordering of speech is the explicitness of the utterance. This is based on an individual's increasing experience in

²² This is not to say that some experiences, such as the records of the *near-death experience* (N.D.E.), are or approximate a total escape of time and space; see also the meditative experience known as the "oceanic experience." In the researcher's own experience of

linguistic-cognitive operations. The earliest explicit language experience is made with mother. Here, we see evidence of "intuitive" understanding at this early, more primal life experience of the infant (see Shatz, 1992; Schantz, 2001).

The earliest observed interactions between mother and child were formerly seen externally. With new technology we can observe the infant *in utero*. There is scientific evidence to convince us that the infant responds to external stimuli (e.g., a mother's voice and music) in utero. The earliest babble of the child in the first few weeks and months of infant development, further the dialectical processes begun in utero (see Shatz, 1992; Zeki, 1992; Damasio and Damasio, 1992). "Experience begins in the womb, and child psychologists hold that communication between mother and child correlates with the development of neuronal pathways in the foetal brain." (Turner, 1983: 245)

Language exists as an artifact in the external world -- a collection of symbols in admissible combinations -- and as the embodiment in the brain of those symbols and the principles that determine their combinations. The brain uses the same machinery to represent language that it uses to represent any other entity....

We believe the brain processes language by means of three interacting sets of structures. First, a large collection of neural systems in both the right and left cerebral hemispheres represents non-language interactions between the body and its environment, as mediated by varied sensory and motor systems -- that is to say, anything that a person does, perceives, thinks or feels while acting in the world. ...

Second, a smaller number of neural systems, generally located in the left cerebral hemisphere, represent phonemes, phoneme combinations and syntactic rules for combining words. When

glossolalia, however, she is not in a trance state, nor does she perceive herself as experiencing that which is traditionally referred to as "mystical experience."

stimulated from within the brain, these systems assemble word-forms and generate sentences to be spoken or written. When stimulated externally by speech or text, they perform the initial processing of auditory or visual language signals.

A third set of structures, also located largely in the left hemisphere, mediates between the first two. It can take a concept and stimulate the production of word-forms, or it can receive words and cause the brain to evoke the corresponding concepts. (Damasio and Damasio, 1992: 89)

Developmental interactions between mother and child represent the basis for sociolinguistic dialogue at the adult level (Riegel, 1976: 692). Whether it is the early mother/caretaker-child dialogue or the adult-adult dialogue, there are two persons involved in a *synchronization* of verbal sequences (temporal structuring).²³ It is important to recognize that: "The mother, in a more concrete sense, has to speak, direct, and prevent, but she has also to listen and change her own activities according to the demands of her child." (Riegel, 1976: 693)

Goren, Sarty, and Wu (1975) provide evidence that infants, with a median age of nine minutes, can turn their eyes and heads to follow a series of moving stimuli. Their work suggests that there is within human neonates the possibility of visual discriminations, and that this exists without any visual experience prior to testing. Their conclusion is that "visual perception" is an unlearned capacity.

The infant enters the world predisposed to respond to any face. . . . The results may be interpreted as being consistent with an unlearned perceptual organization present at birth in human infants. Moreover,

²³ A similar experience may also occur between the author who attempts to provide information, direction and knowledge to society. Both mother and author, states Riegel, are intermediaries, not unlike the priest and professor.

these results suggest that an evolved predisposition to respond selectively to faces may be present at birth. (Goren et al., 1975: 547-548)

The question the researcher poses is the following: "Just how many of these organized 'perceptual systems' do we have within our mindbrain and body? What others may be [co-]evolving?"

To restate, the mother and child interaction is one of the human neonate's earliest dialogical interactions. At minimum there are two persons "both operating interactively over time and thus growing and developing together...." (Riegel, 1976:689) Now we see in this earliest of human dialogue, *temporality, synchronicity, and change*. At the level of increasing complexity, we can say that these foci occur within the systems making up our sociocultural, biophysical, intrapsychic, and transpersonal spheres or alternatively, these occur within the pentarchy of spiritual expressiveness.

According to Riegel (1976), while balance or synchronization is the goal [sic] of human development, such a temporal balance can only be understood if the state of imbalance is simultaneously considered (see Blasius, 1976/1973; d'Aquili and Mol, 1990). "Development is rather seen as consisting in continuing changes along several dimensions of progressions at the same time." (Riegel, 1976:696)²⁴ This is as true for organisms at the simplest level of development, as it is for the complex creature of evolution,

²⁴ The researcher thinks of this as a synchronous matrix or nexus of fields; patterns occurring within the apparent chaos. This pattern or order is similar to Lorenza's butterfly pattern (see Arden, 1998) or Dr. Kekulé's benzene ring formulation (discovered through the dream of the snake eating his tail). These patterns are often, initially, unavailable to the naked eye, but the mindbrain is capable of such sophisticated perception.

Homo sapien sapiens. One might add, this is also true for the creature's creations, such as the "scientific paradigms" produced in various historical moments.²⁵

At any stage of development, with balance or synchronization being the goal, that state can only be understood if the state of imbalance is simultaneously considered: "balance and imbalance are dialectically determined, and their relationship changes continuously" (Riegel, 1976: 697). If we see *existence* as experiencing a constant flow of interweaving events/encounters, then we go a long way toward reconciling differences, e.g., the subject-object segregation.

d'Aquili's (1983) thesis of a *myth-ritual complex* resulting from a culmination of a long phylogenetic evolutionary process and a neural model to explain its properties, holds promise for a more inclusive understanding of glossolalia, as dialectical expression of [perhaps] a primal dialogue and greater psycho-social integration within the mindbrain.

Symbolic systems are laid in the early neonatal and prenatal experiences of the child (see Mead, 1934; Shatz, 1992; Joseph, 2001; Teske, 2001). These early experiences of childhood form the social biography of subsequent social and emotional patterns in adulthood. These include the "trust and faith in a larger world of spirit." (Teske, 2001: 98)²⁶ Evolutionary

²⁵ "The neurosciences are shifting our understanding of cognition from traditional objectivism - cognition as rational propositions - to cognition as experiential realism." (Ashbrook, 1989: 67)

²⁶ Human cognition involves neurobehavioral plasticity and the hypertrophy of the prefrontal cortex (Teske, 2001). The hypertrophy of the prefrontal cortex "guarantees a predisposition to

and developmental evidence convinces one of our social interdependencies; that is "...our membership in larger human groups -- are both necessary for and constitutive of the mental and spiritual life of human beings." (Teske, 2001: 95)

Regarding linguistic production "...all linguistic production depends on context and intent for its ultimate meaning. It is not unusual for similar or even identical utterances to mean very different things when correlated with intent and context." (Chaika, 1990: 180) The inherent *meaning* of glossolalic utterances or "speech" is a meaning that is independent of traditional decoding (interpretation) procedures. If decoding takes place regarding "interpretation" of glossolalic utterance, it typically occurs by another at the meeting where it occurs (see Chaika, 1990; see the many respondent quotes contained within this chapter). However, it is interpretive centre[s] of the mindbrain, culturally *loaded*, that are involved in "decoding," interpreting and explaining glossolalic phenomenon (see Blasius, 1976/1973: 107-122 for a discussion on the phenomenological view of language).

Among French writers glossolalia (or speaking in tongues) is considered the tendency to create new languages that become richer and more stable over time. To a great extent, the formation of such languages is understood to involve clear consciousness and deliberate will (for example, Cénac or Teulié). By contrast and deviating less from tradition, among German writers, the various verbal forms of glossolalia are considered only the involuntary eruption of intense affective

employ symbolic learning and facilitates the computational learning behind the evolution of human cognition, consciousness, and culture, including religious systems." (Teske, 2001: 97). This prefrontal hypertrophy enables symbolic capacities and makes *H.s.s.* less dependent on only genetic or animal communications.

processes with a weakening in the clarity of what is conscious. (de Certeau, 1996: 29 [italics in original translation])

The researcher's personal experience uncovers the fact that glossolalic utterances facilitate and advance other expressions; similar to many glossolalists interviewed, she experiences "visions," "colours," "light," "geometry," "automatic writing", and "ideas;" all of which may or may not be associated with "thought" produced "simultaneously" during the experience or later upon reflection.²⁷

M9:4

. . . so, this became a very practical thing, too, when counselling with someone, to trust God for a prophetic word for them and then receive a word of knowledge, which would often come in, the way of a picture, a coloured picture to me, and then that picture needed to be interpreted, which usually under my breath, I have to speak in tongues just to try and get the understanding of the meaning of what it was, and then have the courage to start out speaking, a prophetic word to someone. And one of the examples "M" uses, in speaking prophetic words is, it's like pulling out Kleenex? You may only get the first word but you won't get the second word till you pull the first one. [chuckle] So, it puts you out on a limb a bit. So you feel the word of the Lord's, given you something to say to that person. It may just be one word, so you start with your word and see where it's going to go. You pull that Kleenex out and you find oh, the Lord is saying something more, something more. And that we need to learn [clear throat] when the Lord's not putting any more Kleenex out there, don't go on and giving your own opinion or saying things that you think would be nice for them to hear. Just learn to know what God is saying prophetically, and stop when that prophetic word is stopped.

Christian charismatic glossolalia usually proceeds from the Christian conviction in the Baptism of the Holy Spirit, and its social context is both *public (communal)* places, e.g., a church meeting, small bible-study group, prayer group, counselling situations, and a *private (personal)* place. Grady and Loewenthal suggest "two forms" of glossolalia, which they call Type 'A' (calm)

²⁷ In this way, the researcher "replicates" and "verifies" some of the experiences/effects reported by the respondents.

and private, and the other Type 'B' (excited) and public glossolalia (1997: 190). Considering that this researcher is herself a glossolalist, and has specifically observed and asked about "public and private" practices of glossolalia, she does not find their forms helping in sorting out that which might be tongues involving a "psychiatric disturbance." Remember that many glossolalists speak of "several tongues" that occur in *both public and private* spheres. The following remark by one of the respondents to the researcher's probing question, highlights a tension in describing and considering "public" and "private" domains. This might better be referred to as communal and personal experiences.

F7:6

I: . . . I am just wondering [pause] if you can describe this process of intuition, intuiting your environment in that public space, and then if you can do it again in your private space, if you could think about how you feel [pause] in your private space.

F7: [pause] I'm uncomfortable with separating too much between public and private.

I: Ok. That's fine, that answers the question too.

F7: But [pause] and I could point out that at the clergy conference this year, I was part of a prayer team with a visiting bishop and we laid hands on people and prayed, and I prayed in the spirit and I expect he was doing the same thing, before we [pause] spoke. So this is not something that I am not unable to do within the structure of the church. I don't want to give the impression of that.

M5:4

I: When you do have your own private devotional time [pause] does it come out there as well, as let's say, if you were contemplating, being meditative let's say in a group? For instance, on Sunday? So, let's take this private, your private time with God and then the public time. In those two situations would there be any difference with your tongue speaking?

M5: Mmm no, I wouldn't say so. I think, I would say it's about the same.

It is theorized that language produced for social sharing or for catharsis is noncommunicative and it is posited that "glossolalia is a social phenomenon

with a shared meaning. In other words, the fact of speaking in tongues gives its own meaning." (Chaika, 1990: 180) To focus on the "decoding" of glossolalic utterances in terms of language and linguistic rules however, is to miss the real meaning of *the process and action* inherent in glossolalia.

M8:7-8

I: So, if I ask you why you speak in tongues?

M8: I speak in tongues for discernment [pause] for my own life, for other people's life. I speak in tongues because to me it's the language of God, and I'm able to communicate with him [heavy grunt-like clearing of his throat]. And again, I speak in tongues because through that, I have the sense of God's love in my life, or his presence in my life. So, those would be the three main reasons why I continue to speak in tongues.

I: Ok. So, when you use this phrase, "language of God." What do you mean by that?

M8: Well, to me, God's language is relationship. And, if you can't speak to somebody it's very difficult to be in a relationship [pause] and so, this somehow, allows me to speak to God in a relationship. We're all called to be in a personal relationship with God and to me, this is the language of that relationship with God.

Years ago, the pioneering neurosurgeon Wilder Penfield wrote the following:

There is a permanent record of the stream of consciousness within the brain. It is preserved in amazing detail. No man can, by voluntary effort, call this detail back to memory. But, hidden in the interpretive areas of the temporal lobes, there is a key to a mechanism that unlocks the past and seems to scan it for the purpose of automatic interpretation of the present. It seems probable also, that this mechanism serves us as we make conscious comparison of present experience with similar past experiences. (Penfield, 1966/1958: 251)²⁸

The mindbrain is the site of all behaviour and interpretation, will and intent. Joseph cogently notes:

²⁸ Penfield notes however, that this is only one mechanism in brain physiology and that there is a vastness to the brain that needs much more exploration (1966/1958: 269). In 2003, a similar comment can be made – there is still much to the brain and conscious processes that we do not understand (see Joseph, 2001).

If religious and mystical experiences are hallucinations or silly superstitions, and if there is no Hereafter or spirit world, then why has our brain become adapted for perceiving and dreaming about what supposedly does not exist? . . . First came sounds, and then later, specialized nerve cells evolved that could analyze vibrations and then later, sounds. . . . Indeed, it could be argued that the evolution of this neuronal spiritual, mystical, religious capacity is the consequence of repeated and exceedingly intense perceptual and emotional experiences with "God" and the spiritually sublime over many generations. Perhaps under the guiding influence of "God," or perhaps after repeated experiences with gods, spirits, demons, angels, and lost souls, *Homo sapiens* evolved these neurons, which enabled them to better cope with the unknown as well as to perceive and respond to spiritual messages that increased the likelihood of survival. A true scientist would not rule out such a possibility. (Joseph, 2001: 132)

We cannot explore any experience without an examination of interpretive structures. These structures are situated within the neurognostic systems of the brain and involve the entire environment of the individual "percipient." The mind engages the entire sociocultural context and all its encoded phylogenetic history and memory, in order to interpret experience. In an experience interpreted as "religious" articles of "faith and creeds" enter this cosmology (see Laughlin, 1995).²⁹

Interpretation refers to the cognitive imperative (Laughlin and d'Aquili, 1974; Laughlin, McManus, & d'Aquili, 1992/1990); this is an active process by which the "mind rises to meet the phenomenal world" (Laughlin, McManus and d'Aquili, 1992/1990: 166). Interpretation involves all the cognitive, intentional

²⁹ In Laughlin's view of "the cycle of meaning," "The society's worldview is expressed symbolically in its mythopoeia, and especially its ritual, which leads to direct experiences that are interpreted in such a way that the worldview is vivified and verified. Shamans may interject their influence into the process by structuring the symbolic expression and again by helping to interpret the experience." (Laughlin, 1995: 21) The researcher notes: I argue that in my experience of glossolalia, the "interjection by Shaman" is part of my self's ego interjecting after the direct experience to help interpret the glossolalic experience.

and somatosensory processes that rise to meet mindbrain in the social field (*lifeworld*) in the construction of experience.³⁰

Language also must be understood to include both the symbolic and the emotive (see Ogden and Richards, 1946; Blasius, 1976/1973; Beaugrande, 1997), along with the rational dualism propagated in linguistics (e.g., semantic structure, lexicalization [style], syntactic structures [primarily a function of semantic organization] and expression structures).³¹

Another qualification on language is that given by Bronislaw Malinowski:

[the analysis of meaning]...For the clear realization of the intimate connection between linguistic interpretation and the analysis of the culture to which the language belongs, shows convincingly that neither a Word nor its Meaning [sic] has an independent and self-sufficient existence. The ethnographic view of language proves the principle of Symbolic Relativity as it might be called, that is that words must be treated only as symbols and that a psychology of symbolic reference must serve as the basis for all science of language. Since the whole world of 'things-to-be-expressed' changes with the level of culture, with geographical, social and economic conditions, the consequence is that the meaning of a word must be always gathered, not from a passive contemplation of this word, but from an analysis of its functions, with reference to the given culture. (Malinowski in Ogden and Richards, 1946: 308-309)

There is a "world of meanings" that must be considered in the culture of the people being examined. This is as true in the culture of the Academy, as it

³⁰ See here Joseph Lyons description of the three regions of experience: *central*, *mediate*, and *peripheral* (Lyons, 1973: 25)

³¹ van Dijk writes (regarding the control of the structures of 'expression'): "...personal opinions, social position, social relations between participants, and even institutional roles of speakers may be multiply and autonomously coded at the level of intonation, stress, standard language, sociolectal or dialectal pronunciation, as well as gestures, face-work, proximity, and so on." (1997: 212) van Dijk notes that context models have a nature and function and describes the theoretical control they exert on the various structures of discourse (see also Laughlin, 1992).

is within the social field of the ethnographer and scientist. The social field of meaning is encapsulated with the "tribes" cosmology, just as surely as the gene within the molecule.

F3:15

F3: . . . and I've been having this thought come to me. And the way I describe a lot of things, like, what you've just said, are worlds within worlds. Like, 'cause somebody's even said, when you strike a match it creates so many atoms it's like little tiny worlds of their own. And you know, and I had this thought the other day. [pause] Do microbes, have microbes? [she's laughing] Do you know what I'm saying? How far down? You know . . . like how far up can we go and how far down can we go? When you think that our greatest telescopes can only see so far into the universe but as they make bigger and better ones, you'll see a little bit further, and a bit further. It's endless. No one has reached the depths of the sea. So, then I thought to myself, then nobody has reached the depths of micro – microsc – microscopic life, whatever. And so on. I get these thoughts.

Malinowski makes a cogent argument; there are relationships between a symbol, a thought and Referent [sic] (in Ogden and Richards, 1946). This relationship began in pre-historic time; it is an evolutionary, phylogenetic process, with language and thought.

The researcher leaves further discussion of the linguistic and conscious phenomenological experience to others. It appears that "primitive" structures for language exist prior to birth; that the pragmatic function of language exists prior to thought, and that thought is to a large degree influenced by language. With the greater development of the mindbrain, there is a dialogical *self*, and this self becomes integrated and "coherent" interacting in the social field.³²

³² As a point of interest, in many ancient languages, the word for brain and bone marrow was the same and for the Greeks and the Chinese, both of these were thought to grow from semen (Gellatly and Zarate, 1999: 13). According to Gellatly and Zarate (1999), "Egyptians of The Middle Kingdom (c.2040-1786 B.C.) were so unimpressed by the brain that they did not preserve it with the rest of the body, as they did the heart, lungs, liver, and kidneys."

In one sense, the *sacred canopy* is the mindbrain, whose processes we still are just beginning to understand (see the work of Freeman, 2001; Sulis, 2001; Sulis and Gupta, 2001). Yet, what of these interpretative structures within each one of us? What does the "interpretation" of phenomenal experience "mean" to the *self*, ego, and transformation (of *self*)?

Pentarchy of Expressive Attributes

F1:1

I: How does speaking in tongues make you feel?

F1: A very powerful energy experience – I felt somehow 'taken over' by this.

I: What is most meaningful to you about speaking in tongues?

F1: The surrender to something that feels so good when not resisted.

The five *expressive* attributes (identified in Figure 7.1) are dialectically related; it is within this *pentarchy of relationships* where the *mechanism* of energy-exchange takes place; it is through these domains that [the proposition of] *spiritual transmutation* is cognitively "explained."

It is by a thorough investigation into the lived reality of the glossolalic experience, that the researcher can talk about what it is that she is ethnographically observing. As mentioned in the glossolalia literature review, good ethnographic descriptions exist within social science on Pentecostalism and tongue-speaking (Goodman, 1972a; Samarin, 1972b; Malony and Lovekin, 1985; Poloma and Pendleton, 1989; Poloma and Hoelter, 1998; Poloma, 1998, 1999; Nouvet, 2001); however, few researchers push phenomenological awareness via the crucible of direct human experience on the part of the researcher. It is in direct experience where this researcher

locates herself and the phenomenological gap: the energy of glossolalia has been seen and felt within the body of this researcher. After the experiencing, the phenomenon is a cognitively reflected-upon event. Having experienced, the researcher can state that a dialogical engagement of the congealed body with "something Other" is indeed experienced (perceived and *apprehended as energy*), along with a dialectical engagement of that which is external to her. In some respects the following description is most apt:³³

. . . [regarding the researcher's autoethnographic experience of glossolalia] demonstrates how the anthropological Self, experiencing the verbal utterances of glossolalia (speaking in tongues) can create a bridge into the world of the Other, when one truly becomes a participant of a particular experience. . . . Am I pushing it to say we have here an example of anthropology as, simultaneously Theoretical Self and Theoretical Other, a longstanding internal divide that represents the diversity of the discipline? At the very least, we have an example of the transformation of self-consciousness as a prerequisite for understanding the Other, and for constructing a bridge to the Other. Hopefully any fieldwork is itself such a transformative event. (Fox, 2002: 4 –5)

The researcher is aware that her findings challenge traditional Western conceptions of "reliability" and "validity." The research findings and their interpretation simply give evidence to the fact that the mind-body conception of Western/Euroamerican science is a nascent conception. To this state-phase in science must now be added the theoretical findings and musings of recent considerations coming from physics, mathematics, and neuroscience (see Bentov, 1977; d'Aquili and Mol, 1990; Laszlo, 1991; Laughlin, 1992, 1997;

³³ Comment by Dianna J. Fox, Ph.D., on Irene Smolik's paper, "Glossolalia: An Autoethnographic Account" read by Brian Given, Ph.D. at the NEAA conference "Building

Braud and Anderson, 1998; Davis-Floyd and Arvidson, 1997; Pearsall, 1998; Jahn and Dunne, 2001; Sulis, 2001; Sulis and Gupta, 2001; and Hawkins, 2002).

... At the end of the day, we are confronted with an archive of irregular, irrational, yet indissmissible data that testifies, almost impishly, to our enduring lack of comprehension of the basic nature of these phenomena.

... all of this actually may have been a misguided search for the key to these phenomena under a familiar intellectual lamp post, while the processes we seek to understand actually are functioning in more shadowy regions of the mental and physical worlds. (Jahn and Dunne, 2001: 300)

Autonomy of the primary institutions, "subjective" autonomy and anomie of the social order are dialectically related. At the very least it may be said that "subjective" autonomy and autonomy of the primary institutions, the two most remarkable characteristics of modern industrial societies, are genuinely ambivalent phenomena. (Luckmann, 1967: 116)

Figure 7.1 Pentarchy of Expressive Attributes making up the body-mind-spirit complex of *H.s.s.*

In Figure 7.1, one side of the pentagon is represented by a dotted line, while the other four sides are represented by solid lines.³⁴ The dotted line represents a continuous mutually-constituting dialogue and process of energy exchange occurring between the organism and the ecological environment, social field, and cosmos. It is somewhat similar to the aperture of a camera and it represents a process similar to osmosis – a “semi-permeable membrane” between this world and the other largely unseen world. For the glossolalist, one mechanism of energy exchange is glossolalia. Here *Spirit [Other]* meets spirit [self].

The pentarchy of expressive attributes is a simple geometric representation of the domains that engage our *existence* as mortals. Our existence, whatever we believe about our existential self, engages the metaphysical question of meaning – which is really the question of death and subsequently life; hence, “*is that all there is?*” is a question that never goes away, despite the wish to disregard it.

The five domains reveal how the self (*spirit*) engages living in a body, in the world, engaging a certain belief system (worldview). Several respondents point to these aspects when they speak about glossolalia and the search for the “deeper things of ‘God.’” The following quote serves to illustrate how this is most often expressed.

³⁴ The naming of these five attributes is significant. It relates to the literal definition of *pentarchy* and is reflective of the researcher’s theoretical position. *Pentarchy* is from the Greek word *pentarchia* [from *penta* + *archia*] meaning “a group of five countries or districts each under its own ruler or government.” (Merriam-Webster, 1994: 860)

M2:5

I: What stands out for you in terms of speaking in tongues? [pause] Either an experience that you've had while speaking in tongues or maybe praying with someone and speaking in tongues. [pause] Do you have anything that stands out?

M2: I just say that the simplicity of being able to do that and the resolving empowerment that I feel. Empowerment and a feeling of oneness with the Lord. A sense of being in his presence, sensing his presence. [pause] I guess what Paul says you know, you are edified.

I: So that's, you feel empowered so, it's the feeling you get from speaking in tongues that really resonates with you? That's what stands out for you.

M2: Yeah I think I feel the manifest presence of God - is what, I guess would be a way of putting it. The manifest presence of God.

I: If I ask you, "What does speaking in tongues mean to you?" What would you say to me? {he echoes, What would I say? Yeah, ok...let's see}

M2: [pause] I guess what I just said, the immediacy of God's presence, that I actually sense it, and the empowerment that comes to do whatever I need to do. The empowerment to witness, to pray for healing, to preach to teach to have the right word in the right situation. That kinda thing. Also, yeah, it could be empowerment to withstand like an attack from somebody, some kind of, like I am going to have to deal with somebody who is a critical person or something, that it gives me a kind of strength to be able to deal with that kind of thing.

The researcher now provides concrete evidence, using the glossolalist's vocabulary, to show that the glossolalist's *experiencing* expresses an immanent power. This energy allows the glossolalist to *transcend* his/her temporal existence. Utilizing these domains is an attempt to dissect and make explicit the glossolalic experience; in so doing, the reader will see the evidence of how the *practice* of glossolalia serves as a *mechanism for the dialogical and somatosensory engagement with 'God' or cosmic consciousness*. Under each attribute, the researcher provides transcript quotes. The reader is asked to engage these quotes using the method of *epoché*. Chapter eight will further synthesize and bring these findings and musings on *glossolalic complexification*, to a close.

The Body-expressive

. . . So began the Christian heritage, with the view that the human body was a source of evil thoughts and acts. (Lyons, 1973: 40) . . . We have to go as far afield as some of the branches of Yoga to find, in the concept of Chakras ("centers of energy"), a theory of the functioning of the body in experience. (Lyons, 1973: 255).

Coming out of the respondents' accounts of glossolalia, is a definite *use* of the body. It is a use that is different than that encountered in traditional Christianity. In order to illustrate how glossolalia utilizes *all* of the organism, several quotes are presented, which highlight *how* this *spiritual energy* expresses through and in the human organism.³⁵

A pervasive reliance upon the visual for knowledge has been at the expense of the bodily, thereby generating supposedly irresolvable dualisms: subject-object, mind-body, inner-outer, reason-sense. (Ashbrook, 1989: 78)

M2:5

I: This desire to pray for people and lay hands on people, if you can just explain to me, what kind of a feeling was it? Like, is it a thought, did your hands actually feel like they needed to touch people? I mean what was the experience of having that desire?"

M2: How I felt initially, I don't remember if it was my hands, or just a desire to do it or what, but I do know that since then, and I don't know if that was the case then, or not, but since then, when I felt like I wanted to pray for someone's healing, if it's a really intense experience, I usually feel it with tingly or sweating hands. I just feel this heat, like I want to put my hands on people - like I want to, I have something to release though my hands that I gotta get outta my system. It's gotta leave my system. I sense that as a healing virtue of the Lord. It's nothing I have, it's just I'm a vessel and, I sense that I just can hardly keep my hands off of a person. I have to touch them. I have too, and then if they're receptive then that releases, whatever it is, and I feel it leave. Some people that aren't open, I feel like, it's a brick wall -- nothing happens.

M3:5

I: I am interested in how speaking in tongues makes you feel and [pause] in terms of how it makes you feel if you can just kinda cover everything you think about, when I ask you about feeling.

³⁵ The researcher underlines certain words and phrases in order to highlight the importance of that being described.

M3: Okay, like [pause] when I start praying in tongues, and then I sense that [pause] something is happening, the Holy Spirit is moving, I get an increased, [pause] heart rate, your heart beat goes up, you feel agitated, and I remember standing up and feeling like, a shaking all over, you know, like trembling, difficulty standing [pause] you know, your knees knocking together I guess. Just shaking, just and again the physical thing -- I've often said that if God doesn't speak to us in vocal words he speaks to us through our emotions. And he touches our emotions, which is why very often we either laugh or cry and to me, God, he doesn't need to tell me he loves me, he makes me feel him, makes me feel his presence. But when you get, just like electricity, you know, if you get a shock, you get too much of it, your body can't take it. Well, I think the same thing happens when God, you know, you start praying in tongues, and God starts moving on you and you keep praying and his presence gets stronger and stronger, that you start shaking, physically. And you reach the point where you just can't handle it, which very often results in you ending up falling down. Falling on the floor. But yeah it does effect you, or me, physically, I won't say you. [chuckle]
 I: It does effect me physically too.

The following is a field note made by the researcher after interviewing a particular glossolalist.

There seems to be a reluctance on the part of my respondents to admit to much physical feeling or sensation. This individual admits to feeling the presence of God, but will not admit to any really physical sensations. I notice that his expression of tongues is so much like he is as an individual – quite quiet, does not move around much during the interview, his answers are relatively short and to the point. And yet, upon pursuing or probing, these individuals are indeed experiencing, to various degrees, something in or around their physical bodies, as a result or during speaking in tongues.

F7:8

F7: Well this is what I think. [pause] I think we have to be really, I think we have to be aware of the Greek literature in acting as dualism; which is not present for Paul really. And which we're re-discovering in Medicine, with wholistic approaches. So, we are, as human beings, to be whole in this. We do use our minds, and our hearts, and our bodies. And it is, and we've also lost this in the church. We do not pray with our bodies as we might; because that's one of the things that comes when people really open up into the spirit and they get up there and use their bodies. And the reason that I think tongues are very important is because in order, at least to begin, you have to surrender your tongues. And that's incredibly difficult to do.

Hands are used in many ways in the charismatic expressions. However, they are used for more than clapping, finger-snapping, and just generally

moving with the rhythm of the glossolalist. A primary experience is that of *raising hands* and the *laying on of hands*. This expression often serves to trigger and facilitate others who are the recipients of this form of expression.

M8:3

I: So you could be quite naturally, if you were at prayer time, say at the table here, and having a time, you could just do it quite naturally and nothing unusual would happen?

M8: Yes.

I: So, there's no warmth, no physical changes?

M8: No, no, there's just nothing physical, other than there just a warm sensation of, being [pause] close to God. There is that physical presence of closeness. There's always a temptation when you're praying in tongues to lift your arms in praise – especially at a prayer meeting. But I could theoretically during my prayer time in tongues, and not have any major physical differences happen.

M8:5

M8: . . . It was an interesting experience because I was at work, and I knew they [speakers] were in town and at some point in my morning, I just really felt that same impression to be somewhere, so I went over to where they were. [pause] And at some point during that seminar, they said, "We want to pray for people for physical healing." And I found this interesting, so they said, "We want people who speak in tongues to come forward." And they already had at the front, a number of people who were seeking physical healing in their life. And there was maybe 25 people or so there. So they said that they want people who speak in tongues to come up and lay hands on these people. And I didn't move. And then they said, now we want, 25 of you big guys you know, to come up and just catch them when they happen to fall down in the Spirit [pause] so, I said, well I can handle that. So I went up there. As I was up there standing behind the person, Francis came up to me and she said, "there is nobody in front to pray, you come up and pray for this person." And so, I said well, "Ok, I guess I can do that." Anyway, she said, "Now, we just want you to lay your hands on these people and begin to pray in tongues." So, she said, "1, 2, 3, and we're going to do it." So everybody would just do. So we, "1, 2, 3" and we all laid hands on these people and started praying in tongues [pause] and of the 25 people standing there, only one fell down, in the power of the Spirit. And that was the person who was in front of me. And so, I knew at that moment that this was totally beyond me. You know, and so, somehow, after awhile, the person who was slain in the spirit, which is the expression, later that person began to wake up and she started praising God. She said, "My God, I'm healed, I'm healed." You know, she had a major back injury and at that point the Holy Spirit had healed her. And this is when I knew, without a doubt, that this stuff was all for real. Because I knew that what had happened was not me. It was not within me, it was something far beyond me. But yet, somehow it was triggered at that moment through the speaking of tongues and the laying on of hands.

M2:4

Because when I, one of the first things I noticed after I was baptized in the Spirit, not only did scripture come alive for me, I had this immense desire to lay hands on people - to pray for the sick. And I thought I was going crazy or something. Why did I want to touch people? I never wanted to touch 'em before? I mean I could pray for them - why touch them? And I didn't understand that. And, till I went to the School of Pastoral Care Conference, where this Lutheran speaker, that clarified for me what tongues was really all about, also talked about healing. And afterwards, he came up to me and he never met me before, and he says, "Did you ever pray for people's healings?" And I said, "Well, kinda, a little bit." He said, I may be wrong, but he said, I feel like God has a gift of healing for you. And so, I encourage you to just every effort to whom you get to lay hands on people and pray for them." And then I said, "What's the bit with laying on of hands?" And he said, "Well, it's a point of contact. It helps release a person's faith, it helps you to be a more direct channel to release the power of God." You don't have to pray, you don't have to lay hands on 'em, but some cases you want to.

The Heart-expressive

Some day, after mastering the winds, the waves, the tides, and gravity, we shall harness for God the energies of love and then, for a second time in the history of the world, Man [sic] will have discovered fire.
Teilhard de Chardin

This change in the location of subjectivity presaged the later development of Platonic, Gnostic, Christian, and Cartesian distinctions favoring mind over and against the body. It may also have contributed to some of the characteristic psychological and pathological processes (e.g., psychosomatic illnesses, repression, narcissism) currently attributed to the psychology of the modern Western, and specifically, North American self. (Lind, 2001: 23)

M6:14

M6: . . . so I use the prayer language. It is also a way of getting a answer, getting an interpretation to a problem, to a [pause - blows out] to a [pause] to a need. And there are thoughts that come out of that, and it sort of flows into your mind. And I have guess got so used to doing it, I don't even, I have never researched or attempted to research why it happens or should - you know. Or what are all the elements of it happening, or whatever, I just do it. And people say, "Well, that's very dangerous." "You should be figuring this out." "You should be analyzing this, you should be blah blah blah blah." I don't do that. I just, part of my walk I guess is, is being obedient what my knower is saying, is of the Lord at the time for the moment. That's not a very - [he stops and laughs]

I: No, this is a good answer. Now you pointed to your heart, before, and you said, "What I know in my heart" some people will use a phrase what I feel in my heart. What do you mean by that? What is heart to you?

M6: That's where the Holy Spirit has residence in me. As a result of the baptism of the Holy Spirit.

I: Is it a place in your body?

M6: Yeah. And I think it's around the heart. I, we teach that. We, and I have never heard anything that is [pause] contrary to that?

M7:7

I: So, speaking in tongues makes you feel...

M7: Takes the restrictions away from you.

I: Ok. What would you say is most meaningful about speaking in tongues for you?

M7: The most meaningful thing about speaking in tongues for me, is the freedom that it gives me to express the thoughts of my heart [pause] towards the Lord [pause] or to bring a problem to him. If I don't know how to address the problem, I just speak in tongues, and I know he hears, and I know he answers. [pause]

I: Ok, so when you say it allows free expression of your heart, what is your heart?

M7: My heart is that deep within me, that motivates my every action. [long pause]

I: Do you feel your heart?

M7: Oh yes. Definitely.

I: Ok. And what does it feel like?

M7: Well, most of the time it feels real good. I, it's life.

I: Do you feel it in any place in your body? Could you point to your heart?

M7: Oh [pause] [he blows out] it's somewhere between the pit of my stomach and the top of my head.

F7:6,7

F7: . . . What happens? See I don't use any notes when I preach [pause] I [pause] I think through what I think needs to be said in my head, and I memorize certain key points; but I cannot preach if I use notes because I don't have the context. I think that, possesses some of what you're talking about. So, I [pause] in some ways, which I would probably have trouble analyzing. [pause] Just automatically intuit – from what people, what I see with people's eyes, as to their attention and their [pause] how receptive they are to what I'm saying. You can always tell, when it gets quiet. [pause] And what I find is that when the Spirit is very much present, when we are open to the spirit and very much present, there's a thing that happens in your heart that [pause] for me [pause] it, although this is usually when I'm going to have to do something, it, my heart starts to thump and my palms sweat and my mouth gets all dry. [pause] When I'm preaching [pause] well that always happens to me before I preach anyway [pause] so, I think it's a combination of those things; that I'm [pause] I have thought through certain things, that my brain has sort of worked out a certain path; I analyze [pause] and not at a really conscious level, the

data that I'm getting from the situation; from the circumstances around [pause] but it's always confirmed for me by the heart thing, I know.

I: So the heart flutters? Or, you actually get a physical sensation of something from your heart region?

F7: Yeah. Now, it, may just be a light, like, you know that sense of light increase in your heart? But if there's something that I need to do, then there tends to be the [pause] the flutter moving to something [pause] and you know. If you are in a gathering [pause] that is open in the spirit, where we wait for a message from the Lord? And, what happens a silence descends and there is that sense; and I think that everyone shares that of waiting and you know, waiting for who is going to speak the word or message [she taps the wooden shelf] [long pause]. Now, it's a tricky thing. . . .

The Cognitive-expressive

It's all in the mind, y'know.

George Harrison

M3:10

I: Now, if I asked you, What do you mean by mind?

M3: Mind?

I: Yeah, can you - what would you answer me?

M3: What I think.

I: What you think, okay. [pause]

M3: And it's controlled by me.

F7:12

I: If I ask you if speaking in tongues is tangible to you?

F7: Yeah.

I: Ok. I, feel it is for me, and it's something I want to also work with – when I'm meditating.

F7: But, you mean, even in mind?

I: Yes. You see I believe it's substance in my mind as well.

F7: Well, you see, I'm a very well, I don't know if I'm verbal or visual. When I speak I see the words in my head. I can spell. I see the words all the time.

And I, while saying one thing will be thinking about something else. You know there's always words in my head. . . .

I: Okay, so ring, run that by me again, because I'm thinking of things that trigger in the brain.

F7: So – if I'm talking to you, as I'm talking to you, I see the words in my head, as I speak and this is why I say I can spell, because I'm one of those people that if you say a word to, I'll look up and I spell it. I use to say it was my one real gift I can spell [pause] anything, just about. I'm losing it lately [pause] so, I'm very visual. And I cannot, if you speak, if someone speaks, I do not hear well. [pause] I do much better if I read the text.

M3:7

I: Do you want to push that a little bit when you say that emotions are sensed and not felt?

M3: Well, you know like hurt is something that is a result of your thinking. You know my father died, and I was hurt, so that's in my mind, but yet I react physically, I'll cry you know and I feel the pain. But again when I say I feel the pain I don't feel the physical pain. It's a like a mental anguish 'K?

So, that's the emotional or the sensing of God but (interruption...tape turned off)

I: Okay, so just back to the idea that, the sensing comes first, in your?

M3: in my mind.

I: In your mind.

M3: Yeah, and you know, I perceive a hurt, and because it's personal it effects me. So, in my mind I'm hurting but when I hurt in my mind it manifests itself in my body, or my emotions. And that is what I mean when I feel something in my emotions, if it's a hurt I feel like crying. I know one time when my son was diagnosed with a heart condition, and the doctor said, you know, there could be problems and look for these symptoms. And he was very young and I thought, "Man he is just young," and I went home and I cried. Well, the hurt was at the hospital when he told me there was a condition, but the feeling that I felt was when I got home and I started crying, I felt the physical. So that's what I'm saying is when I speak in tongues and I start hearing from the Lord, and if he wants me to do something he'll, I will sense his presence more and that is in my emotions and I get the same reaction as you would when you [slight pause] as a person would when they were hurt or something and you feel like crying. You feel like crying. I guess I am trying to distinguish between the feeling in the body and the feeling in the mind.

I: Yeah, yeah, and that's great.

M3: It comes in the mind first and then it translates itself into my body through my emotions. You know. It's an expression of my emotions.

I: Do you ever feel something physically first before you actually get the idea? In your mind?

M3: Oh yeah, well very often worshipping. Like if we're in a worship service, I don't get thoughts then, it's just the feeling. You know, and usually that feeling is that of comfort, of being loved. [slight pause] You get into worship and you just let yourself go and [slight pause] I guess sometimes I visualize things you know, like God coming and hugging the people. And I guess I visualize that because that's what I'm feeling, you know. So this is running the opposite way of what I just said. This isn't a result of something that started in my mind but it started in my emotions and then as a result of that, I say, "Oh, God is loving me now." And you know I feel close to him. . . .

The Socioreligious-expressive

Christianity paved the way for the social progress – political, economic, scientific – of the modern world, the social progress which is so dominantly characteristic of that world. For the Christian notion of a rational or abstract universal human society or social order, though

originating as a primarily religious and ethical doctrine, gradually lost its purely religious and ethical associations, and expanded to include all the other main aspects of concrete human social life as well; and so became the larger, more complex notion of that many-sided, rationally universal human society to which all the social reconstructions constituting modern social progress involve intellectual reference by the individuals carrying them out. (Mead, 1934/1962: 293)

M4:4

M4: And [pause] that sense of wanting more was to a great met, well I became a Christian out of the Christian, out of the experience of community as much as anything else. So, in that, Church service, I was completely accepted by the people or felt completely accepted, whether or not they did I guess, is another story I guess. But I felt completely accepted by that group of people, who were all sort of in their early twenties. And it was that acceptance by them, as much as anything else, that lead to my making a decision to become a Christian. And, then wanting to just, to embrace everything that came with that experience was what I was doing at the time. So, you know, you went to healing services, and we went to praise services, and we went to prayer services, and we went to, you name it, and you know, sort of we went everywhere, just trying to embrace everything that, [pause] the Church and I use the word in the capital, universal church sense, had to offer. So, we went to Anglican things and we went to Catholic stuff. And you know, if there was something going on, that it seemed like, that we, that there was something there, we would grab, we would sort of go and participate in it.

M7:6

M7: Well, within myself [pause] I have good thoughts and bad thoughts, and I have the desire to, help people and so forth and so on. But, when the Holy Spirit, when I became aware of the Holy Spirit, I became aware of the things that [pause] that please and honour God, in a way that I never had before. And I believe that, that really is the critical thing. Like, many people, wear these little bracelets wwid "what would Jesus do?" and that's a wonderful reminder of considering, What would Christ do in these circumstances. Well, I don't really need a bracelet because the Holy Spirit makes me aware. I become, my conscience will remind me quickly, whether I should do something or shouldn't do it.

I: So, this awareness, this understanding comes through your conscience in the form of thoughts?

M7: Yeah. Yes.

I: And the thoughts, just, again I just want to push that a bit more. These thoughts, how do you differentiate those from your thoughts versus the thoughts of God. How do you distinguish?

M7: [pause] Well, I think when you're living the Christian life, I mean really living the Christian life, your thoughts are motivated by the Holy Spirit. Not just certain thoughts, but I believe all your thoughts are. And when [clears throat] I was speaking to my wife, if I speak harshly to her, or unkindly towards her, especially the words are not out of my mouth before I feel regret for

having spoken that way. Whereas, without the Holy Spirit, you just, storm out and forget about the, harshness of what you said. Now, I, still say harsh things and I still do things which are unkind and all the rest, but I have a conscience now which is so sharp that I immediately know that I have dishonoured the Lord, I have hurt him.

I: Would you say your conscience then, has become more sensitive?

M7: Very much so.

I: So, things are changing for you then?

M7: Yeah.

M9:16,17

I: Can you live your life without speaking in tongues?

M9: You can, but you're handicapped. Terribly handicapped. [pause] And I guess [clears throat] Western thinking for so long has only included the mechanical. They've learned to live without the supernatural. And they live [he chuckles] and we've been progressing but [pause] we've also missed a whole lot because they are not into the spiritual. And yet, I think in Western society, as in all societies, God has built in the supernatural and so those who are really seeking now, and yet have written Christianity off, are finding it in the New Age Movement or in other demonically oriented, even though people wouldn't realize there are supernatural experiences. And so they are following into a trap of getting the second best, that God would prefer to give you a spirit that's holy rather than an unclean spirit. That yes, can speak to you supernaturally, but not with God's character, not with God's [pause] content, of who God is and his understanding of who he wants us to be. So [pause] I guess tongues doesn't increase my, aptitude; it doesn't increase my intelligence; I'm still the person God made me but [pause] in the area [clear throat] that I am gifted, and even in the areas that I wait using the gift of tongues helps me to do better than I would have done if I hadn't neglected that, at that point in the day. I think that's only because that's the way God made it. He made us to dwell in the natural and the supernatural; to him both are very, very important; not that he puts the natural down. Jesus was the best natural we ever had and when he comes back he's going to show us the perfect natural but he's also going to increase the supernatural and cleanse the supernatural because we're still messing it up to some degree. But he's going to bring it together in a perfect way. In the meantime, he wants us to practice both so that we will be ready to work with him when he does come.

F7:10

F7: . . . Yeah so I have had that experience. You feel like your feet are not actually touching the ground. And you're singing all the time. And then wow. However, the point of my talk about the leg-shaving, is that there are certain disciplines that need to be maintained, so that even through the dry times, if you keep the disciplines up, like prayer and reading the bible, and public worship, and spiritual direction and confession, and [pause] these things will carry you through. They'll keep you going. [pause] But the problem, I think, with [pause] with the high times in the power of the Spirit, is that then you can either begin to feel that you've failed and lost it completely, if you don't feel that. [pause] Or, that, it wasn't real. And it's a reality, it's a sacred place.

The Spiritual-expressive

Beloved Pan, and all ye other gods who haunt this place, give me beauty in the inward soul; and may the outward and the inward man be at one. Socrates

M3:12

. . . And then I've had the experience of beauty; there's beauty, and then I've had fragrance too. So, there's been other things.

I: The fragrance [pause] and the beauty, can you describe those a bit?

F3: The beauty is a light, it's like rainbow light, like diamonds. I've had like, you know if you look into a diamond you've got all the colours of the rainbow. It's bright, bright light and it's diamond light. And I've, and brilliance, I've had that [pause] since the serenity, just around me.

I: Okay. So, the light enfolded you?

F3: [pause and looking for words] It surrounded me. It's been like wings, like white wings around me. It's been beautiful.

M2:5

I: What stands out for you in terms of speaking in tongues? [pause] Either an experience that you've had while speaking in tongues or maybe praying with someone and speaking in tongues. [pause] Do you have anything that stands out?

M2: I just say that the simplicity of being able to do that and the resolving empowerment that I feel. Empowerment and a feeling of oneness with the Lord. A sense of being in his presence, sensing his presence. . . .

M5:6

M5: . . . Like I mean, you see there's so many, like to me there's so many different ways like when the presence of God touches me. I have had lots of manifestations, physically so it's hard for me to pinpoint one just when I'm doing, when it happens when I'm speaking in tongues. Okay? [pause] Like I definitely, I have tingling right through my body.

I: Your whole body? your head?

M5: Yeah, yeah it goes right through me. [pause]

I: And this can happen when you're speaking in tongues or prior to?

M5: I would say that right after that, then tongues will come? But I mean, this will happen and then tongues will proceed after, yeah. [pause] Most of the time when I feel the presence of God, now that you mention it, I speak in tongues then, I do. Like, I'll feel, the, if I'm praying for someone and like it's hard to explain, what it is I feel, when I feel the presence of God. But to me I don't know, the best way I can say it. Let's say you were standing and you were alone?

I: Mm.

M5: All of a sudden a real person comes behind you. And it just comes really, really close, enough that you know he's really there. There's no doubt in your mind, you haven't seen him, but you know he's there. I feel that.

F11:5

F11: Well [she chuckles] that's the hard thing. Like on Sunday, I'm very comfortable here now – so there was nothing that I felt after. But after you sort of feel a sense of something has been accomplished because there's a release in you. And there's a peace that comes. Sometimes, laughter comes, even. Then you know for sure. But even when there's no [pause] like I mean, it, the noise level, like which was the war, lasted maybe for [pause] It's hard to say, it was very cold in there, I could think of being very cold on Sunday. [she laughs] So, that wasn't part of it. But it lasted maybe 10 minutes, maximum in the noisy part. So then, it kind of quietened down, so I knew, although I was in travail. And there was things happening inside me, a little bit of, that I could be among people and they wouldn't notice. So, I went back. And that's when there might have been a bit more of realization and there was crying, like I stood at the back for awhile and I cried, I don't know what I was crying about. [pause] That's the thing, my mind? And people will often say to me, "Well what are you doing that for?" Like I mean, "Ask God and he'll tell you." Well, I'm sorry, God doesn't privilege me with that information. I don't know if it's because I'm judgmental or whatever he just uses my body. And I let him. So, but after, it used to be, now not on Sunday, like I say, because I'm more comfortable and it seems to be, but at one point there was a lot of judgement, criticism, and when you're sensitive in the spirit, you feel that too. Now, when I was taken over with that, it didn't matter, because I feel nothing. I am not aware even, almost, of where I am. It's like [long pause] well, I've never been raised up in the heavens, but, spiritually I have. It's like I'm not aware of my surroundings sometimes. Not always, sometimes I'm aware, but sometimes, I'm not aware.

Conclusion

Nobody can know what the ultimate things are. We must, therefore, take them as we experience them. And if such experience helps to make your life healthier, more beautiful, more complete and more satisfactory to yourself and to those you love, you may safely say: 'This was the grace of God.'
(Jung, 1966/1938: 114)

The researcher hopes that the reader can see that glossolalia is more complex than previously defined. Previous definitions centered around the following type of definition.

GLOSSOLALIA, translated literally from the Greek, means "tongue speech." It is a form of unintelligible vocalization which has non-semantic meaning to the speaker, and is interpreted in the Bible as a divinely inspired spiritual gift. (Hine, 1969: 211)

The pentarchy of expressive attributes provides a framework within which the typology of glossolalia can be discussed; analysis uncovers that mutually-exclusive categorization of [spiritual] glossolalic experience is not supported by *practical experience* (i.e., when we look through the Christian charismatic cultural cosmology [strip the experiential from the interpretive aspect], we see a *life-* energy that behaves in universal but nuanced fashion [personality], and it does so within the body organism of the [charismatic] glossolalic experient). Exclusive categorization is the brain's [dichotomizing] bifurcating (*hemisphericity*) that which is experienced as whole.

Glossolalia is a consciousness-raising phenomenon; it changes or transforms the percipient – the respondents interviewed provide *empirical* evidence to this effect.

The main obstacle to man's [sic] development, then, is his lack of knowledge about the nature of consciousness itself. If we look within ourselves at the instant-by-instant processes of our minds, we'll soon notice that the mind acts much more rapidly than it would acknowledge. It becomes apparent that the notion that our actions are based on thoughtful decisions is a grand illusion. The decision-making process is a function of consciousness itself; the mind makes choices based on millions of pieces of data and their correlations and projections, far beyond conscious comprehension, and with enormous rapidity. This is a global function dominated by the energy patterns that the new science of nonlinear dynamics terms *attractors*. (Hawkins, 2002: 29)

If the researcher takes the liberty of applying *critical point analysis* to glossolalia, then glossolalic expression is that specific, critical point "at which the smallest input will result in the greatest change." (see Hawkins, 2002/1995: 45) It is an altered phase of consciousness, as difficult as this is to define.

The reader has used consciousness to comprehend and apprehend the material text just read. It is hoped that future scientific research will further an examination of alternative phases of consciousness within glossolalic expression, yet it is also suspected that as far as reason goes, some things will remain a "mystery." Perhaps all that is left then, is to attempt to experience the union with the "something" Other and yet found within; then the reader[s] can join the researcher in forming a group of sympathetically-resonating researchers.

The twin dangers for such a "science" of "spirituality" were well stated by James (1902). He insisted on the importance of a "radical" empirical study of the felt reality, conditions, and fruits of religious experience, avoiding the twin dangers of false reductionism ("medical materialism") and "over-belief." Within this region of empirical study, so tenuously established, it seems especially important that contemporary researchers preserve both a phenomenological perspective on the nature and teleology of numinous experiences and an equal interest in their predisposing processes – cognitive, physiological, personal, social. Those concentrating on the existential manifestations of the spiritual need to recall that such experience taken "literally" *is* over-belief and that not all talk of "mediating processes" *is* reductionistic. Those centering on "process" need to be clear, with James, that no findings with respect to arousal, dopamine, or cross-modal synesthetic metaphor can prove that the experiences so mediated are, as such, either illusion or truth. That way lies ideology, whether nihilist or religious, not the intersection of experience and process characteristic of the human sciences. Rather, it is the place and nature of numinous experience in mind and behavior to which we might aspire to make a contribution. (Hunt, 2000: 390-391)

The challenge is to *experience* in order to validate that which is universal.

Religious experience is absolute. It is indisputable.... No matter what the world thinks about religious experience, the one who has it possesses the great treasure of a thing that has provided him with a source of life, meaning and beauty and that has given a new splendour to the world and to mankind. . . . Is there, as a matter of fact, any better truth about ultimate things than the one that helps you to live? (Jung, 1938:113-114)

CHAPTER EIGHT

QUO VADIS?

This is again Nature's little hint: "Study the micro and you'll find the macro reflected in it." Or if we study ourselves thoroughly, we may just find the design of the universe reflected in us.
Bentov, 1977: 129

The analysis of data suggests that glossolalia is a *process* of personal *spiritual transmutation*, occurring within an alternative phase of consciousness. This transformation results in a raising of individual and collective universal consciousness. There is an effect upon the physical organism (body) and consciousness (which engages the *spiritual self*); namely, these *transmute* into a higher, purer energy state-phase.

Understanding doesn't proceed simply from examining data; it comes from examining data in a particular context. Information is useless until we know what it *means*. To understand its meaning, we don't only need to ask the right question; we also need the appropriate instruments with which to measure the data in a meaningful process of sorting and description. (Hawkins, 2002: 26)

The implication of the theory of *transmutation* occurring as a result of engaging an energy field within, around, and beyond the human organism, challenges existing interpretive frameworks in religion and social science. A person engaging glossolalia experiences a cellular transmuting of body and mind; the empirical evidence is seen through such experiences that traditional

psychology and sociology term *religious* experience, *clairvoyance*, *telepathy*, *ecstasy*, or even hysteria.¹

The implication of this theoretical framework challenges existing interpretive frameworks in many fields, especially [religious] *experiencing*. This is not to say earlier works do not also point in this direction.

L. Carlyle May's early survey of glossolalia and related phenomena in non-Christian religion, reveals that various *forms* of speech-phenomena are widespread and very ancient (1956: 92). Similar to May, this research project uncovers the *fact* that various forms of religious vocalization do present themselves – in this case, within charismatic Christianity – evidenced within a small 'sample' of charismatic Christians. Unlike May and others who have researched glossolalia, the results uncovered in this project do not convince the glossolalic-researcher that glossolalia is a learned phenomenon (as suggested by May, 1956; Hine, 1969; Spanos, 1986; Dillon, 1998). It is the case that glossolalia can be facilitated by another tongue-speaker *for* a percipient who desires this expression, but it is the cultural domain that ascribes *meaning* to this event, and this indeed, may be said to be *learned* expressive behaviour. Knowledge of tongues and the doctrine of The Baptism in the Holy Spirit, however, do not automatically mean that a percipient will speak in tongues. Why might an individual desiring tongues, not speak in tongues and why do psychologists such as Spanos, et al., say that individuals

¹ See Mueller (1989) for a fuller discussion on the comparisons between "paranormal" experience and Christian experience.

can be taught to speak in tongues and that it is likely social learning and not an altered state of consciousness? (1986: 21)

The extensive forms of glossolalia discovered here, though parallel to those of May, give evidence to the fact that non-verbal glossolalia also occurs, and this too is both unintended (spontaneous) and intentional behaviour. May's (1956) six-category classification of vocalic data, built on Lombard's (1910) four categories, are similar to the typology of tongues produced here. The major difference however, is the finding that more than "sound quality" occurs in glossolalia. The typology of tongues produced here, is potentially useful for further analytical and descriptive application to other religious cultures and cross-cultural comparisons.

Phonations frustes, a category that May refers to as "a miscellany of examples describing mutterings that vary from gurgling to meaningless syllables," are found in his cross-cultural data of non-Western societies, which "had received little or no Christian influence at the time they were observed and described." (May 1956: 79) The types of vocal behaviours represented under *vocal utterances* in the typology of glossolalic utterances, "fit" May's and Lombard's category of *phonations frustes*; as do accounts of xenoglossia, animal language and occasionally *ermeneglossia* (interpretation of tongues). Unique here however, is the uncovering that some of these speech forms are also subvocalizations. The unique somatosensory engagement occurring within glossolalic utterances is [here] also well documented.

While this dissertation does not delve into the sociocultural basis of Christian charismatic glossolalic behaviour, or give a psychological explanation of Christian charismatic glossolalia, it does give a first-hand account of *direct experience* through reflected-upon accounts of nineteen glossolalists. The lived experience of the methodology, *intuitive inquiry*, allows the glossolalic-researcher's voice to be added to these accounts; thus, "to be heard" in this *experiential* research project. Given the direct experiencing of many of the glossolalic expressions uncovered, the researcher has direct and first-hand *knowledge [gnosis]* of the unique mindbrain-body datum that informs her typology and explication of glossolalia. In other words, the typology both "feels right" with respect to the researcher's own experience, and fits the reported experiences of respondents.

As a *transpersonal* explanation and explication this interpretation *means* glossolalia is the very movement of a power or energy and as *spiritus mundus* in the world seeks its image within a *holographic* universe. The purpose of studying glossolalia is to seek information about how it is that encounters are *transcended* in the mundane existence or lifeworld,² of the Christian charismatic individual.

And she came and asked me. She says, "I just want to do you a favour. You introduced me to Jesus Christ, so I would like to introduce you to the Holy Spirit." (M4:1)

² However, it is really difficult to call the existence of highly conscious individuals "mundane," yet, the individual does express spiritual attributes throughout daily living. For someone with a highly evolved consciousness, there is no longer any separation between spiritual world and the earthly (in one sense, the veil has been rent).

The human organism as *being* in the world, longs for meaning; without coherency and fruitful understanding of our place in time and space, we feel "lost," "empty," "confused," "unfulfilled," "restless," and the list of adjectives on the predicate, go on. The central problem of meaning cannot be considered without a consideration of our presuppositions about life (formerly, a philosophical quest), and of thought and language. The only way to handle this dilemma, is to talk about the structure of existence and our experience as beings rising up to greet what meets us in the world.

Existence as Experience

The dualism which arises from the reference of religious ideas away from the empirical experience of common life expresses itself in a multitude of forms with which we are, unhappily, only too familiar. It appears as the disjunction between secular and sacred, between human and divine, between the natural and the supernatural, between body and soul; or, with a somewhat different intonation, between reason and emotion, between matter and mind, between individualism and socialism. (MacMurray, 1936: 69)

Glossolalia is studied in a variety of ways, but its value as a "mechanism" of dialogical self-integration and spiritual transmutation needs to be more fully explored. Previous research into glossolalic utterances has resulted in the label "regressive speech," though it must be noted: "glossolalia can be called regressive because the most common sounds of any speaker appear to be the ones that are learned earliest by a child...." (Samarin, 1972b: 42) The point is however, that whatever the answer to: "Why do people speak in tongues?" glossolalia has meaning, affect, and an effect on the individual and, like all experience, is processed and intended through the mindbrain.

Humanity is an "affliction" that we're all burdened with. We don't remember asking to be born, and we subsequently inherited a mind so limited that it's hardly capable of distinguishing what enhances life from what leads to death. The entire struggle of life is in transcending this myopia. We can't enter into higher levels of existence until we advance in consciousness to the point where we overcome duality and are no longer earthbound. (Hawkins, 2002: 291)

F3:7

I: If I ask you **why you speak in tongues**, what is your answer to me?

F3: It's the way, the best way to express what I can't otherwise express. [longer pause] And I feel expresses deeper things of the spirit, that I really wouldn't know how to express [pause].

I: And why is this important to express these deeper things?

F3: Ooh, it's just like so important to me; because who can know the depth of our spirits but the Lord, you know. And I know there is so much more to us. It's like, when we only use a portion of our brain, you know, and yet there's so much. I just like the mysteries of life. The mysteries [pause] I'm not a superficial person. So I like the deep things of life; and the hidden meanings. I see hidden depths in many, many ways other people don't see them. And it is important to me. I cannot be superficial. The superficialities of life bore me. And the superficialities that people live by, bore me and I can't be like that. I'm not an intellectual, don't get me wrong. It's not an intellectual thing, it's a spiritual thing. You know? Though I do like certain intellectual endeavours obviously, you know, I mean, exploring things and [pause] yeah, [she chuckles] that's about it, I think.

F8:12

I: If I said to you, or asked you, why do you speak in tongues, what's your answer?

D: Because God gave us the gift of tongues. [pause] To give us power, to come against things that aren't of him. And [pause] uh [longer pause and she breaths out] It's I think [pause] I don't understand but [pause] I believe it's so we won't get a big head, figuring, we know it all. He, it's not that he wants to belittle us; it's that some things are not healthy mentally or emotionally for us to have that complete understanding of. And he sees the future, and we don't [pause] And [pause] there are things that from time to time, God shows some people that, like he shows me some pretty nasty things some times.

I: In your head? Or as a thought?

D: In my spirit.

I: Can you describe that for me?

D: When I'm praying in tongues [pause] I get like a picture. [pause] It's usually a picture of something or somebody, something some place, somewhere, and I see something happening.

M3:9

I: If you you could sum it up?

M3: The thing that is most important to me?

I: That is the most meaningful?

M3: Communicating with God.

I: 'k [Pause]

I: Now, if I asked you why do you speak in tongues? What would your answer be?

M3: The same thing. [breaks out in a laugh] And why do I use tongues and because I see it more as, that is his language not mine.

I: Okay.

M3: You know, and where that makes a difference. I'll give you an example. My son was raised by myself and my wife. She's English. And I am French. My son married a French girl. And he sits there [points to the other side of the table] and talks French to her. And I am listening to the conversation. And in French I will ask him a question. And he will turn to me and answer in English. And I'll answer him back in French. And he'll come back English. 'K. Well, why is that? Because when he looks at me he says English is my Dad's tongue French is [name of wife] tongue, and he just switches automatically. Well, to me tongues is God's tongue and you know normal speaking is mine. You know and I guess speaking the normal language too, is probably limited, if you can compare it to a spectrum of light, it's what we see. But, if you take physics, you find out that light isn't just what you see, there is above and below, different ranges, and same with sound. But, it's the same with speaking in tongues. When I speak in a known language I speak in a certain frequency range. But when I speak in tongues, it is like broadcasting, it's different, it's not, you can't - we call it a tongue but it is not actually a tongue, it's a communication. You know. So, it's very important, I mean, I probably couldn't put across to God the things that I do when I'm praying in tongues, I couldn't do that in a known language, even if I knew what I was saying; if I knew what my needs were. But I start praying in tongues, it's like a short-hand, it you know - flips it across to God.

What about the respondent's idea of "short-hand?" Note the following quote on tongue-speaking by one Christian church writer:

. . . A very holy man, Abbot Lazarus, of the Greek Orthodox Church, author of books on the mysticism of this church, once said to me, "I wish very much that I had the gift of tongues."

"Why, Abbot Lazarus?" I inquired, surprised beyond measure that this most erudite, British-educated scholar should desire such a gift.

"Because from my study in mysticism I have come to know that it would be a short cut to contemplative prayer. We spend hours every day saying the Jesus Prayer ('Lord Jesus Christ, Son of God, have mercy on me') in an effort to make contact with God. If I could speak with tongues, this contact would be made instantly." (Agnes Sanford, 1982/1966: 159)

The form, content, and context of "religious experience," as *one type* of experience, cannot be studied without a return to *interpretative structures*. This quite frankly, is the mindbrain -- with all its moods, urges, cognition, all cognized and operational processes, neurognosis, its *language*, in all its complexity, working toward "self-convergence," "unity," "wholeness," and "transcendence." The evidence coming from the respondents' experiences, however, point to a dimension rarely considered empirically -- the *presence* of that which is really immanent; that which is resident within the mind-brain-body of *the human organism*.. This latent energy, or power, that which the glossolalists refer to as "Spirit," is potentiality residing within all living organisms.

Silence. I can't stand it. I really can't. Beside me, the man moans gently, moans and stirs, and moans --

That voice!

Chattering, crying, ululating, the forbidden transformed cryptically to nonsense, dragged from the crypt, stolen and shouted, the shuddering of it, the fear, the breaking, the release, the grieving --

Not Calla's voice. Mine. Oh my God. Mine. The voice of Rachel.

...
'Was it -- was I -- was it very loud?'

'No,' Calla says. 'It wasn't loud at all.'

I have no way of knowing whether she is telling me the truth or not. She is looking at me closely and questioningly, as though trying to decide whether to say something.

'Look -- it's okay,' she says at last. 'I know it wasn't -- well, you know -- a religious experience, for you.'

(Margaret Laurence, *A Jest of God*)

Earlier the question was raised: "Why might an individual desiring tongues not speak in tongues?" According to some of the respondents interviewed, it is often the case that an individual is self-conscious about engaging this

behaviour; it has often been disparaged by churches who do not believe in tongue-speaking as a Christian gift, and individuals coming out of such a background have difficulty experiencing tongues for the first time. Other respondents have family members and friends that are "afraid" of it or believe that tongue-speaking is not from God but rather, from "Satan/the Devil." Some of the respondents 'surveyed' here, reveal that they sought tongues in the privacy of their own space or with two or three 'safe' friends; by letting go of any inhibition or by consciously acknowledging something greater than their own brains (in this case, acknowledging 'God' [such as the case with "M8"]), these individuals suddenly started tongue-speaking. While some of these respondents also tried to start tongue-speaking on their own by "babbling" incoherently, they always felt that this was being done under their volition and was not automatic or spontaneous. They "knew" that what they were producing was coming from their attempt at tongue-speaking; once glossolalia "descended" however, they proceeded uninhibited and knew it was under some 'other' power than their own volition.

Our findings that glossolalia can be easily learned through direct instruction, along with demonstrations that tongue speakers can initiate and terminate glossolalia upon request and can exhibit glossolalia in the absence of any indexes of trance (Samarin, 1972; Spanos & Hewitt, 1979), support the hypothesis that glossolalia utterances are goal-directed actions rather than involuntary happenings. Spanos, et al. 1986: 23)

The assumption in studies such as Spanos, et al. (1986) and Samarin (1972b) is that religious groups encourage tongue speaking and that the

acquisition of glossolalia is facilitated by frequent exposure to experienced tongue speakers (Spanos et al. 1986: 21). From this researcher's observation and experience within one 'sample' of a Christian charismatic group, tongue-speaking was rarely "taught" or "talked" about, *per se*. The researcher has seen and experienced someone being *facilitated* to speak out in tongues for the first time, but this was a relaxed and simple technique.

Within the personal experience of the researcher, it appears that individuals engaging/practicing tongues frequently, are individuals who are well-integrated, happy, and feel enabled to cope with personal struggles in their life. Less frequent tongue-speakers were heard to say, "*I really should speak in tongues more often, eh?*" Less frequent tongue-speakers do notice a "difference" in persons who practice glossolalia regularly, or "unceasingly." (Recall here that tongues can be spontaneous and unintended). Glossolalia has a range, and some individuals may find that certain glossolalic expressions invite "misunderstanding" and "embarrassment." Therefore, the glossolalic utterance initially "sought" is often verbal glossolalia. Recall that some glossolalic utterances involve bodily expressiveness, and for an introverted or uninitiated person, these expressions may be found to be too "foreign" or strange to desire (refer to chapter six for a fuller explication of tongue-speakers who engage the other forms of glossolalia and who experience dissonance in the cultural domain, when engaging "unacceptable" glossolalic expressions). Recall also, that the ego-structure of persons may "gain the day" and the person will then delimit the frequency and type of

glossolalic utterance. Given the findings of the researcher, it is the cultural domain and the glossolalist, that delimit the extent of consciousness-raising.

Within this Christian charismatic group, there is evidence of tongue-speaking and other glossolalic expressiveness during the one-hour long worship period on Sunday; but it is not the case that tongue-speaking is “taught.” Rather, tongue-speaking in this group occurs to individual’s who seek it or in some cases, it comes upon them when another tongue-speaker prays for them. It is the case that individual’s feel that praying with/in tongues “empowers” or “enables” them, and this may be one reason why a non-tongue-speaker seeks to engage this phenomenon.

Although Spanos et al. (1986) were able to reproduce glossolalia in “an experimental demonstration,” this researcher is not convinced that this glossolalia is that which is produced by charismatic glossolalia. Again, refer to respondent “F4” (chapter six) who was able to “produce” verbal utterances resembling tongue-speaking, in order to defray the wrath of a group that believed that you *had to* speak in tongues. In the glossolalia literature, it appears that experimental glossolalia is indeed a “pseudolanguage,” produced with the goals of the experiment in mind. This is not to say that these individuals may not actually go into glossolalic utterances via this experiment – but there is nothing to indicate that these “subjects” were specifically asked about the glossolalic utterances produced (experimenters merely investigated the 30 second tapes produced). The point being made here, is that this research project reveals that glossolalia is more than simple babble, and that

respondents *know* when it is their incoherent speech and when this is not their own expression. Recall here that some respondents have even tried “experimenting” with their own glossolalic expressions, trying to insert “words” they have heard someone else use. When they do so, these individuals find they cannot smoothly continue their own glossolalia. These particular words do not fit their dialect of sounds. In the words of one respondent:

It's a strange thing. Just as an experimental way, because I'm very analytical. I've tried, “Ok, Lord I want to” maybe say this word or that word, I heard someone – it doesn't work in. I put it in – like I may hear a word that someone says and I say, “I'm going try that.” But, but it doesn't flow. It be like, if I was talking in my language and invited a French word in – yet, it may not make sense to the context of what I'm saying, you know? So, I don't, I just tend to just let it flow. And I find that when I'm doing it, it's best not to think about what I'm doing. Just let it come out. (F3:3)

Consequences of Glossolalia: the Dialogical Self

Glossolalia, as dialectic, evidences the dialogical self. This “mediator” is something that “bypasses” [might one say, ‘transcends’] the ego of mindbrain.³

The ubiquitous human ego is actually not an “I” at all; it's merely an “it.” Seeing though this illusion reveals an endless Cosmic Joke, where the human tragedy itself is part of the comedy. The irony of human experience is in how fiercely the ego fights to preserve the illusion of a separate, individual “I” –even though this is not only a metaphysical impossibility but the wellspring of all suffering. Human reason exhausts itself ceaselessly to explain the inexplicable The mind, in its identity with the ego, cannot, by definition, comprehend reality; if it could, it would instantly dissolve itself upon recognizing its own illusory nature. It's only beyond the paradox of mind transcending ego that what *Is* stands forth, self-evident and dazzling in its infinite Absoluteness. And then all these words are useless. (Hawkins, 2002: 291)

³ In Judeo-Christian terminology, it could be stated that the “ego” is redeemed, or, alternatively, the ego becomes “Christ's ego,” the individual is submitting to the Lordship of Christ in life.

As glossolalia spews out its "babble" or its groaning, it initiates a communion with the *spiritual-expressive self* or *spirit* of H.s.s.. It is dialogue that can occur in communal and personal place, and is something which may or may not engage organized religion.

M5:1

I: Now, have you found that when you speak in tongues now, you have the same vocabulary of sounds? Does your babble seem the same [he sighs] or do you feel it changes a bit?

M5: I, you see sometimes it happens over me. It's, let's, I don't know, the weirdest places sometimes. Let's say I'm walking on Rideau Street not too long ago. And all of a sudden I just have this urge inside to speak in tongues, and I do it.

Glossolalia is dialogue within the mindbrain that bypasses the social construction of modern language and carries one back to a more pristine communication. The glossolalist has only to "sit back" and listen as the tongue pours forth, effortlessly, a simple speech that allows a transcending of temporal stresses. It requires no response *per se* – it does its own thing if allowed. It triggers biophysiological responses that render the percipient free from *bounded existence*; evidenced by a speech that is free from linguistic rules and the culturally loaded meanings inherent in the particular language(s) known to the glossolalist. It has concomitant somatosensory manifestations (nervous system changes) that function to explicate, *interpret*, or assist universal *ongoingness*. There is "spontaneous and systematic evolution of the nervous system," just as one might observe in meditators (e.g., there is the *physio-kundalini* syndrome which appears very much like the manifestations of some glossolalists, e.g., F11). (see Bentov, 1977: 137)

M5:14

M5: But if, let's say, I'm in a church, and people start singing in tongues and stuff, I will pray in tongues, but I won't sing it.

I: Ok. Anything else? In terms of the expression of tongues?

M5: It's always accompanied with the rest of it so it's hard for me to put – words of knowledge will come with it.

I: Ok.

M5: Like, one time we were in front of the church and all of a sudden I said something in tongues and then I just saw a picture, a vision and there was a busted knee. And then I said, someone has a sore knee, and God's going to heal you. And this lady, it was her first time in Church, and she came up front and she lifted her dress just a little bit to show her knee, and it was all really bad. So she was all excited that someone would receive something and she hadn't told anyone; she was just coming to church. So, I think God uses it to speak to people.

I: Did you pray for her healing.

M5: Mm. I did right there. I always do. If I receive like that, most of the time I will pray. I'll ask them if they want prayer for it.

I: Right. Just getting back to the visions – like I'm calling them visions too. If someone were to ask you "What is the vision?" Is it, do you feel that you see external to yourself or do you feel it's inside your head or is it a thought from up above?

M5: It's like even if you, if I told you the word elephant – you'd see it, right, in your mind?

I: Right?

M5: So, that's what I see. That's exactly what I see.

Glossolalia has neurological structure and function. Observation and personal experience reveal that it uses the organs of speech (which involves the brain and body) and it is a functional behaviour for the individuals who practice and continue glossolalia. It is a direct experience with potential for self-integration; it mediates one's human experiences and controls and inhibits other behaviours (see Mumford, 1996).

F7:11

F7: . . . Life-changing. And that's really how you know that God is the best – when things happen that transform us, things happen that change. Because we can't – I don't know how many people I told this to on the weekend [she's chuckling] through confession and prayer [pause] it's not about us changing ourselves – and we can't even really do that very effectively; if we try to do it on our own, we will fail. You give yourself to God and then God will [pause] show the way to change. And only God's power can really change. And I

have to keep learning this myself over, and over, and over. And I need messages like these things, because I was so crushed. . . . I still believe [pause] that if people can really surrender, and open to [pause] the power, really open to the power of God moving through and the sign for that is tongues, then there is even more a transformation.

I: So, if I asked you the question, "Why do you speak in tongues?" What is your answer?

F7: [pause] My first impulse is to say, I'm not sure I can not speak in tongues, now. But I just told you earlier that I can, I need to do it though. I need to [pause] because it is my mantra or rosary; it is how I fill my mind and listen for God's voice.

Glossolalia is one *mechanism* for transcending the individual self and environment, with powerful effects on one's *personal identity*. This identity is one that consciously permits one to feel that the *universe flows* and that there is a more powerful *energy* that the physical being can draw upon. It may be described by a particular culture, to be "God" or "Divine Mind." Status, purpose, meaning and subsequent interpretation occur through the available language of the social field where tongue-speaking is experienced.

F8:16

I: So, about speaking in tongues then, what is the most important part for you in speaking in tongues?

D: I think I would have to say, [pause] to know God is hearing me [pause] and to do that [what] I'm doing [pause] my praying is changing somebody's life or protecting someone's life. And I am not required to know that. I don't have to know that anymore. Because [pause] I've had this wild experience. Like there's not very many people I can tell because [pause] they say, "Oh yeah, right!" [pause] But like I've had the world tower thing over twenty years ago, and then I have this other one. And I've had visions of [pause] of children in sewers and in basements in Romania and Bulgaria hiding because I was on the street as a small child. I ran away from being molested. And as a teenager, to run away from the lack of love and acceptance and attention. And as an older person I was on the street because [pause] I thought if I went on the street I would stop the world, and I'd get off. But I didn't. I find out that it was worse. So, but I've had three experiences on the street. So, I understand about the street. And, the only difference when someone is on the street is geographical location and the climate. You have the same feelings, you're cold, you're dirty, you're tired, you're hungry, you're thirsty and you're terrified. Because your life has no value on the street. None [pause] and

that's why I know that, should God honour me by allowing me to go to Romania or Bulgaria to work with the children, that I could help them.

I: You're willing to go there to work?

D: Yeah. I'd like to go there to work with the street kids. Because they're three generations of street children that have never been parented. [pause] And three generations is an awful lot being lost and given to the dirty old man. I don't call him the devil. 'Cause that gives him power if you name him. To me he is just a stinky dirty old man.

Glossolalia is liberating; sometimes laughing at the ego and rational brain that always wants to rule the mind. It is the freedom and playfulness of childhood -- the child babbling to mother and mother babbling back. It is sound and affect that are uninhibited.

M8:6

I: What is your sense, when you're praying in tongues? What do you think happens to your rational reasoning mind?

M8: It goes into the closet. [pause] Yeah, I've learnt that you can't rationally understand; it's an experience [pause] and for many, many years I tried to understand God with my head; I tried to understand the Holy Spirit with my head. But back, in that room in the states was the first time I was able to put my mind aside and allow, allow that to happen. So, I don't really try to intellectualize this. I didn't, prior to it. I went out and I read all kinds of books about other people's experiences and about how this happens because I wasn't speaking in tongues at that time. And intellectually it just didn't happen for me. It was only when I allowed that intellect to be put aside and say, "Come out of my head, and into my heart." And, when I was able to do that, that's when that manifestation comes. So, when I'm speaking in tongues, I just try to get my mind out of the way. Now, you can't stop it -- my mind is very active and it likes to go, you know, from pillar to post. But the experience of tongues is not an intellectual experience for me. It's purely, just allowing something within me, to take over and pray to God, without passing through my intellect.

It is also more; for some glossolalists it is "work," a "job," it is a call to allow pain and dissonant experience to pour forth, yielding after the paradoxical feeling of a "completion" and "peace." (see Bentov, 1977: 135-146)

From field notes coming out of the researcher's own glossolalic experience:

Glossolalia is a point-of-intersection where subject (my spirit-self) and object (universal Spirit) meet. I sense it as my spiritual self speaking to my embodied, congealed self. It is evidence of "Spirit" -- it uses breath, speaking through my breath. It may turn to organized religion or a community of like-minded, but these may just be one place where glossolalia expresses. Glossolalia animates not just the physical-neurological substrates of my being as being-in-the-world, but it is a vital principle that animates my human 'existential self'.

Samarin (1972b) found that the most interesting and most complex uses of glossolalia are symbolic. However, glossolalia is also considered pleasurable, expressive, and therapeutic (Samarin, 1972b: 197). Reviewing Mumford (1996) once more, she examined women in a large charismatic setting in Boston and concluded that tongue-speaking experience is integral to a sense of positive, transformative change; that tongue-speaking is pivotal in establishing and maintaining a highly meaningful dialogical and sensate connection with the Divine [sic]. She also states that tongue-speaking functions in a variety of ways, e.g., it is experienced as a source of solace and protection and of an enhanced capacity to cope; tongue speaking contributes to a sense of derived agency, authority, and self-worth, and that tongue-speaking deepens connection with others. However, she also concludes that tongue-speaking has the potential of functioning as an addictive response to painful reality, and that tongue-speakers often explain the causes of events in terms of tongue-speaking, neglecting available data that would support alternative interpretations. However, this *insider must* report that glossolalia *is* and that it is "more."

M9:13

M9: . . . I mean it's just got so much practical value to it, that I mean, I do it when my car doesn't start. I, you know, take authority over every spirit of malfunction, and I invite the Holy Spirit to flow and I'll speak in tongues and I: And does your car start?

M9: And my car often starts or I'll find some way of getting it going that I would never have expected.

I: Ok.

M9: And to me, it, I bring it into every circumstance [pause] that I've got to be doing in life.

Investigations across widely varying disciplines stress "how sense of self is inherently 'dialogical', or the product of ongoing dialogue both within the individual and between the individual and other individuals." (Lysaker and Lysaker, 2001: 25)⁴ Georgaca explores the "multi-voiced nature of the self" in her analysis of language and subjectivity (see Georgaca, 2001: 223-236). Her analysis "demonstrates the enactment of transferential dialogical positions at the beginning of the therapy and traces their recognition by the client through the gradual development of increasingly reflexive subject positions towards the end of therapy" (Georgaca, 2001: 223).

In treating various forms of psychosis, psychotherapy attempts to mediate between the individual's internal and external dialogues. Lysaker and Lysaker show how psychotherapy has "the potential to revive internal dialogue through its explicit use of external dialogue helping to restore previous levels of social function." (Lysaker and Lysaker, 2001: 23) Obviously, anything that disrupts ("derails") these voices of the self or disrupts the associative

⁴ The concept of the dialogical self or 'dialogism' has come from several sources. According to Lysaker and Lysaker (2001), dialogism is linked to the Russian literary critic Bakhtin, developed from his readings of Dostoyevsky. Nietzsche is also a contributor to the "soul as

processes and affect dysregulation in mental processes, is most likely to cause symptomatology or disequilibrium of some sort.

M8:6

I: What would you say is the most meaningful aspect to you, of speaking in tongues?

M8: Obviously to me, it's in prayer. Like it's an enhancement to my prayer life. And I can sit back and just let go and pray in tongues, it's just, to me [pause] it's a special communion with, God that I can't get any other way, you know? [pause] It's just a very warm presence. You know, like, to me, it's the presence of God in my life. Being involved in the occult, I know very much what it's like to have an occultic presence? [pause] And my first experience of God, was, a different sort of presence, but it's a presence that's not laced with fear. It's a presence that's laced with peace. So, it's just another, it's just another sense of peace that comes upon you when you're in that.

As is obvious by now, how a particular cultural community defines the varieties of human behaviour within its purview, effects how individuals interpret and *integrate* their internal and external world (see Lex, 1975; Womack, 1982; Bourguignon, 1989; Persinger, 1987; de Certeau, 1996; Martínez-Toboas, 1999).

F11:6

F11: Like, here I'm new and then when I saw everything happen after – it had to do with prayer for you too. And I mean, you were under attack and what not? And I think the atmosphere has to be clear for everything to come together the way it did. So, when I am in an assembly, and I start to do it I get, because it starts with a particular song; a word, the Pastor says something, they're praying for someone, so I know that I'm travelling with that. But last Sunday, the Sunday before, I didn't come to church, because I was overcome at home. It started with me, falling in the spirit, shaking, and all of a sudden, a roaring and screaming, and moaning, and so I said to my husband, "Well, there's no sense in me, going to Church today, I'm staying home and doing this work." So, there I didn't know. I really [pause] I figure it was for the Sunday Service, but I really had no way of knowing. And you know [pause] and most of the time I don't think of asking God because it's so unimportant. What's the difference what I am doing it for? I know it's the Holy Spirit within me. And it's like OK. But, even, I have asked him at times, because people have said, "Well ask him. Ask him" But I don't get that information.

subjective multiplicity" and the "soul as structure of drives and affects (Nietzsche [1886/1966] pp.26,20-21)" (quoted in Lysaker and Lysaker, 2001: 25).

It is not unusual for religious experiences to be phenomena that represent more or less successful adaptation attempts on the part of individuals experiencing life stress (Prince, 1979; see Bentov, 1977). Whatever else one can say about religious experiences, it is the personal self who engages particular experiences through the mindbrain and the self does this through interactive internal and external dialogical communication with "voices" within the self (with all the attendant neurophysiological responses). The extent, to which the ego of the self can order and control these dialogues, is the degree to which an individual can control or inhibit behaviour.

If a reasonably good case can be made for regarding psychoses as spontaneous or endogenous attempt on the part of the psyche to heal itself and solve life problems, perhaps we should try to see other types of religious experiences in the same light. Such a mechanism is clearest in conversion experiences.

...The function of the psychosis is to break down the ego and its maladaptive defenses (experienced as death or world destruction), and to reintegrate as a more adaptive ego (experienced as rebirth). ...

... we seem well advised to assist the self-righting power of the psyche through tranquilizers, manipulation of the social milieu and psychotherapy. There is nothing particularly sacred about a psychosis, not even a religious psychosis. (Prince, 1979: 179)

Lysaker and Lysaker (2001) suggest that the dialogues used in psychotherapy represent an intuitively appealing route by which to try and resuscitate collapsed dialogues. The researcher's personal experience is that glossolalia is both inner and outer dialogue (with all its particular somatic and motor responses), and that it mediates the pulls and counter-pulls of the many social forces or stresses in an individual's environment. Grady and Loewenthal ask: "Is psychopathology *relieved* by glossolalia, as is claimed by

some of its practitioners?" (1997: 185) This researcher replies, "potentially yes," since glossolalia must be viewed as a *complex*, and not simply as "tongue-speaking." As Martínez-Toboas (1999) cogently reveals, cultural context must also be explored in any situation labelled "pathological."

And that's something else too. When I pray in tongues, as well as when I'm being slain in the spirit – it is total relaxation. I mean this is the type of relaxation that people pay hundreds and thousands of dollars to go away to a health spa. But, I get that inner peace [pause] and [pause] and I, it makes me think I should do it far more than I do, you know. Just to get to that peaceful place. (F3:4)

Pawel Lewicki explores nonconscious social information processing and presents evidence to support the theory of "internal processing algorithms" which have an important role in human adjustment. His results demonstrate:

. . . that people acquire more information than they are aware of, that this nonconsciously acquired information is stored in long-term memory in a form not available at the level of conscious awareness, and that this information nonconsciously influences subsequent relevant cognitive processes. The data support the hypothesis of self-perpetuation of internal processing algorithms and suggest that if there is a lack of salient contradictory evidence (i.e., evidence that is inconsistent with an IPA [internal processing algorithm]), then once initiated, the IPA may develop (become stronger) even in the absence of any supporting evidence. This mechanism seems to play an important role in the development of stable dispositions (e.g., various personality dispositions or psychological disorders). (Lewicki, 1986: 220)⁵

Identity and Personal Transformation

Numerous quotations can be cited to support changes in the lives of these respondents. The following list is suggestive of some changes:

- An increased sensitivity (toward self and others)

⁵ Lewicki uses the following definition of the word *nonconscious*: "It denotes cognitive contents and processes that a person cannot become aware of simply by directing his or her attention to them, even when the person is motivated to access that content or process."

- ❑ Self-reflectiveness – getting to know the personal self
- ❑ An increasing self consciousness of one's attitudes
- ❑ "God" is seen as all-powerful, all-knowing, and ever-present and residing within mortal bodies
- ❑ There is what the researcher calls a "reclaiming of the body" in worship as well as in the devotional life of the person
- ❑ The individual experiences physiological changes (psychic and physical healing)
- ❑ There is an attitude of humility
- ❑ Persons become less judgmental
- ❑ There is more personal self-control
- ❑ Individuals become more loving
- ❑ There is less legalistic thinking
- ❑ Persons begin to feel free
- ❑ There is disciplined activity
- ❑ Individuals are more forgiving and more tolerant of others

When asked the question: "Overall, does [how does] speaking in tongues affect your current life-style?", the researcher found that many respondents referred to the conversion experience and existing as a "Christian" to be the focus of the changes in his/her life and personal experiences. A few suggested or admitted forthrightly that tongue-speaking does affect lifestyle and relationships with others. Yet, none desire to live life without tongue-speaking.

The Practice of Glossolalia: *Prayer Changes Things*

Now this is serious business, especially since thought energy can be focused. As long as we are just sitting and producing idle thoughts, the thought energy is diffuse, and it eventually spreads out, weakens, and disappears. However, when we consciously concentrate and send coherent thoughts, that thought energy or thought form will impinge on the person for whom the thought was meant. (Bentov, 1977:74)

All glossolalists refer to their tongue-speaking as "prayer language." Whatever we take the definition of "prayer" to be, these prayers are indeed

thoughts consciously and unconsciously expressed. Whether the individual begins, ends, or intersperses logical thought processes with tongue-speaking and glossolalic expressiveness, these thoughts are *focussed energy*. It appears, for the respondents interviewed, that frequent use of tongue-speaking produces benefits throughout their daily existence. Frequency of tongue-speaking makes tongue-speaking natural and "easier."

I: Is there anything that surprises you about speaking in tongues?

M4: It surprises me that you can just, that I just do it. It's not; I don't approach it any differently than I approach speaking in English. It's actually easier to speak. Like, speaking in tongues, I just do it. If I was to speak, I know some French and I know some German and that's much more difficult. (M4:7)

M9: Yeah, yeah. I think, we only grow in that gift, the more we practice it.

What is a gift?

M5:11

I: So, how would you, if I ask what a gift was, in relation to your describing speaking in tongues as a gift, which is the way many people do, but in your own words, what is the gift?

M5: The gift is that when I do it, it brings me a peace. It helps me, like I said, when I am in fear or something like that, or, I know when I've done it, I've received interpretations of it for, for people and it's blessed them, you know what I mean?

F3:6

F3: . . . Because it was a gift from him. It's his gift. And so his gift is a touch. He has given me many, many gifts over the years. And I think you have to acknowledge that they are gifts and that they're from the Lord. They're good gifts. They're wonderful gifts you know?

I: So, how would you define a gift? You say, you describe tongues and other things, as a "gift from the Lord." What does gift mean to you? [pause] Why is it a gift?

F3: Special blessing and it's a special honour [pause]. And it's very meaningful and it just reassures me that God is, and that he loves me, and I'm special to him.

How do you know?

The idea of “knowing,” contained in the following quote, was heard many times in these interviews.

M6:10

M6: . . . I mean I knew that I knew, when we were in this room, which is the prayer room on Sundays, the Lord was going to do some healing. He was going to heal people, I mean he was going to physically heal people. There was going to be physical healings, there was going to be, you know, wounds in people that, spiritual wounds that were going to be, you know, physical, inner wounds that were going to be healed. I don't know what they are, but I **knew that I knew that I knew.**

I: Ok.

M6: You then run the service under that anointing. You are sort of, almost like, you're up on another level and when the time for the actual healing takes place, up in the front, when we had the altar call, there was what, 50 or 60 people come up. Ok? And we spent the next hour and a half just praying for people. It was just, they were going out in the spirit, they were you know, there were healings taking place. [pause] The anointing it's, and then when it's all over, it's over.

I: And you feel it too?

M6: You feel it, it's there, it's gone. But, while you're there you, like, the Lord says, “I'm the commander.” “You're the one with the guns, you're the one with the weapons, you're the ones...” My hands are his hands in a healing service. I don't mean to come on, [he chuckles] I'm not trying to set myself up with my fingers in my braces here, I'm not. If you were to do it, it would be your hands that he's using. [pause] 'k?

I: Would it be fair to say it's like you're flowing in a different energy?

M6: Yes, absolutely. Yeah – and I don't know how to explain that energy. I just know. And it's, it's a loving, it's a, oh yeah, it is.

All charismatic glossolalists admit to an energy being experienced; what happens to them is described as “*I know, that I know, that I know.*” The researcher heard this phrase again, and again. Some glossolalists point to their heads and refer to it as their “knower.” What is experienced as *knowing*, is always attributed to “Spirit” or “God” speaking to them. The researcher believes that this *energy* the glossolalist feels or acknowledges, is the energy

flowing within the universe; an energy that is "unseen" and for most of humanity, unacknowledged.

We now know that the purpose of evolution is to produce consciousnesses of higher and higher order. The universe is a teaching and learning machine [sic]. Its purpose is to know itself. Knowledge is freely available in the universe like every other natural resource. It is there for everyone who is willing to make the effort to take it. We can poke around in our sequential "objective" time-space, or we can take the intuitive, subjective "time-space" route. Both are needed to get us there.

As creatures in all galaxies are going through their event patterns in this enormous hologram called the universe, we should remember that each element of volume in the hologram contains *all* the information about the whole grand design. In other words, "knowledge is structured in consciousness." (Bentov, 1977: 128-129)

According to Charles Tart: "A state of consciousness is a dynamic process; aspects of it are constantly changing in their particulars even while the overall pattern remains recognizably the same." (1986: 4) Further to this, he writes:

. . . many of the most important aspects of enlightenment are nonverbal in nature. Words cannot capture the essence of this knowledge. Further, enlightenment involves certain kinds of knowledge, state-specific knowledge, that cannot be adequately comprehended in our ordinary state of consciousness, . . . words in our ordinary state can be useful in thinking about enlightenment, especially if we are careful not to confuse the words with the realities. . . . (Tart, 1986: 7)

This researcher believes that glossolalia yields "state-specific knowledge," which should be validated against other aspects of scientific knowledge. Wilbur writes: "For spiritual knowledge itself is *not* symbolic; it involves direct, nonmediated, trans-symbolic intuition of and identity with spirit." (Wilbur, 1983: 133) The cognitive map of individual consciousness, and collective

consciousness, changes as persons experience “leaps” or “jumps” along an overall continuum of enlightenment (see Tart, 1986; Hawkins, 2002). Glossolalia yields direct apprehension of something cosmically ‘Other.’ The call for a circle of *sympathetically* resonating researchers or *communal confirmation*, is then a checking of these results with others who have adequately completed the injunctive and illuminative strands of experiential, experimental, repeatable and publicly verifiable *spiritual knowledge* (Wilbur, 1983: 133). Perhaps there is here then, a call; a call for researching the socio-cultural domains in which this state-specific knowledge of *Spirit* takes place. Such a search will undoubtedly lead to a cognitive apprehension-illumination of the “object domain,” via an understanding of, if not direct experience with glossolalic utterances. One can experience the “object domain” in ways that classical social-anthropology respects. However, “new” understanding can lead to dialogue between these various ways of doing research.

Conclusion: Honourable Closure

The spiritual transmutation occurring in these glossolalists, is a result of an internal-external spiritual dialectic; one that engages primal and modern mind, brain, and body. It calls out that it is nothing less than a polysemic and polyvalent discovery of *spirit* (self) and *self-identity*. These processes transmute the organism to a higher level of existence – that is, there is a raising of consciousness. It involves “clear consciousness” and a deliberate “will.” According to Richard Schantz, “there is given element in experience

which is independent of thought and which is possessed of a distinctive nonpropositional and nonconceptual content.” (2001: 167)

Reflecting upon the sensuous content of experience, Schantz writes:

. . . my position allows us to preserve the strong intuition that animals and prelinguistic infants can enjoy sensory episodes of the very same kinds as users of language.

According to my alternative picture, experiences are subjective representational states with objective nonconceptual content, and yet they can serve as justifiers for our beliefs. The epistemic significance of experience does not depend on its conceptualization. . . .

. . . We acquire by the senses, normally, direct knowledge of physical objects and events. What makes this knowledge direct is that it is not based on other knowledge or beliefs. (Schantz, 2001: 178)

The “dark side of the moon,” is that Christian charismatics [might] “ignore” the tremendous *spiritual* changes that actually occur within and without their organismic and ecological sphere at the same time that they account for these changes in terms of Christian creed and doctrine [“the Holy Spirit”]. Whatever the glossolalist’s interpretation, this does not negate the experiencing of an immanent dimension that is both inside and outside of “time-space.” The prayers [conversations] produced by the glossolalist are effacious for themselves, others, and the cosmos. There are neurobiophysical changes within the organism and a propulsion into a higher phase of consciousness. *Union is being made* with something greater than the single organism.

One reason that an increased understanding of glossolalia is so critical to our socio-historical moment, is that whatever else happens to new social movements, charismatic glossolalic activity never disappears. Writing about the Toronto Airport Christian Fellowship, the sociologist Margaret Poloma

notes: "the tension existing between charisma and institutionalization has been greatly reduced as institutional demands continue to take a greater toll on the free move of the spirit."⁶ One of the ways to "monitor" this "free move of the spirit," is to understand glossolalia and to follow the places it "shows up." As individuals engage glossolalia, what are its effects upon both individual and institution?

A further consequence of a better understanding of glossolalia is that it contributes to an improved understanding of certain psychological and physiological states in individuals. In 1973 James T. Richardson writes:

We would add that the line between some areas of what are usually termed psychopathology and simple psychological needs and drives that might serve as motivating factors for individuals is sometimes difficult to discern. The question of the part played by specifically psychological states in generating and sustaining the tongues movement is still an open one.

In lieu of the above, Sheila A. Womack (1982) notes: "The striking behavioral similarity between GTS [Gilles de la Tourette Syndrome] and glossolalia is hidden by the fact that they are treated as two distinct and unrelated phenomena." Womack explains:

. . . in neurological terms the disjunction in values assigned to similar behavior. Temporary hemisphere disjunction is offered as an explanation for belief in a supernatural cause for these behaviors. Labelling them as good and evil results from differential stimulation of the pain or pleasure system. The neurophysiological relation of movement to affect further biases the oppositional labelling of their experience. (1982: 75)

This researcher senses that an improved understanding of glossolalia can contribute to dialogue with disciplines such as neurophysiology and further illumine the nature of glossolalia. As Womack notes: "Even though GTS is still a relatively mysterious disease, there is a significant body of knowledge concerning its neurochemistry and neurophysiology. There is much less known about the neurobiological substrates of glossolalic behavior." (1982: 86)

The consequential effect of glossolalic expression and concomitant expressiveness does not support the distinction between "religious experience" and all other experience. The duality of existence is non-existent (except to personal "will" or "ego"). As other researchers study the neurological basis for "religious experience," a further study of glossolalia contributes to a heterophenomenological analysis of all experience. There are important "mysteries" that glossolalists can help the scientist explore. While this research project is a nascent conception of all that glossolalia means, it points the way to future research.

The anthropologist Michael Winkelman applies a "shamanic paradigm" to explain the origins and cross-cultural distribution of shamanism and its modern manifestations. He writes: "The cross-cultural manifestations of shamanism and its contemporary appeal are rooted in psychobiological structures and basic functions of the brain, mind, and consciousness." (Winkelman, 2002: 1875). This researcher believes that this project's nascent attempt to uncover

⁶ Quote from an entry prepared for the *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*, February, 1998 [available on-line:

hitherto neglected aspects of glossolalia, serves to contribute to a better understanding of humankind's inherent spiritual impulse; further research will likely contribute to a further understanding of developmental opportunities within spiritual practices. The present project will also contribute to the new field of neurotheology.

Validity of the Research Methodology

Given the rich interview data and subsequent uncovering about glossolalic expression, experienced partially with and through the researcher herself, *sympathetic resonance* is found to be an empirically valid and valuable tool for studying such an intimate transpersonal experience. Glossolalia is contributing to the positive attractor fields now being uncovered in physics. The challenge however, is not just for science but it is also to the Christian [charismatic] community. Hawkins makes a cogent comment on Christianity.

The level of truth originally expounded by Jesus Christ calibrates at 1,000—the highest level attainable on this plane. By the second century, the level of truth of the practice of his teachings had dropped to 930, and by the sixth century, to 540. By the time of the Crusades, at the beginning of the 11th century, it had fallen to its current 498. A major decline in the year A.D. 325 was apparently due to the spread of misinterpretations of the teachings originating from the Council of Nicaea. . . .

It should be noted that the Lamsa translation (from the Aramaic) of the New Testament calibrates at 750, and the King James Version (which was translated from the Greek) at 640. Just as there is a wide range in the level of truth of various translations, so there is a wide variation between different Christian practices. Most major persuasions—Roman Catholicism, Anglicanism, Christian Science (and many small denominations, such as the Quakers)—calibrate in the high 500s. Specialized interpretations, such as that of the contemporary *Course in Miracles*, or the 14th-century mysticism of Meister Eckhart,

calibrate at 600. . . . extreme fundamentalist groups with explicit reactionary political agendas can calibrate as low as 125.

As regards Christianity, the fall from a calibrated 930 to 498 “must be recognized as the greatest single catastrophe in the history of Western religion.” (Hawkins, 2002/1995: 311). Whatever else can be said about the decline in Christian loving, this researcher believes that if charismatic glossolalists can continue to elevate consciousness, and move into all spheres of living in less legalistic tendencies, truly loving life and other *H.s.s.*, (whose culture and belief systems are “different” than their own), then the true passion of the “Christian message” will be revealed. The charismatic glossolalist consciously recognizes a power within and without. However, what the glossolalist *does* with this power and *how* this power is interpreted, will effect society a little, yet, it will effect humankind a lot.

According to Charles Tart:

A state is an *altered* state if it is discretely different from some baseline state we want to compare things to. . . . Altered states have power to change what we perceive as reality. (Tart, 1986: 5-6)

We cannot ignore recent findings about the mindbrain and mechanisms of perception (nonconscious as well as conscious perception). This is true no matter what the subject-object of the investigation may be. It is the mindbrain that explores and interprets its own behaviour. We have reached a point in modernity where dialogue and *experience* with all disciplines and cultures must occur. Scientific research and glossolalists are challenging us with the

metaphysical questions we have for too long left to theologians and philosophers.

"Existence is infinitely complex and as Durkheim reminded us, what functioned as one thing in the past may adopt a different function in the future." (Mol, 1982: 323). The researcher's experience "speaks to," "speaks with," and "speaks from" the many levels of physical and spiritual complexity, as these interweave and mutually constitute one another. The spiritual impulse within, which may or may not turn to organized religion, strives to create meaningful systems in its existence on this planet. It strives to interpret experience in a way that provides coherency and order.

This researcher senses that *meaning* will always be part of humankind's quest for understanding human existence. It is therefore incumbent upon researchers to help understand the myriad of experiences, in particular spiritual experiences, which exist in our particular socio-historical clime. As noted earlier in the dissertation, it is important to understand via direct experience, and to bring this cognitively reflected upon event, into the academy for communal confirmation or disconfirmation. Scientists must attempt to illumine humankind's existence and prevent intellectual obfuscation and ossification; we must begin to understand how humans can transcend and "make sense" of their lived realities. With regards to glossolalic utterances, it is time to see how this spiritual experience affects the brain and body and all that is consciousness. This can only occur in dialogue with advances in other disciplines and with emerging ones, such as neurotheology.

Jung's observation is still cogent.

The individual is the only reality. The further we move away from the individual toward abstract ideas about *Homo sapiens*, the more likely we are to fall into error. In these times of social upheaval and rapid change, it is desirable to know much more than we do about the individual human being, for so much depends upon his mental and moral qualities. (1964: 45)

The advanced complexity of *Homo sapiens* evolutionary development is evidenced in the fact that we are at this moment in history, *consciously* being challenged to become reflective beings, being-in-the-world. Perhaps the snake is again biting its tail. As Socrates has said, the unexamined life is not worth living. Let us continue the universal dialectic and experience the *living energy* of the universe.

And so the interview ended. He asks me if he can pray for me. I answer, "Yes." He proceeds to pray a beautiful prayer in English – but I am convinced that the interview has had the presence of 'the Other,' the *Spirit presence* we have just been talking about.
(the researcher's field notes)

...And where was Atman to be found, where did He dwell, where did His eternal heart beat, if not within the Self, in the innermost, in the eternal which each person carried within him? But where was this Self, this innermost? It was not flesh and bone, it was not thought or consciousness. ... But where were the Brahmins, the priests, the wise men, who were successful not only in having this most profound knowledge, but in experiencing it? Where were the initiated who, attaining Atman in sleep, could retain it in consciousness, in life, everywhere, in speech and in action?

...One must find the source within one's own self, one must possess it. Everything else was seeking – a detour, error.

Siddhartha, by Herman Hesse
(1957/1951:4-5)

*We look at it, and we do not see it,
and we name it The Unvarying.
We listen to it, and we do not hear it,
And we name it The Inaudible.
We try to grasp it, and we cannot get
hold of it, and we name it The Subtle.
With these three qualities, it cannot be made the subject
of description, and hence we blend them together to
obtain
The One. ...Ceaseless in its action, it cannot be named,
and then it again returns and becomes nothing.*

Tao Te Ching

APPENDIX A

ETHICS PROTOCOL¹

(To be read by interviewer before the beginning of the interview. One copy of this form should be left with the respondent, and one copy should be signed by the respondent and kept by the interviewer.)

My name is **Irene Ann Smolik** and I am a Ph.D. student in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Carleton University. This project is part of my dissertation research and investigates "speaking in tongues," otherwise known as *glossolalia*. The aim of my research is to gain a fuller understanding of your experience in "speaking in tongues." You need to know that I want to know about your experience and your understanding of it, and that I also "speak in tongues." My dissertation project is titled "*The Glossolalic Utterance: What Does it all Mean?*"

I am the principal investigator on this project and can be contacted at this phone number at Carleton University - (613) 520-2600 ext. 1438. If you have any questions about the interview or anything that you would like more details about, please ask. It is important that you also have the name of the Chair of the Carleton University Research Ethics Committee, in case you have any concerns or comments. His name is Professor Klaus Pohle, and his telephone number is 520-2600 ext. 7434, (E-mail klaus_pohle@carleton.ca).

It is important to reassure you that your participation in this project is guided by some very specific guidelines.

First, your participation in this interview is entirely voluntary.

You are free to refuse to answer any question at any time.

You are free to withdraw from the interview at any time, and the interview will then be considered terminated. Please read and respond to the following withdrawal statement.

"Should I exercise my right to withdraw I will / will not [please circle one of these responses]

allow the researcher, Irene Ann Smolik, to use the information I provided."

This interview will be kept in strictest confidence and your name and Church-denomination will not be identified. Your interview will be tape-recorded (another consent form, attached), and your interview given a code for purposes of data analysis. You may have the audiotape produced from this interview, for your personal keeping once all data analysis is complete.

Only the principal investigator, Irene Ann Smolik, has access to your audiotape, its transcription and any notes from the interview. Audiotapes and notes will be kept in a locked file cabinet in my office. However, certain details of your experience may be discussed with members of my dissertation committee.

Excerpts of your interview may become part of the final dissertation but under no circumstances will your name or identifying characteristics be included in the final write up.

You should know that the final dissertation project might be made into a book, once the dissertation process is completed.

¹ Taken and adapted from McCracken (1988, p.69).

Code: _____

329

I would be grateful if you would sign this form, indicating that you have read its contents and that you understand the purpose of the interview. One copy of this consent form is for your personal records and will be left with you.

(Signed) _____ [Irene Smolk (Researcher)]

(Printed) _____

Date _____

(Interviewer to keep signed copy; leave one copy with respondent)

Address for those requesting a copy of the audiotape:

Tape Recorder Consent Form

You are *free to refuse* to have me tape record our interview. However, if I am allowed to record our interview, it will make it easier for me to listen to your responses and give your answers more attention. Remember that it is **YOUR** experience that I am most interested in hearing. Again, I must admit to you that I too speak in tongues, and you do not have to withhold information that you **WANT** to share with me, because I believe that your experience is very important.

This tape will only be identified with a date and a code, so that your responses will not be identifiable. If you do not want a copy of this tape for your own, this tape will be destroyed as soon as it is transcribed.

Do you agree to have this interview taped?

YES

Participant's Name

Participant's Signature

Date _____

Interviewer's Name

Interviewer's Signature

Date _____

NO

Participant's Name

Participant's Signature

Date _____

Interviewer's Name

Interviewer's Signature

Date _____

A copy of this consent form has been given to you for your record and reference.

IMPORTANT INFORMATION:

I would also like to leave you with the name of someone to whom you may speak, in the event that our face-to-face depth interview leaves you feeling with things "unsaid" or wanting to deal with personal issues that this interview brings to your memory.

It is important for you to realize that this interview asks you to talk about something very personal, and that dealing with personal issues can be energy depleting as well as energizing. However, you are free to re-contact me to speak about aspects of your glossolalic experience that you think I should know but forgot to tell me about. You are also free to contact Reverend Dr. Tom Sherwood, Carleton University Chaplain.

Dr. Sherwood is aware of my research and has put together a wonderful group of ministers/counselors who will speak to you, should you feel the need to talk further about your interview experience. Please, do not hesitate to call either one of us at the following number(s):

Irene Ann Smolik, *Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Carleton*

Rev. Dr. Tom Sherwood, *Chaplain*

Code: _____

331

APPENDIX B

PRELIMINARY QUESTIONS ¹

"The Glossolalic Utterance: What Does it all Mean?" Qualitative Interview

Date: _____
Place: _____
Time: _____
Interviewer: _____

Subject's First Name (to be used during interview only): _____

YOU ARE FREE TO LEAVE UNANSWERED, ANY OR ALL OF THE FOLLOWING:

Birth Date: _____

Age: _____

Sex: _____

Birth Place: _____

Mother-tongue - language first spoken: _____

Residence Pattern:

Born in _____

_____	till	_____	Big, medium, little, village, rural/urban/suburb:
_____	till	_____	Big, medium, little, village, rural/urban/suburb:
_____	till	_____	Big, medium, little, village, rural/urban/suburb:
_____	till	_____	Big, medium, little, village, rural/urban/suburb:
_____	till	_____	Big, medium, little, village, rural/urban/suburb:

Special Comment: (e.g., military family with freq. moves)

Birth Order: 1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th

Brothers:

How many? _____ residing in: _____

Ages: _____

Sisters:

How many? _____ residing in: _____

¹ These questions are adapted from McCracken (1988, p.67).

Code: _____

332

Ages: _____

Parent(s) or Guardian(s):

Mother age		Died/year		Your age then	_____
Father age		Died/year		Your age then	_____

Marital Status of Parents: **M/D/S** _____ [D/S]How old were you?

Mother remarried when you were?

Father remarried when you were?

Lived with mother between the ages of _____ and _____ years.

Lived with father between the ages of _____ and _____ years.

Special Comments:

Mother's Birth Place: _____ stepmother _____

Father's Birth Place: _____ stepfather _____

Ethnic background of mother _____ stepmother
Ethnic background of father _____ stepfather

Occupation of mother _____ stepmother
Occupation of father _____ stepfather

Religion of mother _____ stepmother
Religion of father _____ stepfather

Respondent's Education: _____ and Occupation: _____
(Highest Level of Education/Year of Graduation/Emphasis-specialty)

Marital Status and History:
(married, single, re-married/divorced, other)

Children:
(age and gender of children)

age gender
age gender
age gender
age gender
age gender

Code: _____

333

SPECIAL COMMENTS: _____ (i.e., children adopted/step-children; other children residing in the household)

Religion/faith _____

How frequently do you attend your place of worship? [Please circle]

Daily, weekly, monthly, several times a year, once every several years, only special holidays.

On a Scale of 1 to 10, with 1 considered a low standard of living, and 10 an excellent standard of living, how would you rate your economic status?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 [circle]

APPENDIX C

The Glossolalic Utterance: What Does It All Mean?

Introduction into the questionnaire:

I. I want to learn about your experience of speaking in tongues. Will you describe for me, please, when you first spoke in tongues? [Chronology]

- ⇒ How did your **first experience** occur? (e.g., where did it occur and how did it happen)
- ⇒ How long have you been speaking in tongues?
- ⇒ Has your experience of speaking in tongues changed over this period of time?
- ⇒ How often do you speak in tongues? _____
- ⇒ Has your life has changed, since you first began speaking in tongues?
How has it changed?
- ⇒ Generally, where do you speak in tongues?
- ⇒ Under what circumstances to you speak in tongues?

II. What did you know about speaking in tongues before your first experience?

- ⇒ Thinking back over your experience with speaking in tongues, what stands out for you? Can you describe any special experience for me?
- ⇒ How does speaking in tongues make you feel?
- ⇒ What is most meaningful to you about speaking in tongues?
- ⇒ In your own words, will you describe for me just what speaking in tongues means to you?
- ⇒ If I ask you '**WHY**' you speak in tongues, what is your answer to me?
- ⇒ To what can you compare this experience of speaking in tongues? Please explain this to me, as best you can?

Code: _____
Date: _____

335

III. Describe your experience of speaking in tongues for me? [looking for form and content of the experience]

- ⇒ What is the most important part of speaking in tongues?
- ⇒ What is your 'role' in tongue-speaking? [What do you 'do' to start speaking in tongues?]
- ⇒ Do you ever encounter any difficulty in tongue-speaking? For example -- are there times when you want to speak in tongues and cannot?
- ⇒ Are there things about tongue-speaking that you do not understand?
- ⇒ How do you feel about things you cannot make sense of when you speak in tongues? Is there anything that surprises you about speaking in tongues?

IV. Do you know others who speak in tongues? (1) Yes (2) No _____

- ⇒ What is your relationship to these persons? [relationships]
- ⇒ Do you talk to others about speaking in tongues? (1) No (2) Yes
- ⇒ Who might you speak to about this?
- ⇒ What is their reaction?
- ⇒ Overall, how does speaking in tongues affect your current life-style?
- ⇒ Have your relationships with family and friends changed since you began speaking in tongues? If so, how have these relationships changed?
- ⇒ What else do you want to say to me about your experience with tongue-speaking?

APPENDIX D
Demographic Summary for
Respondents
The Glossolalic Utterance: What Does It All Mean?

Code	Age	Mother-T	M/S/D	Education	SES	Attend Church	Siblings	Children	Religion	B.O.*	Yrs Tong**
M 1	47	French	m	M Div-4 yrs	7	Weekly	7	3	EvanBapt	7	0
M 2	60	English	m	M Div-4 yrs	7	Daily	2	3	Charismat	2	35
M 3	60	French	m	1 yr colleg	5	W	8	2	CharisChri	8	22
M 4	42	English	m	2 yr Univ	8	W	4	4	Christian	1	20
M 5	50	French	m	College	8	W	10	2	Christian	8	15
M 6	68	English	m	H.S.	7	W	Adopted	5	Protestant	n/a	22
M 7	79	English	m	H.S.	6	W	3	5	Charismat	1	21
M 8	57	English	m	College	7	W	2	6	R.C.	2	26
M 9	62	English	m	M.A.	7	M	4	2	Prot/Christ	2	10
M 10	41	English	m	Grad Sch-2 yrs;BA	4	Rarely	1	0	Christian	1	20
F 1	56	English	m	PhD cand-ABD	6	non-response	6	4	None	1	15
F 2	44	Somolia	m	College-Dip	6	Never	11	4	Muslim	1	0
F 3	56	English	m	Grade 12	7	W	2	0	Born-Again	1	3
F 4	48	German	s	M.A.	2	W	1	0	Christian	1	15
F 5	67	Czech	m	H.S.	5	W	1	5	Christian	2	22
F 6	66	French	m	Grade 9	5	W	4	4	Christian	NR	23
F 7	49	English	m	BA/BTh	9	W	2	4	Christian	2	20
F 8	65	Gaelic	d	Grade 11	4	W	1	4	Christian	1	56
F 9	41	English	m	B.A.	8	W	3	4	Christian	3	20
F 10	80	English	m	Grade 10	5	W	5	6	CharisChri	3	24
F 11	60	French	m	ChemTech	5	W	5	0	non-den	1	23
F 12	49	LowGerm	d	PhD cand-ABD	1	W	2	1	non-den	1	24

* Birth M8 - incl M-9
Order 1 child 2 children
** Years not born adopted
in Tongues into this Family

APPENDIX D
Demographic Summary for
Respondents
The Glossolalic Utterance: What Does It All Mean?

Code	Freq	Ethnicity	Type of First Experience
M 1	Never	French	Not tongue-speaker
M 2	Daily	Eng/German	Private
M 3	Daily	French	Private
M 4	Daily	Irish/Eng/German	Public Meeting
M 5	Daily	French	Private
M 6	Daily	English	Private
M 7	Daily	English	Small Group [4]
M 8	Daily	Canadian/Scottish	Private
M 9	Daily	German/Swiss/Irish	Private
M 10	Daily	Native American/N. Europe	Private
F 1	Rarely	Australian	Group
F 2	Never	Somolia	Not tongue-speaker
F 3	Daily	Irish/English	Private
F 4	Monthly	German	Private
F 5	Daily	Czech/Slovakia	Private
F 6	Weekly	French	Group
F 7	Weekly	English	Private
F 8	Daily	Irish/Jewish	Public Meeting
F 9	Weekly	English	Private
F 10	Occasion	English	Small Group [4]
F 11	Daily	French	Public Meeting-conference
F 12	Daily	Dutch Mennonite	Public Meeting

GLOSSARY

Attractor Field: There is the discovery in nonlinear dynamics of *chaos theory*, of powerful energy patterns. These are termed *attractors*. Researchers, such as David Hawkins, suggest a new paradigm for recontextualizing human experience. In light of advances and discoveries in advanced theoretical physics and the nonlinear dynamics of consciousness itself, Hawkins has calibrated scales based on these recent findings. It is suggested that there are powerful "*attractor fields*" within the domain of consciousness. These, writes Hawkins: "dominate human existence and therefore define content, meaning, and value, and serve as organizing energies for widespread patterns of human behavior." (2002/1995: 31)

Baptism in the Holy Spirit: This is often considered a 'second encounter' with God. The first encounter is 'conversion.' This second encounter is the point at which "the Christian begins to receive the power of the Holy Spirit into his/her life; for most Pentecostals and neo-Pentecostals, the evidence of having been baptized by the Holy Spirit is glossolalia." (Poloma, 1982: 243) Father Francis Martin (1998) writes, "The baptism in the Holy Spirit is a name for a grace which in one form or another has always been present in the Church's life. . . . In the English-speaking world, the most familiar name for this grace is 'baptism in the Holy Spirit.' This derives from the name given to the original experience of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit very early in the history of what is now called Pentecostalism. In the Latin-speaking world, it was felt that using the term 'baptism in the Holy Spirit' could confuse people since it could sound like a second administration of the Sacrament of Baptism. . . . The Latin-speaking countries generally possess a very strong catholic, and therefore sacramental, tradition. . . . Therefore, in many Latin countries, as well as in other parts of the world, phrases are used such as 'the release of the Holy Spirit,' 'the pouring out or effusion of the Holy Spirit,' or even 'the blessing of the Holy Spirit.' In the English-speaking world, the most familiar name for this grace is 'baptism in the Holy Spirit.' " (Martin, 1998: 9-10)

Chaos Theory: "The science of *process* as opposed to *state*. . . . Chaos theory recognizes the capacity of a complex system to simultaneously give rise to both turbulence *and* coherence. . . . [it] encompasses such subjects as period doubling, iteration, fractals, and bifurcation, and recognizes that within finite space, there's an infinite number of dimensions." (Hawkins, 2002/1995: 313)

Charisma (*pl. charismata [also charisms]*): In the catholic sense, the term means “the spiritual graces and qualifications granted to every Christian to perform his task in the Church,” as well as, “charisma is the theological term for denoting extraordinary graces given to individual Christians for the good of others.” (The Catholic Encyclopedia, Volume III, 1908 On-line edition 1999 by Kevin Knight) According to St. Paul, these are considered to be word of wisdom, word of knowledge, faith, the gift of healing, the working of miracles, prophecy, the discerning of spirits, diverse kinds of tongues, and interpretation of speeches (I Corinthians xii, 8-10). Theologians often distinguish between these gifts, stating that some charismata tend to further the inner growth of the church and others that promote “her outer development.”

Charismatics: “Born-again Christians who accept the Bible as an inspired Word of God and who believe they are emphasizing a part of Christian tenet that is often neglected by other Bible believers, namely, the power of the Holy Spirit, the Baptism of the Holy Spirit, and the Gifts of the Holy Spirit.” (Poloma, 1982: 243). Many emerging Charismatic Churches describe themselves as non-denominational and their adherents often respond, when asked “What is your religion or faith?” that they are ‘Christian’ or ‘Charismatic’ or that they are ‘Charismatic Christian.’

Content: Content includes *all* that makes up the glossolalic expression, whether manifest or latent, internal or external, subconscious/nonconscious and consciousness processes (see chapter four for a more complete discussion).

Context: According to Hawkins: “The total field of observation predicated by a point of view. Context includes any significant facts that qualify the meaning of a statement or event.” (2002/1995: 314) As used in the dissertation, *context* refers to the physical and external conditions in which glossolalists live their lives, as well as the place which glossolalia has within the life of the glossolalist (e.g., the frequency of the ‘practice’ of tongues or *where* the glossolalist uses tongue-speaking).

Energy Field: Here the researcher appropriates the definition given by David Hawkins: “A range set by parameters off the phase space of an attractor field – whose pattern operates within the larger energy field of consciousness and is observable by characteristic effects in human behavior. The power of energy fields is calibrated much like voltage in an electrical system or the power of magnetic or gravitational fields.” (Hawkins, 2002/1995: 314)

Ermeneglossia: This is the interpretation of tongues.

Evangelical: "A Christian who accepts the Bible as the Word of God but allows for some flexibility in interpretations. While charismatics tend to be evangelical, not all evangelicals are charismatics." (Poloma, 1982: 244)

Form: This refers to the shape and structure of the glossolalist's manifested glossolalic expression. This is the external appearance of glossolalic expression and the observed behaviour is part of the outward appearance of glossolalia.

Full Gospel Businessmen's Fellowship International (FGBMFI): FGBMFI was started by a California dairy farmer Demos Shakarian (1951). During the 1930s - 1940s, Shakarian organized revivals with the cooperation of classical Pentecostal churches.

Full Gospel: "A charismatic term referring to emphasizing the baptism of the Holy Spirit and the accompanying gifts as part of orthodox Christian teachings." (Poloma, 1982: 245)

Fundamentalism: As a reaction to a 'Protestant Liberalism' in the United States, along with the introduction of the theory of evolution, many conservative theologians and Christians began to react. "But conservative theologians clearly saw that the question of evolution was only one instance of the threat the new ideas posed to the 'fundamentals' of Christianity. Soon the term 'fundamentals' became characteristic of the anti-liberal reaction that came to be called 'fundamentalism.' In 1846, when that movement was beginning to crystallize, the Evangelical Alliance was formed, seeking to join all those who saw liberalism as a denial of the faith." (González, 1985: 257) These fundamentals were: the inerrancy of Scripture, the divinity of Jesus, the Virgin birth, Jesus' death on the cross as a substitute for our sins, and his physical resurrection and impending return (González, 1985: 257).

Gifts of the Holy Spirit: These refer to [nine] manifested phenomenon such as *glossolalia*, prophecy, revelation, wisdom, faith, healing, miracles, discernment of spirits, interpretation of tongues in a public meeting, and for the Christian engaging these, are considered to be available to [all] believers in Jesus Christ, who also embrace the Biblical Scriptures. The Christian believes and considers these to be evidence of the presence of "God's Holy Spirit" within his/her physical body. The use of the term "gifts" is often a "tricky" term and is inconsistently applied to various phenomena by Christians; for most Pastors the term "gift of interpretation" would refer to that coherent message which follows someone who has just spoken in tongues in public; it is given in the

mother-tongue of the congregation often by someone other than the person who has just given the public utterance in tongues.

Glossolalia: This is also referred to as “speaking in tongues” or “tongues” or “tongue-speaking.” It is considered by some as a “form of nondiscursive prayer in an unintelligible language.” (Poloma, 1982: 245). The etymology of the word is from the Greek phrase, *glossais lalein*; *glossais* is the dative plural form of γλῶσσα (*glossa*), meaning the *tongue* – by implication a *language* (specially one naturally unacquired); and *lalein* from the Greek meaning to talk (*glossolalia*) but from various Greek words: λαλεω (*laleo*), λαλια (*lalia*), and λεγω (*lego*) meaning shew, speak, tell, and utter. Kildahl mentions that: “Its literal meaning is to speak with the tongue, which is of course how everyone speaks.” (1972:11) This word is never used in the New Testament. Orestis Lindermayer states: “the term used is *homilein glossais* (*homilein* is obviously related to ‘homily’, ‘speech’, and *glossais* is dative plural). He goes on to say that glossolalia is really a “low-brow” term which became part of the language of Christians and that this must have happened at a very early period within Christianity. Lindermayer speculates that this term may have been coined to present a conceptual differentiation or opposition to the term *katalalia*, “which is used in the New Testament as ‘slandering speech’, and *katalalia* is thus conceptually very close to *diavallein* (infinitive) – also ‘slandering’, - from which *Diavolos*, ‘Devil’, is produced as a noun.” (personal communication with Orestis Lindermayer, Nov. 6th, 2002).

Hologram: “A three-dimensional projection into space of the image of an object, created by projecting laser light so that half of the beam is directed to the object and then onto a photographic plate, which received the other half of the beam directly. This creates an interference pattern on the plate so that a laser beam projected through the plate recreates the image of the object in three dimensions. It’s of interest that every fragment of the photographic plate is capable of reproducing the entire image of the whole. In a holographic universe, everything is connected to everything else.” (Hawkins, 2002/1995: 315) Physicist David Bohm has described a holographic universe, “with an invisible *implicate* (“enfolded”) and a manifest *explicate* (“unfolded”) order.” (Hawkins, 2002/1995: 50)

Hologramic Theory: This theory was actually first proposed by physicists, but is being used by behavioral and biological scientists to account for diverse “paradoxes” of the brain (see Pietsch, 2002). Dr. Paul Pietsch has used this theory to predict results in his lab, which “has led to new

and unsuspected possibilities of brain and mind." (Pietsch, [On-line] Available at: www.indiana.edu/~pietsch/hologramic.html 2002/07/03).

Quoting Dr. Pietsch:

"There is evidence of memories on molecules. The most convincing case has come from studies of decision-making and memory in bacteria . . . some physiologists have found no chemical changes associated with learning. Hologramic theory suggests reasons for such discrepancies, some mathematical, others that can be seen by way of physical stimulation. . . ."

Neo-Pentecostals: "Christians, largely in mainline denominations and parachurch ministries, who have accepted the Pentecostal doctrine emphasizing the Baptism of [sic] the Holy Spirit and the accompanying gifts of the Holy Spirit." (Poloma, 1982: 246)

Non-glossolalist: This term refers to an individual who does not speak in tongues. It contrasts with the *anti-glossolalist*; the anti-glossolalist is an individual who does not believe Christians should practice this behaviour.

Pentecostals: "Those Christians belonging to 'classical' charismatic denominations (Assemblies of God, Apostolic Churches, Church of God in Christ, Church of God-Cleveland, etc.) that stemmed from the charismatic revival of the early twentieth century." (Poloma, 1982: 246).

Phase space: "A map that affords the condensation of time-space data into a pattern in multiple dimensions." (Hawkins, 2002/1995: 317)

Praying in the Spirit: This often refers to praying in tongues or glossolalia. (Poloma, 1982: 246)

Prophecy: "A gift of the Holy Spirit through which a person speaks in the name of God by giving an exhortation, reporting a vision, providing a revelation, or interpreting a glossolalia utterance." (Poloma, 1982: 246)

Revelation: "A form of prophecy which covers an event or events in a person's life that is not secured through the senses." (Poloma, 1982: 246)

Revival: "A process entailing a personal conversion, salvation, regeneration or spiritual rebirth in a particular place at a particular time. Contrasts with a period of 'extended revival' or *awakening*." (Poloma, 1982: 246)

Singing in the Spirit: These are glossolalic utterances (*doxa-utterances*) that are sung (there is a melodic harmonious rhythmic singing). It occurs in worship and praise services, and also in the private devotional and

meditative time of the glossolalist. These are primarily spontaneous utterances but they can be intended. When such singing occurs in a group of glossolalists, or within a charismatic service, it is referent and beautiful, sounding as if the entire 'song' is 'choreographed.'

Slain in the Spirit: The individual's physical strength is overshadowed by the power of [the presence of] what is called "the Holy Spirit." The individual often collapses to the floor, but may also simply be standing or sitting and become unable to move until such time that the power 'passes' [is released] from the individual. A scholar on Pentecostalism and Neo-Pentecostalism, Professor Margaret Poloma gives this definition: "The power of the Holy Spirit so filling a person with a heightened inner awareness that the body's energy fades away and the person collapses to the floor." (1982: 247)

Spirit Baptism: See Baptism in the Holy Spirit.

Spontaneous Glossolalia: This is tongue-speaking that is not consciously intended. It can occur at any time and in any form (see discussion in chapter five and chapter six).

Spontaneous Glossolalist: This is an individual who does not consciously practice or believe in the religious or ritual use of tongue-speaking *per se*; this is an individual through and in whom the phenomenon of tongue-speaking expresses without intention. It can occur in meditative practice or within kinesiology sessions. The glossolalic utterances produced can occur within the entire range of glossolalic utterances (and manifestations) discussed for charismatic glossolalists.

Xenoglossia: This refers to the ability to speak in a foreign language, one that the glossolalist has not normally learned. Most often, however, this ability is a one-time occurrence. It can happen in communal and private worship.

Xenolalia: "Paranormal communication in a recognized foreign language." (Christie-Murray, 1978: 67)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abrahams, Roger D. (1986). Ordinary and extraordinary experience. In Victor W. Turner and Edward M. Bruner (Eds.), *The anthropology of experience* (pp. 45-72). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Aldrich, Virgil C. (1966). An aspect theory of mind. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research: A Quarterly Journal*, XXVI, 313-341.
- Alston, William P. (1991). *Perceiving God: The epistemology of religious experience* (pp. 1-67; 286-307). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Arden, John B. (1998). *Science, theology and consciousness: The search for unity*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Argyle, Michael, and Hills, Peter (2000). Religious experiences and their relations with happiness and personality. *Psychology of Religion*, 10(3), 157-172.
- Ashbrook, James B. (1989). The whole brain as the basis for the analogical expression of God. *Zygon*, (24)1, 65-81.
- Ashbrook, James B. (1993). From biogenetic structuralism to mature contemplation to prophetic consciousness. *Zygon*, 28(2), 231-250.
- Bailey, Kenneth D. (1994). *Typologies and taxonomies: An introduction to classification techniques*. Sage University Paper Series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, series no. 07-102. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bainbridge, William Sims. (1997). *The sociology of religious movements*. New York: Routledge.
- Banton, Michael. (Ed.). (1966). *Anthropological approaches to the study of religion*. Conference on New Approaches in Social Anthropology, Jesus College, Cambridge England, 1963. New York, NY: Frederick A. Praeger, Publishers.
- Barušs, Imants. (1996). *Authentic knowing: The convergence of science and spiritual aspiration*. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press.

- Beaugrande, R. de. (1997). The 'Conscious and unconscious mind' in the theoretical discourse of modern linguistics. In M. I. Stamenov (Ed.), *Language structure, discourse and the access to consciousness* (pp.9-47). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins North America.
- Bellah, Robert N., Madsen, Richard, Sullivan, William M., Swidler, Ann, and Tipton, Steven M. (Eds.). (1996). *Habits of the heart: Individualism and commitment in American life*. Updated with a new introduction. Berkeley: University of California Press. (Original work published 1985)
- Bentall, Richard P., and Pilgrim, David. (1993). Thomas Szasz, crazy talk and the myth of mental illness. *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, 66, 69-76.
- Bentov, Itzhak. (1977). *Stalking the wild pendulum: On the mechanics of consciousness*. New York: E. P. Dutton.
- Ben-Yehuda, Nachman. (1979). Altered states of consciousness: A sociological perspective. *Journal of Altered States of Consciousness* 4(4), 345-356.
- Berger, Peter L. (1969). *A rumor of angels: Modern society and the rediscovery of the supernatural*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, Inc.
- Berger, Peter L. (1979). *The heretical imperative: Contemporary possibilities of religious affirmation*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books/Doubleday.
- Berger, Peter L. (1990). *The sacred canopy: Elements of a sociological theory of religion*. New York, NY: Anchor Book, Doubleday. (Original work published Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1967).
- Berger, Peter L., and Luckmann, Thomas. (1966). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge* (pp. 1-43). Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.
- Berger, Peter L., and Luckmann, Thomas. (1969). Sociology of religion and sociology of knowledge. In Birnbaum and Lenzer (Eds.), *Sociology and religion: A book of readings* (pp. 410-418). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

- Bergson, Henri. (1944). *Creative Evolution* (A. Mitchell, Trans.). Toronto: Random House, Inc. (Original work published Henry Holt and Company, 1911)
- Bergson, Henri. (1946). *The creative mind* (M. L. Andison, Trans.) (pp.9-32;248-260). New York, NY: The Philosophical Library, Inc.
- Bertolino-Green, Dianne Lynn. (1987). *Right-brain expressions of religious experience: A bimodal paradigm in Shaker case studies*. [On-line]. Abstract from: UMI ProQuest Digital Dissertations: File: Full Citation & Abstract: Item: AAT 8800193 [Source DAI-A 48/11, p. 2897, May 1988].
- Beyer, Peter. (1998). The city and beyond as dialogue: Negotiating religious authenticity in global society. *Social Compass*, 45(1), 67-79.
- Bhaskar, Roy. (1996). Empiricism. In W. Outhwaite and T. Bottomore (Eds.), *The Blackwell dictionary of twentieth-century social thought* (pp.193-195). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Inc. (Original work published 1993)
- Bibby, Reginald W., and Brinkerhoff, Merlin B. (1973). The circulation of the saints: A study of people who join conservative churches. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 12, 273-283.
- Bibby, Reginald W., and Brinkerhoff, Merlin B. (1994). Circulation of the saints, 1966-1990: New data, new reflections: Research note. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 33(3), 273-280.
- Blasius, Wilhelm. (1976). *Problems of life research: Physiological analyses and phenomenological interpretations*. New York: Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg. (Translation of "Probleme der Lebensforschung", Freiburg: Rombach + Co GmbH, 1973)
- Blumer, Herbert. (1956). Sociological analysis and the "variable". *American Sociological Review*, 21(6), 683-690.
- Boucoulalas, Marcie. (1997). Intuition: The concept and the experience. In Robbie Davis-Floyd and P. Sven Arvidson (Eds.), *Intuition: The inside story* (pp. 3-18). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Boudon, Raymond. (1996). Methodology. In W. Outhwaite and T. Bottomore (Eds.), *The Blackwell dictionary of twentieth-century social thought* (pp.379-381). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Inc. (Original work published 1993)

- Bourgeois, P. L. (1990). *The religious within experience and existence: A phenomenological investigation*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.
- Bourguignon, Erika (Ed.). (1973). *Religion, altered states of consciousness, and social change*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press.
- Bourguignon, Erika. (1989). Multiple personality, possession trance, and the psychic unity of mankind. *Ethos*, 17(3), 371-386.
- Bowen, John R. (2002). *Religions in practice: An approach to the anthropology of religion*. (2nd ed.). Toronto, ON: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bradfield, Cecil David. (1979). *Neo-pentecostalism: A sociological assessment*. Washington, DC: University Press of America, Inc. .
- Bras, G. Le (1969). Some problems of the sociology of religion. In Birnham and Lenzer (Eds.), *Sociology and religion: A book of readings* (pp. 430-445). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Braud, William, and Anderson, Rosemarie. (1998). *Transpersonal research methods for the social sciences: Honoring human experience*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Brinkerhoff, Merlin, and Mackie, Marlene. (1993). Nonbelief in Canada: Characteristics and origins of religious nones. In W. E. Hewitt (Ed.), *The sociology of religion: A Canadian focus* (pp. 109-132). Toronto: Butterworths.
- Bruce, Steve. (1998). The charismatic movement and the secularization thesis. *Religion*, 28, 223-232.
- Buber, Martin. (1996). *I and thou*. (Walter Kaufmann, Trans.). New York, NY: Touchstone.
- Burawoy, Michel. (1998). The extended case method. *Sociological Theory*, 16(1), 4-33.
- Burgess, Stanley M. (1984). *The Holy Spirit: Ancient Christian traditions*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc.
- Burgess, Stanley M. (2001). Pentecostalism in India: An overview. *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies*, 4(1), 85-98.

- Campbell, Ronald L. (1981). The nature of transpersonal anthropology. *phoenix: Journal of Transpersonal Anthropology*, 5(1), 119-132.
- Carroll, Robert Todd. (1998). *Glossolalia*. [Online] Available: <http://www.skepdic.com> [2000, February 16].
- Cartledge, Mark J. (1998). The future of glossolalia: Fundamentalist or experientialist? *Religion*, 28, 233-244.
- Cartledge, Mark J. (2000). The nature and function of New Testament glossolalia. *The Evangelical Quarterly*, 72(2), 135-150.
- Cartwright, Christine Ann. (1983). *Charismatic culture in St. John's, Newfoundland: A Crossdenominational study of religious folklife in three groups*. [On-line]. Abstract from: UMI ProQuest Digital Dissertations: File: Full Citation & Abstract Item: f2810629 [Source: DAI-A 44/11, p. 3454, May 1984].
- Chaika, Elaine. (1990). *Language: The social mirror*. (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Chittick, W. C. (1983). *The Sufi path of love: The spiritual teachings of Rumi*. SUNY Series in Islamic Spirituality. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Christie-Murray, David. (1978). *Voices from the gods: Speaking with tongues*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.
- Cicourel, Aaron V. (1969). *Method and measurement In sociology* (pp. 34-72). New York: The Free Press. (Original work published 1964)
- Cohn, Werner. (1967). A movie of experimentally-produced glossolalia. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 6, 278.
- Cohn, Werner. (1968). Personality, pentecostalism, and glossolalia: A research note on some unsuccessful research. *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 5, 36-39.
- Coleman, Simon. (1998). Charismatic Christianity and the dilemmas of globalization. *Religion*, 28, 245-256.
- Corelli, Rae. (1996). How very different we are. *Maclean's*, 109(45), 36-40.

- Corten, André. (1997). The growth of the literature on Afro-American, Latin American, and African Pentecostalism. *Journal of Contemporary Religion*, 12(3), 311-324.
- Cox, Harvey. (2001). *Fire from heaven: The rise of pentecostal spirituality and the reshaping of religion in the twenty-first century*. Cambridge, MA: Da Capo Press. (Original work published 1995)
- Crick, Francis, and Koch, Christof. (1992). The problem of consciousness. *Scientific American Mind and Brain* [Special Issue], 267(3), 153-159.
- Crowley, Michael. (1998). Spiritual winds over a cultural sea: Grass-roots patterns in Latin America. *Religion*, 28, 257-270.
- Csikszentmihalyi, Mihaly. (1990). *Flow: The psychology of optimal experience*. New York, NY: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- Cutten, George Barton. (1927). *Speaking with tongues: Historically and psychologically considered*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Damasio, Antonio R., and Damasio, Hanna. (1992). Brain and language. *Scientific American Mind and Brain* [Special Issue], 267(3), 89-95.
- d'Aquili, Eugene G. (1983). The myth-ritual complex: A biogenetic structural analysis. *Zygon*, 18(3), 247-269.
- d'Aquili, Eugene. (1993). *Apologia pro scriptura, sua*, or maybe we got it right after all. *Zygon*, 28(2), 251-266.
- d'Aquili, Eugene, and Mol, Hans. (1990). *The regulation of physical and mental systems: Systems theory of the philosophy of science*. Mellen Studies in Sociology, Vol. 4. Queenston, ON: The Edwin Mellen Press.
- d'Aquili, Eugene, and Newberg, Andrew B. (1993). Religious and mystical states: A neuropsychological model. *Zygon*, 28(2), 177-200.
- Davis-Floyd, Robbie, and Arvidson, P. Sven. (Eds.). (1997). *Intuition: The inside story interdisciplinary perspectives*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Dawson, Lorne L. (1996). Giving voice to the sacred: Collaborative representations in the study of living religious traditions. In Thomas A. Idinopulos and Edward A. Yonan (Eds.), *The sacred and its scholars: Comparative methodologies for the study of primary religious data*. New York, NY: E. J. Brill.

- de Certeau, Michel. (1996). Vocal utopias: Glossolalias. *Representations*, 0(56), 29-47.
- DeGrandis, Father Robert. (1987). *Coming to life: Being baptized in the Holy Spirit*. Mrs. Linda Schubert (Ed.). (n.p.): Pauline Books and Media.
- Dell, Mary Lynn. (1993). *Brain, symbol, & experience: A psychiatric and theological dialogue*. *Zygon*, 28(2), 217-230.
- Denzin, Norman K., and Lincoln, Yvonna S. (1994). Introduction: Entering the field of qualitative research. In Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Methods* (pp. 262-272). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Derrida, Jacques. (1998). Faith and knowledge: The two sources of 'religion' at the limits of reason alone. In J. Derrida and G. Vattimo (Eds.), *Religion. Cultural Memory in the Present*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press. (Original work published 1996, Éditions du Seuil et Éditions Laterza)
- Derrida, Jacques, and Vattimo, Gianni (Eds.). (1998). *Religion. Cultural memory in the present*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press (Original work published 1996, Éditions du Seuil et Éditions Laterza)
- De Vol, Thomas. (1974). Ecstatic pentecostal prayer and meditation. *Journal of Religion and Health*, 13(4), 285-288.
- Dijk, T. A. van. (1997). Cognitive context models and discourse. In M. I. Stamenov (Ed.), *Language structure, discourse and the access to consciousness* (pp. 189-226). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins North America.
- Dillon, Shaye J. (1998). *Glossolalia: An ethnographic study of the rhetorical role of speaking in tongues in the creation of the Pentecostal religious culture*. [On-line]. Abstract from: UMI ProQuest Digital Dissertations: File: Full Citation & Abstract: Item: AAT 9915647 [Source: DAI-A 59/12, p. 4314, Jun 1999].
- Dilthey, Wilhelm. (1954). *The essence of philosophy* (Stephen A. Emery and William T. Emery, Trans.) (pp. 34-76). Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.

- Dilthey, Wilhelm. (1985). *Introduction to the human sciences* Vol. 1. Edited, With an introduction by Rudolf A. Makkreel and Frithjof Rodi (pp. 1-43; 99-391; 492-501). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Dombrowski, Kirk. (2001). *Against culture: Development, politics, and religion in Indian Alaska*. Fourth World Rising Series. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Douglas, Mary. (1996). *Natural symbols: Explorations in cosmology*. New York, NY: Routledge. (Original work published 1973)
- Dourley, John P. (1997). Issues of naturalism and supernaturalism in Tillich's correlation of religious with psychological healing. *Studies in Religion*, 26(2), 211-222.
- Dressler, Richard A., and Kreuz, Roger J. (2000). Transcribing oral discourse: A survey and a model system. *Discourse Processes*, 29(1), 25-36.
- During, Jean. (1997). African winds and Muslim djinns: Trance healing and devotion in Baluchistan. *1997 Yearbook for Traditional Music*, 29, 39-56.
- Durkheim, Émile. (1964). *The rules of sociological method*. (8th ed.). (Sarah A. Solovay and John H. Mueller, Trans., and George E.G. Catlin, ed.). New York, NY: The Free Press of Glencoe. (Original work published 1938)
- Durkheim, Émile. (1995). *The elementary forms of religious life* (Karen Fields, Trans.). New York, NY: The Free Press. (Originally published as *Les Formes élémentaires de la vie religieuse: Le système totémique en Australie*, Paris, F. Alcan, 1912)
- Eaves, Lindon. (1989). Spirit, method, and content in science and religion: The theological perspective of a geneticist. *Zygon*, 24(2), 185-215.
- Ellison, Christopher G., and Sherkat, Darren E. (1995). Is sociology the core discipline for the scientific study of religion? *Social Forces*, 73(4), 1255-1266.
- Elvesjö, Hans. (2001). *Holistic consciousness: Neurotransmitters are memory transducers*. [On-line]. Available: <http://home.swipnet.se/~w-22081/consciou.htm>
- Epstein, Daniel Mark. (1993). *Sister Aimee: The life of Aimee Semple McPherson*. San Diego: Harcourt Brace & Company.

- Evans, Dylan, and Zarate, Oscar. (2000). *Introducing evolutionary psychology*. New York, NY: Totem Books.
- Ferguson, Sue. (1999, November 29). The Christian World. *Maclean's*, 112(48), 70-71.
- Fernandez, James W. (1986). The argument of images and the experience of returning to the whole. In Victor W. Turner and Edward M. Bruner (Ed.), *The anthropology of experience* (pp. 159-187). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Feuerbach, L. (1969). The truth of religion. In Birnbaum/Lenzer (Eds.), *Sociology and religion: A book of readings* (pp. 87-91). Englewood Cliff, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc. (Reprinted from *The essence of Christianity* [1941], London: 1854, pp.12-14;24-27; 29-31)
- Fields, Karen E. (1995). Translator's introduction: Religion as an eminently Social thing. In Emile Durkheim, *The elementary forms of religious life* (xvii-lxxiii). (Karen Fields, Trans.). New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Fillmore, Charles. (1995). Keep a true lent. Unity Classic Library. Unity Village, MO: Unity Books. (Original work published 1953)
- Fischbach, Gerald D. (1992). Mind and brain. *Scientific American* [Special Issue], 267(3), 48-57.
- Fischer, Roland. (1976). On the remembrance of things present. *Journal of Altered States of Consciousness*, 2(4), 361-369.
- Fischer, Roland. (1978a). The making of reality. *Journal of Altered States of Consciousness*, 3(4), 371-389.
- Fischer, Roland. (1978b). Cartography of conscious states: Integration of east and west. In A. Arthur Sugarman and Ralph E. Tarter (Eds.), *Expanding dimensions of consciousness* (pp. 24-57). New York, NY: Springer Publishing Company.
- Flanagan, Owen. (1992). *Consciousness reconsidered*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Fletcher, Gilbert Thomas. (1985). The charismatic movement and its effects on the local United Methodist church within the Jacksonville district of the central Illinois conference. (Doctor of Ministry Degree, Drew University,

- 1985). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 46,(05), 1316. (University Microfilms No. AAT8515800)
- Foley, Robert A. (1996). Anthropology. In William Outhwaite and Tom Bottomore (Eds.), *The Blackwell dictionary of twentieth-century social thought* (pp. 20-24). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd. (Original work published 1993)
- Fox, John W. (1992). The structure, stability, and social antecedents of Reported paranormal experiences. *Sociological Analysis*, 53(4), 417-431.
- Francis, Leslie J., and Kay, William K. (1995). The personality characteristics of Pentecostal ministry candidates. *Personality and individual differences*, 18(5), 581-594.
- Franz, M.-L. von (1986). *On dreams and death*. Boston: Shambhala Publications, Inc. (Original work published Munich: Kösel-Verlag GmbH & Co., 1984)
- Franzosi, Roberto. (1998). Narrative analysis - or why (and how) sociologists should be interested in narrative. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24, 517-554.
- Freeman, Walter J. (2001). Three centuries of category errors in studies of the neural basis of consciousness and intentionality. In W. Sulis and I. Trofimova (Eds.), *Nonlinear dynamics in the life and social sciences*. (n.p.), IOS Press. (Original work published 1997, Elsevier Science from Neural Networks, Vol. 10, pp.1175-1183)
- Fukuyama, Francis. (1999). The great disruption: Human nature and the reconstitution of social order. *The Atlantic Monthly*, May, 55-80.
- Fuse, Toyomasa. (1967). Sociology of knowledge revisited: Some remaining problems and prospects. *Sociological Inquiry*, 37, 241-253.
- Gallup Poll. (2000, March). Publication sent through personal communication March 23, 2000.
- Garson, James W. (2002). Evolution, consciousness and the language of thought. In James H. Fetzer (Ed.), *Consciousness evolving*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Geertz, Clifford. (1966). Religion as a cultural system. In Michael Banton (Ed.), *Anthropological approaches to the study of religion* (Conference on 'New Approaches in Social Anthropology,' Jesus College, Cambridge, Eng., 1963) (pp. 1-46). New York, NY: Frederick A. Praeger, Publishers.
- Geertz, Clifford. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays*. New York, NY: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers.
- Gellatly, Angus, and Zarate, Oscar. (1998). *Introducing mind & brain*. New York, NY: Totem Books.
- Georgaca, Eugenie. (2001). Voices of the self in psychotherapy: A qualitative analysis. *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, 74, 223-236.
- Gershon, Elliot, and Rieder, Ronald O. (1992). Major disorders of mind and brain. *Scientific American* [Special Issue], 267(3), 126-133.
- Given, Brian. (1992). *Education for experience: One view of Tibetan tantric initiation*. Departmental Working Paper 92-11, Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada.
- Glaser, Barney G., and Strauss, Anselm L. (1999). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine De Gruyter. (Original work published 1967)
- Glazier, Stephen D. (1980). *Perspectives on Pentecostalism: Case studies from the Caribbean and Latin America*. Washington, D.C.: University Press of American, Inc.
- Glock, Charles Y. (1972). Images of "God," images of man, and the organization of social life. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 11(1), 1-15.
- Gluckman, Max, and Egan, Fred. (1966). Introduction. In Michael Banton (Ed.), *Anthropological approaches to the study of religion* (Conference on New Approaches in Social Anthropology, Jesus College, Cambridge, Eng., 1963) (xi-xlii). New York, NY: Frederick A. Praeger, Publishers.
- Goldman-Rakic, Patricia S. (1992). Working memory and the mind. *Scientific American* [Special Issue], 267(3), 110-117.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence*. New York, NY: Bantam Books.

- González, Justo L. (1985).: *The reformation to the present day*. Vol. 2 The Story of Christianity. New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers.
- Goodman, Felicitas D. (1969). Phonetic analysis of glossolalia in four cultural settings. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 8(Fall), 227-239.
- Goodman, Felicitas D. (1972a). *Speaking in tongues: A cross-cultural study of glossolalia*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Goodman, Felicitas D. (1972b). Altered mental state vs. "Style of Discourse:" Reply to Samarin. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 11(3), 297-299.
- Goran, Carolyn C., Sarty, Merrill, and Wu, Paul Y. K. (1975). Visual following and pattern discrimination of face-like stimuli by newborn infants. *Pediatrics*, (56)4, 544-549.
- Gowan, J. C. (1978-79). Altered states of consciousness: A taxonomy. *Journal of Altered States of Consciousness*, 4(2), 141-156.
- Grady, Brian, and Loewenthal, Miriam. (1997). Features associated with speaking in tongues (glossolalia). *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, 70, 185-191.
- Greeley, Andrew M. (1975). *The Sociology of the paranormal: A reconnaissance*. Sage Research Papers in the Social Sciences (Studies in Religion and Ethnicity, No. 90-023). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Grof, Stanislav. (1975). *Realms of the human unconscious*. New York, NY: The Viking Press, Inc.
- Grof, Stanislav. (1998). *The cosmic game: Explorations of the frontiers of human consciousness*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Guba, Egon G. and Lincoln, Yvonna S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Methods* (pp.105-117). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gubrium, Jaber F., and Holstein, James A. (1997). *The new language of qualitative method*. New York:, NY: Oxford University Press.

- Hale, Lindsay Lauren. (1997). preto velho: resistance, redemption, and engendered representations of slavery in a Brazilian possession-trance religion. *American Ethnologist* 24(2), 392-414.
- Hamel, Jacques. (1993). *Case study methods*. With Stéphane Dufour and Dominic Fortin. (Sage University Paper Series on Qualitative Research Methods, Vol. 32). Beverley Hills, CA: Sage.
- Harrison, Michael I. (1978). Commitment mechanisms and routinization in a social movement. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 17(4), 456-460.
- Havens, Joseph. (1961). The participant's vs. the observer's frame of reference in the psychological study of religion. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 1(1), 79-87.
- Hawkins, David R. (2002). *Power vs. force: The hidden determinants of human behavior*. Carlsbad, CA: Hay House, Inc. (Original work published 1995, Sedona, AZ.: Veritas Pub.)
- Henderson, Jeffery Lynn. (1997). *A sociolinguistic analysis of glossolalia at Corinth*. (Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1997). Dissertation Abstracts International, UMI Number: 9731268.
- Heritage, John. (1996). Ethnomethodology. In W. Outhwaite and T. Bottomore (Eds.), *The Blackwell dictionary of twentieth-century social thought* (pp.206-208). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Inc. (Original work published 1993)
- Hervieu-Léger, Danièle. (1998). The transmission and formation of socioreligious identities in modernity: An analytical essay on the trajectories of identification. *International Sociology*, 13(2), 213-228.
- Hesse, Hermann. (1957). *Siddhartha*. (Hilda Rosner, Trans.). New York, NY: A New Directions Book. (Original work published 1951)
- Hewitt, W. E. (Ed.) (1993). *The sociology of religion: A Canadian focus*. Toronto: Butterworths.
- Hine, Virginia H. (1969). Pentecostal glossolalia: Toward a functional interpretation. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 8, 211-226.
- Hinton, Geoffrey E. (1992). How neural networks learn from experience. *Scientific American* [Special Issue], 267(3), 144-151.

- Hocken, Peter. (1986). *Streams of renewal: The origins and early development of the charismatic movement in Great Britain*. Foreword by Cecil Cousen and preface by Walter Hollenweger. Exeter, Devon: The Paternoster Press.
- Holcomb, Harmon R. (1961). Comment. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 1(1), 55-60.
- Hollway, Wendy, and Jefferson, Tony. (2000). *Doing qualitative research differently: Free association, narrative and the interview method*. London: Sage.
- Holm, Nils G. (1987). Sundén's role theory and glossolalia. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 26(3), 383-389.
- Holmer, Paul L. (1961). Scientific language and the language of religion. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 1(1), 42-55.
- Holmes, H. Rodney. (1993). Thinking about religion and experiencing the brain: Eugene d'Aquili's biogenetic structural theory of absolute unitary being. *Zygon*, 28(2): 201-215.
- Holstein, James A., and Gubrium, Jaber F. (1994). Phenomenology, Ethnomethodology, and interpretive practice. In Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Methods* (pp. 262-272). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Humphrey, Nicholas. (1992). *A history of the mind*. London, ENG: Chatto & Windus.
- Hunt, Harry T. (2000). Experiences of radical personal transformation in mysticism, religious conversion, and psychosis: A review of the varieties, processes, and consequences of the numinous. *The Journal of Mind and Behavior*, 21(4), 353-398.
- Hunt, Stephen. (1998). Magical moments: An intellectualist approach to the neo-pentecostal faith ministries. *Religion*, 28, 271-280.
- Hutch, Richard A. (1980). The personal ritual of glossolalia. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 19(3), 255-266.
- Hyde, Maggie, and McGuinness, Michael. (1997). *Introducing Jung*. New York, NY: Totem Books. (Original work published 1992 in the UK and Australia under the title *Jung for Beginners*)

- Idinopulos, Thomas A. (2000). What is religion? *Cross Currents*, April, 1-13. [online]. Available: www.aril.org/whatisreligion.htm [2001, July 26].
- Jackson, Michael. (Ed.). (1996). *Things as they are: New directions in phenomenological anthropology*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Jahn, Robert, and Dunne, Brenda J. (2001). A modular model of mind/matter manifestations (M⁵). *Journal of Scientific Exploration*, 15(3), 299-329.
- James, William. (1958). *The varieties of religious experience: A study in human nature being the Gifford lectures on natural religion delivered at Edinburgh in 1901-1902*. New York, NY: The New American Library.
- James, William. (1996). *Essays in radical empiricism* (intro. by Ellen Kappy Suckiel) (pp. xv-xxiv; 39-90). Bison Books (Reprinted from the original 1912 edition by Longmans, Green and Co., New York).
- Janzen, John M. (1979). Deep thought: Structure and intention in Kongo Prophetism, 1910-1921. *Social Research*, 46(1), 106-139.
- Jaquith, James R. (1967). Toward a typology of formal communicative behaviors: Glossolalia. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 9(8), 1-8.
- Jenish, D'Arcy (1999, November 29). Jesus at 2000: Christian churches shed past constraints in a bid to regain their flocks. *Maclean's*, 112(48), 60-66.
- Jenson, Robert W. (1983). The praying animal. *Zygon*, 18(3), 311-325.
- Joseph, R. (2001). The limbic system and the soul: Evolution and the neuroanatomy of religious experience. *Zygon*, 36(1), 105-136.
- Jung, C. G. (1938). *Psychology and religion based on the Terry Lectures delivered at Yale University*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Jung, C. G. (1959). *The archetypes and the collective unconscious*. (R.F.C. Hull, Trans.). Bollingen Series XX. New York, NY: Pantheon Books Inc.
- Jung, Carl G. (Ed.). (1973/1964). *Man and his symbols*. New York, NY: Dell Publishing Co., Inc.

- Kandel, Eric R., and Hawkins, Robert D. (1992). The biological basis of learning and individuality. *Scientific American* (Special Issue), 267(3), 78-86.
- Keller, Evelyn Fox. (1983). *A feeling for the organism: The life and work of Barbara McClintock*. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman and Company.
- Kelsey, Morton T. (1968). *Tongue speaking: An experiment in spiritual experience*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.
- Kelsey, Morton T. (1988). *Psychology, medicine, & Christian healing*. New York, NY: Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc.
- Kildahl, John P. (1972). *The psychology of speaking in tongues*. New York, NY: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- Kilminster, Richard. (1996). Phenomenology. In W. Outhwaite and T. Bottomore (Eds.), *The Blackwell dictionary of twentieth-century social thought* (pp. 460-463). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd. (Original work published 1993)
- Kimura, Doreen. (1992). Sex differences in the brain. *Scientific American* [Special Issue], 267(3), 118-125.
- Klausner, Samuel Z. (1961). Images of man: An empirical inquiry. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 1(1), 61-73.
- Laffal, Julius, Monahan, James, and Richman, Peter. (1974). Communication of meaning in glossolalia. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 92, 277-291.
- Laszlo, Ervin. (1991). *The age of bifurcation: Understanding the changing world*. Foreword by Ilya Prigogine. The World Futures General Evolution Studies series Vol. 3. Philadelphia: Gordon and Breach.
- Laughlin, Charles D. (1988). Transpersonal anthropology: Some methodological issues. *The Western Canadian Anthropologist*, 5, 29-60.
- Laughlin, Charles D. (1992). *Scientific explanation and the life-world: A biogenetic structural theory of meaning and causation*. Causality Issues in Contemporary Science Ions Research Report CP-2. Sausalito, CA: Institute of Noetic Sciences.

- Laughlin, Charles D. (1994). Transpersonal anthropology, then and now. *Transpersonal Review*, 1(1), 7-10.
- Laughlin, Charles D. (1995). The cycle of meaning: Some methodological implications of biogenetic structural theory. In S. Glazier (Ed.), *Anthropology of religion: Handbook of theory and method*. (n.p.): Greenwood Press.
- Laughlin, Charles D. (1997a). *The anthropology of religion: An introduction*. [Reading Version of paper presented to NEAA 1997].
- Laughlin, Charles D. (1997b). The nature of intuition: A neuropsychological approach. In Robbie Davis-Floyd and P. Sven Arvidson (Eds.), *Intuition: The inside story* (pp. 19-37). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Laughlin, Charles D., and d'Aquili, Eugene G. (1974). *Biogenetic structuralism*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Laughlin, Charles D., McManus, John, and d'Aquili, Eugene G. (1992). *Brain, symbol, & experience: Toward a neurophenomenology of human consciousness*. New York: Columbia University Press. (Original work published 1990)
- Laughlin, Charles D., McManus, John, Rubenstein, Robert A., and Shearer, Jon. (1983). *Anthropology and phenomenology: Ritual and transformation of experience*. Departmental Working Paper 83-6. Carleton University, Ottawa.
- Laughlin, Charles D., McManus, John, Rubinstein, Robert A., and Shearer, Jon. (1986). The ritual transformation of experience. *Studies in Symbolic Interaction*, 7,(Part A), 107-136.
- Laughlin, Charles D., McManus, John, and Shearer, Jon. (1979). *Dreams, trance and visions: What a transpersonal anthropology might look like*. Departmental Working Paper 79-12. Carleton University, Ottawa.
- Laurence, Margaret. (1974). *A jest of God*. Toronto, ON: McClelland and Stewart Limited.
- Leedy, Paul D. (1997). *Practical research: Planning and design*. With contributions by Timothy J. Newby and Peggy A. Ertmer. (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc. .

- Leeuw, G. van der (1963). *Religion in essence and manifestation* Vol. II (pp.460-471; 671-701). (J. E. Turner, Trans.). With Appendices to the Torchbook edition incorporating the editions of the second German edition by Hans H. Penner. New York, NY: Harper Torchbooks, Harper and Row, Publishers. (Original work published Tübingen, 1933)
- Leff, Julian. (1993). Comment on crazy talk: Thought disorder or psychiatric arrogance by Thomas Szasz. *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, 66, 77-78.
- Lewicki, Pawel. (1986). *Nonconscious social information processing*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press, Inc.
- Lex, Barbara W. (1976). Physiological aspects of ritual trance. *Journal of Altered States of Consciousness*, 2(2), 109-12.
- Lind, Richard E. (2001). Historical origins of the modern mind/body split. *The Journal of Mind and Behavior*, 22(1), 23-40.
- Lindermayer, Orestis. (1995). 'The beast of the revelation' American fundamentalist Christianity and the European Union. *Ethnofoor*, VIII(1), 27-46.
- Lindermayer, Orestis. (1998). *Fundamentalism and spirit-possession: Healing and communitas in a Pentecostal community in Greece*. Abstract. *Εθνολογία*, 5(1996-1997), 115-179. (English translation of abstract by Orestis Lindermayer, Αθήνα, 1998)
- Lindermayer, Orestis. (2001, April). *Trinitarian millenialism and eschatology: From Byzantium to North American Pentecostalism and modern orthodox ('Greek-Orthodox') apocalypticism*. Paper presented at the INFORM Conference: 'The Spiritual Supermarket. Religious Pluralism and Globalization in the 21st Century: The Expanding European Union and Beyond.' London School of Economics. [Photocopied]
- Lindermayer, Orestis. (2002, August). *'Moral Familism' in Greece: The conflict between religion and civic culture over control of the individual's conscience in eastern orthodox culture*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Association for Sociology of Religion Meeting. Chicago, IL. [Photocopied].

- Loewenthal, Kate Miriam, Cinnirella, Marco, Evdoka, Georgina, and Murphy, Paula. (2001). Faith conquers all? Beliefs about the role of religious factors in coping with depression among different cultural-religious groups in the UK. *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, 74, 293-303.
- Lovekin, Adams, and Malony, H. Newton. (1977). Religious glossolalia: A longitudinal study of personality changes. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 16(4), 383-393.
- Luckmann, Thomas. (1967). *The invisible religion: The problem of religion in modern society*. New York, NY: The Macmillan Company.
- Lyons, Joseph. (1973). *Experience: an introduction to a personal psychology*. New York, NY: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- Lyons, William E. (1986). *The disappearance of introspection*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Lysaker, Paul H., and Lysaker, John T. (2001). Psychosis and the disintegration of dialogical self-structure: Problems posed by schizophrenia for the maintenance of dialogue. *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, 74, 23-33.
- MacMurray, John. (1946). *The structure of religious experience* (2nd ed.). London: Faber and Faber Limited.
- Malinowski, B. (1969). The public and the individual character of religion. In Birnbaum/Lenzer (Eds.), *Sociology and religion: A book of readings* (pp. 144-158). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc. (Reprinted from Magic, science and religion [1925] In Joseph Needham [ed.], *Magic, science and religion and Other Essays* pp. 35-50, 59-64, 66-71. Boston and Glencoe: 1948. By permission of The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge).
- Malony, H. Newton, and Lovekin, A. Adams. (1985). *Glossolalia: Behavioral science perspectives on speaking in tongues*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Manning, Frank E. (1980). Pentecostalism: Christianity and reputation. In Stephen D. Glazier (Ed.), *Perspectives on pentecostalism: Case studies from the Caribbean and Latin America* Washington, DC: University Press of American, Inc.

- Martin, David. Will the next era be post-Christian? *The National Post* [On-line], Available: <http://www.nationalpost.com/commentary.asp?f=000101/16626> [2000, January 1].
- Martin, Father Francis. (Ed.). (1998). *Baptism in the Holy Spirit: Reflections on a contemporary grace in the light of the Catholic tradition*. Petersham, MA: St. Bede's Publications.
- Martínez-Taboas, Alfonso. (1999). A case of spirit possession and glossolalia. *Culture, Medicine and Psychiatry*, 23, 333-348.
- Marx, Karl, and Engels, Friedrich. (1982). *On religion*. Classics In Religious Studies Scholars Press and The American Academy of Religion Number Three. Chico, CA: Scholars Press. (Original work published 1964)
- Maslow, Abraham H. (1976). *Religions, Values, and Peak-Experiences*. New York, NY: Penguin Books. (Original work published 1964)
- Massey, Douglas S. (2002). A brief history of human society: The origin and role of emotion in social life (2001 Presidential Address). *American Sociological Review*, 67(1), 1-29.
- May, L. Carlyle. (1956). A survey of glossolalia and related phenomena in non-Christian religions. *American Anthropologist*, 58, 75-96.
- McCracken, Grant. (1988). *The long interview*. (Sage University Paper Series On Qualitative Research Methods, Vol.13). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- McGuigan, F. J. (1966). *Thinking: Studies of covert language processes*. New York, NY: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Meredith Publishing Company.
- McGuire, Meredith B. (1977). Testimony as a commitment mechanism in Catholic Pentecostal prayer groups. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 16(2), 165-168.
- Mead, George H. (1934). *Mind, self and society: From the standpoint of a social behaviorist*. (Charles W. Morris, ed. and intro.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press (pp. 135-42, 144, 149-156, 158, 162-164).
- Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary* (10th ed.). (1994). Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster, Incorporated.

- Mesthene, E.G. (1964). *How language makes us know: Some views about the nature of intelligibility*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Mill, J. S. (1969). Utility of religion. In Birnbaum/Lenzer (Eds.), *Sociology and religion: a book of readings* (96-100). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc. (Reprinted *Nature, the Utility of Religion, Theism, Being Three Essays on Religion* pp. 69-71; 76; 77-82; 84-88. London: 1874).
- Miller, G., and Dingwall, R. (1997). *Context & method in qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Mills, Watson E. (1985). *A theological/exegetical approach to glossolalia*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, Inc.
- Mishler, Elliot G. (1986). *Research interviewing: context and narrative*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Mol, Hans. (1983). *Meaning and place: An introduction to the social scientific study of religion*. New York, NY: The Pilgrim Press.
- Mol, Hans. (1985). *Faith and fragility: religion and identity in Canada*. Burlington, ON: Trinity Press.
- Morin, Alain. (2001). The split-brain debate revisited: On the importance of language and self-recognition for right hemispheric consciousness. *The Journal of Mind and Behavior*, 22(2), 107-118.
- Morse, Janet M. (1994). Designing funded qualitative research. In Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Moustakas, Clark. (1990). *Heuristic research: Design, methodology, and applications*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Moustakas, Clark. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Mueller, Dieter C. (1990/1989). *Glossolalia and the right hemisphere of the brain*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of British Columbia.

- Mumford, Linda Anne. (1996). An expanded psychological understanding of religious glossolalia among women. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Boston University. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, UMI Number: 9530625.
- Natanson, Maurice. (1965). Man as an actor. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 26(September 1965-June 1966), 327-341.
- Newberg, Andrew, and d'Aquili, Eugene G. (1994). The near-death experience as archetype: A model for "prepared" neurocognitive processes. *Anthropology of Consciousness*, 5(4), 1-15.
- Nida, Eugene A., and Smalley, William A. (1974/1959). *Introducing animism*. New York, NY: Friendship Press.
- Niesz, Nancy L., and Kronenberger, Earl J. (1978). Self-actualization in glossolalic and non-glossolalic Pentecostals. *Sociological Analysis*, 39(3), 250-256.
- Nock, David A. (1993). The organization of religious life in Canada. In W. E. Hewitt (Ed.), *The sociology of religion* (pp. 41-63). Toronto, ON: Butterworths Canada Ltd.
- Nouvet, Elsye. (2001). *El Mundo, God, and the flesh: Experiencing sacredness in a Nicaraguan church*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Concordia University.
- Ogden, C. K. and Richards, I. A. (1946). *The meaning of meaning: A study of the influence of language upon thought and of the science of symbolism*. With supplementary essays by B. Malinowski and F. G. Crookshank. (8th ed.). International Library of psychology, philosophy, and scientific method. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace and Company.
- Orr, Robert P. (1981). *The meaning of transcendence: A Heideggerian reflection*. Dissertation series American Academy of Religion. No. 35. Ann Arbor, MI: Edwards Brothers, Inc.
- O'Toole, Roger. (1993a). Classical statements on religion and society. In W. E. Hewitt (Ed.), *The Sociology of religion in Canada: A Canadian focus* (pp. 19-27). Toronto: Butterworths.

- O'Toole, Roger. (1993b). Beyond classical statements on religion and society: The sociology of religion in Canada. In W. E. Hewitt (Ed.), *The Sociology of religion: A Canadian focus* (pp. 29-39). Toronto: Butterworths.
- O'Toole, Roger. (1996). Religion in Canada: Its development and contemporary situation. *Social Compass*, 43(1), 119-134.
- Otto, Rudolf. (1950). *The idea of the holy: An inquiry into the non-rational factor in the idea of the divine and its relation to the rational*. (2nd ed.). (pp. ix-xx; 1-24; 215). (John W. Harvey, Trans.). London: Oxford University Press.
- Pache, René. (1954). *The person and work of the Holy Spirit* (Revised). (J. D. Emerson, Trans.). Chicago, IL: Moody Press.
- Pankhurst, Richard J. (1978). *Biological identification: The principles and practice of identification methods in biology*. London, ENG: Edward Arnold.
- Pearsall, Paul. (1998). *The heart's code: Tapping the wisdom and power of our heart energy*. (1st ed.). New York, NY: Broadway Books.
- Penfeld, Wilder. (1966). Some mechanisms of consciousness discovered during electrical stimulation of the brain. In F. J. McGuigan (Ed.), *Thinking: Studies of covert language processes*. The Century Psychology Series. (pp. 251-270). New York, NY: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Percival, Keith. A reconsideration of Whorf's hypothesis. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 8(8), 1-12.
- Percy, Martyn. (1998). The morphology of pilgrimage in the 'Toronto Blessing.' *Religion*, 28, 281-288.
- Perner, Joseph. (1991). *Understanding the representational mind*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Persinger, Michael A. (1987). *Neuropsychological bases of God beliefs*. New York, NY: Praeger Publishers.
- Peterson, Gregory R. (2001). Religion as orienting worldview. *Zygon*, 36(1), 5-19.

- Philipchalk, Ron, and Mueller, Dieter. (2000). Glossolalia and temperature change in the right and left cerebral hemispheres. *Psychology of Religion*, 10(3), 181-185.
- Piaget, Jean. (1968). *On the development of memory and identity*. (Eleanor Duckworth, Trans.). Barre, MA: Clark University Press with Barre Publishers.
- Piaget, Jean. (1971). *Insights and illusions of philosophy*. (Wolfe Mays, Trans.) New York, NY: The World Publishing Company.
- Pietsch, Paul. (2002). *Hologramic mind*. [On-line]. Available: <http://www.indiana.edu/~pietsch/hologramic.html>
- Plotnitsky, Arkady. (2002). *The knowable and the unknowable: Modern science, nonclassical thought, and the "two cultures."* Studies in Literature and Science. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.
- Poloma, Margaret M. (1982). *The charismatic movement: Is there a new Pentecost?* Social movements past and present. (Irwin Sanders, Ed.). Boston: Twayne Publishers.
- Poloma, Margaret M. (n.d.). "The Pentecostal Movement." In Stephen Hunt (Ed.), *Christian Millenarianism: Themes and Perspectives*. [On-line] Available: <http://hrr.hartsem.edu/research/PentecostalMovement.pdf>
- Poloma, Margaret M. (1998). Toronto Blessing. Entry for *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic movements, February, 1998*. [On-line] Available: http://www.hartfordinstitute.org/research/research_pentecostalism_polomaart8.html
- Poloma, Margaret M. (1999). The Spirit and the bride: The 'Toronto Blessing' and Church structure. Manuscript prepared for the *Evangelical Studies Bulletin* (July, 1996). (Published 1999, 13[4], 1-5) [On-line] Available: http://hrr.hartsem.edu/research/research_pentecostalism_polomaart6.html
- Poloma, Margaret M., and Hoelter, Lynette F. (1998). The 'Toronto blessing': A holistic model of healing. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 37(2), 257-272.
- Poloma, Margaret M., and Pendleton, Brian F. (1989). Religious experiences, evangelism, and institutional growth within the Assemblies of God. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 28(4), 415-431.

- Prince, Raymond. (1979). Religious experience and psychosis. *Journal of Altered States of Consciousness*, 5(2), 167-181.
- Proudfoot, Wayne. (1985). *Religious experience*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Ratey, John J. (2002). *A user's guide to the brain: Perception, attention, and the four theaters of the brain*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Reaney, Darryl. (1996). *After death: A new future for human consciousness*. New York, NY: Avon Books. (Original work published 1991, *The death of forever*. Melbourne: Longman Australia)
- Rees, T. (1915). *The Holy Spirit in thought and experience*. London, ENG.: Duckworth & Co.
- Reinert, Duane F., and Bloomingdale, John R. (2000). Spiritual experience, religious orientation, and self-reported behaviour. *Psychology of Religion*, 10(3), 173-180.
- Rhine, L. E. (1970). *Mind over matter: Psychokinesis*. New York, NY: The Macmillan Company.
- Richardson, James T. (1973). Psychological interpretations of glossolalia: A reexamination of research. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 12(2), 199-207.
- Riegel, Klaus F. (1976). The dialectics of human development. *American Psychologist*, (Oct.), 689-700.
- Riley, Bruce T. (1988). *The psychology of religious experience in its personal and institutional dimensions*. (American University studies Series VII Theology and Religion, Vol. 49). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Robinson, H. Wheeler. (1958). *The Christian experience of The Holy Spirit*. Digswell Place, ENG: James Nisbet and Co. Ltd.
- Rodriguez, Sylvia Belmont. (1981). Ecstasy: Map and threshold, a cross-cultural study of dissociation. [On-line]. Abstract from: UMI ProQuest Digital Dissertations: Item Number: AAT 8108985 (Source: DAI-A 41/11, p. 4759, May 1981)
- Roof, Wade Clark. (1979). *The religious dimension: New directions in quantitative research*. (n.p.): Academic Press, Inc.

- Rosen, Irving M. (1974). Some contributions of religion to mental and physical health. *Journal of Religion and Health*, 13(4), 289-294.
- Roy, Louis. (2001). *Transcendent experience: Phenomenology and critique*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Rubinstein, Robert A., Laughlin, Charles D., and McManus, John. (1984). *Science as cognitive process: Toward an empirical philosophy of science*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Ryle, G. (1979). *On thinking*. (Konstantin Kolenda, Ed.). Oxford, ENG: Basil Blackwell.
- Sadler, A. W. (1964). Glossolalia and possession: An appeal to the Episcopal study commission. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 4, 84-90.
- Samarin, William J. (1969a). Forms and functions of nonsense language. *Linguistics*, 50, 70-74.
- Samarin, William J. (1969b). Glossolalia as learned behaviour. *Canadian Journal of Theology*, 15(1), 60-64.
- Samarin, William J. (1971). Evolution in glossolalic private language. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 13(2), 55-67.
- Samarin, William J. (1972a). Sociolinguistic vs. neurophysiological explanations for glossolalia: Comment on Goodman's paper. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 11(3), 293-299.
- Samarin, William J. (1972b). *Tongues of men and angels: The religious language of Pentecostalism*. New York, NY: The Macmillan Company.
- Samarin, William J. (1973a). Glossolalia as regressive speech. *Language and Speech*, 16, 77-89.
- Samarin, William J. (1973b). Variation and variables in religious glossolalia. *Language in Society*, 1, 121-130.
- Samarin, William J. (1979). Making sense of glossolalic nonsense. *Social Research*, 46(1), 88-105.
- Sanford, Agnes. (1982). *The healing gifts of the Spirit*. New York, NY: Jove Book. (Original work published J. B. Lippincott, 1966)

- Schantz, Richard. (2001). The given regained: Reflections on the sensuous content of experience. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, LXII(1), 167-184.
- Schleiermacher, F. (1958) *On religion: speeches to its cultured despisers* (pp. 26-119). (John Oman, Trans.). With an introduction by Rudolf Otto. New York, NY: Harper & Brothers, Publishers. (Reprinted by arrangement with Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., London).
- Schweiker, William F. (1969). Religion as a superordinate meaning system and socio-psychological integration. *Journal for the Social Scientific Study of Religion*, 8(Fall), 300-307.
- Selkoe, Dennis J. (1992). Aging brain, aging mind. *Scientific American* (Special Issue), 267(3), 134-142.
- Shatz, Carla J. (1992). The developing brain. *Scientific American* [Special Issue], 267(3), 61-67.
- Shaw, Robert, and Bransford, John. (1977). Introduction: Psychological approaches to the problem of knowledge. In Robert E. Shaw and John Bransford, John (Eds.), *Perceiving, acting, and knowing* (pp. 1-39). (Conference held by the Center for Research in Human Learning, University of Minnesota, July 23 – August 17, 1973). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers.
- Shea, John J. (1987). *Religious experiencing: William James and Eugene Gendlin*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, Inc.
- Shearer, Jon, Laughlin, Charles D., and McManus, John. (1983). *A biogenetic structural model of phenomenological phases*. Departmental Working Paper 83-1. Carleton University, Ottawa.
- Sherkat, Darren E., and Ellison, Christopher G. (1999). Recent Developments and Current Controversies in The Sociology of Religion. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 25(1), 363-384. [Online]. Available: http://soc.annualreviews.org/cgi/content/full/25/1_363? [1999, October 27].
- Simmel, Georg. (1962). The metropolis and mental life. In Eric and Mary Josephson (Eds.), *Man alone: alienation in modern society* (pp. 151-165). New York, NY: Dell Publishing Co., Inc. (Reprinted from *The Sociology of Georg Simmel* by Georg Simmel. Copyright, 1950, by The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc. and reprinted with their permission).

- Simmel, Georg. (1979). *Sociology of Religion*. (Curt Rosenthal, Trans.). New York: Arno Press Inc. (Original work published 1959)
- Simmel, Georg. (1997). *Essays on religion*. (Horst Jurgen Helle [ed.] in collaboration with Ludwig Nieder, Trans.). Society for the Scientific Study of Religion, Monograph Series, no. 10. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Simpson, George Gaylord. (1961). *Principles of animal taxonomy*. Columbia Biological Series No. XX. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Smith, Daniel S., and Fleck, J. Roland. (1981). Personality correlates of Conventional and unconventional glossolalia. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 114, 209-217.
- Smith, John E. (1965). The encounter between philosophy and religion. In J. E. Smith (Ed.), *Philosophy and religion* (pp. 118-122). New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Smith, John E. (1968). *Experience and God* (pp. 3-67; 158-205). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, John E. (1973). *The analogy of experience: an approach to understanding religious truth* (pp. 25-61; 121-140). New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- Smith, Wilfred Cantwell. (1997). *Modern culture from a comparative perspective*. John W. Burbridge (Ed.). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Smolik, Irene A. (1998). *Denominational switching: A Filipino Experience*. Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Calgary.
- Smolik, Irene A. (2000). *When the spirit speaks: Glossolalia in Canada*. Unpublished paper, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario.
- Smolik, Irene A. (2002, July). *Glossolalia as one dialectic*. Paper presented at The Dialectic Interpretation of Religious Phenomena, The Australian National University, Canberra, Australia.
- Sokal, Robert R., and Sneath, Peter H. A. (1963). *Principles of numerical taxonomy* (A Series of Books in Biology). San Francisco: W. H. Freeman and Company.

- Spanos, Nicholas P., and Hewitt, Erin. (1979). Glossolalia: A test of the "trance" and psychopathology hypotheses. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 88(4), 427-434.
- Spanos, Nicholas P., Cross, Wendy P., Lepage, Mark, and Cristine, Marjorie. (1986). Glossolalia as learned behavior: An experimental demonstration. *Journal Of Abnormal Psychology*, 95(1), 21-23.
- Spradley, James P. (1980). *Participant observation*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Stanley, Gordon, Bartlett, W. K., and Moyle, Terri. (1978). Some characteristics of charismatic experience: Glossolalia in Australia. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 17(3), 269-278.
- Stark, Rodney. (1997). *The rise of Christianity: how the obscure, marginal Jesus Movement became the dominant religious force in the Western world in a few centuries*. (n.p.): HarperSanFrancisco.
- Stark, Rodney, and Glock, Charles Y. (1968). *American piety: The nature of religious commitment*. Berkley, CA: University of California.
- Statistics Canada. (1999). Population by religion, 1981 and 1991 Census, Canada. Available: <http://www.statcan.ca>
- Statistics Canada. (2003). *2001 Census: analysis series: Religions in Canada*. Catalogue no. 96F0030XIE2001015 [On-line]. Available: <http://www.statcan.ca/cgi-bin/downpub/freepub.cgi>.
- Stevenson, I. (1974). *Xenoglossy*. Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia.
- Stewart, Alexander D. (1972). A bishop's concern. *Psychology Today*, 6(3), 51.
- Stewart, David. (1998). *Exploring the philosophy of religion*. (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Stoll, David. (1990). *Is Latin America turning Protestant? The politics of evangelical growth*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Strong, James. (n.d.). *Strong's exhaustive concordance of the bible with brief dictionaries of the Hebrew and Greek words of the original with references to the English words*. Nashville, Tennessee: Royal Publishers, Inc.

- Sugerman, A. Arthur, and Tarter, Ralph E. (Eds.). (1978). *Expanding dimensions of consciousness*. New York: Springer Publishing Company.
- Sulis, William. (2001). The neural basis of mental representations: Nonlinear perspectives. In W. Sulis and I. Trofimova (Eds.), *Nonlinear dynamics in the life and social sciences*. (n.p.) IOS Press.
- Sulis, William, and Gupta, Arun. (2001). Nonlinear dynamics and psychiatry. In W. Sulis and I. Trofimova (Eds.), *Nonlinear dynamics in the life and social sciences* (pp. 308-324). (n.p.) IOS Press.
- Swanson, Guy E. (1974). *The birth of the gods: the origin of primitive beliefs*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press (Original work published 1964).
- Swatos, William H. (1993). *A Future for Religion? New paradigms for social analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Swift, Donald C. (1998). *Religion and the American experience A social and cultural history, 1765-1997*. London: M. E. Sharpe, Inc.
- Szasz, Thomas. (1993). Crazy talk: Thought disorder or psychiatric arrogance? *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, 66, 61-67.
- Tarnas, Richard. (1991). The passion of the western mind: *Understanding the ideas have shaped our world view*. New York, NY: Ballantine Books.
- Tart, Charles T. (1978). Altered states of consciousness: putting the pieces Together. In A. Arthur Sugerman and Ralph E. Tarter (Eds.), *Expanding dimensions of consciousness* (pp. 58-78). New York, NY: Springer Publishing Company.
- Tart, Charles T. (1986). *Waking up: Overcoming the obstacles to human Potential*. The Henry J. Rolfs Book Series of the Institute of Noetic Sciences. Boston, MA: Shambhala Publications, Inc.
- Teske, John A. (2001). Neuroscience and spirit: The genesis of mind and spirit. *Zygon*, 36(1), 93-104.
- Thrower, James. (1999). *Religion: The classical theories*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

- Tillich, Paul. (1957). *Dynamics of faith*. World Perspectives Vol. 10 (pp. 1-73). New York, NY: Harper & Brothers Publishers.
- Tillich, Paul. (1959). *Theology of Culture*. (Robert C. Kimball, Ed.). London, ENG: Oxford University Press.
- Tillich, Paul. (1965). The encounter between religions. In J. E. Smith (Ed.), *Philosophy of Religion* (pp. 95-99). New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Troeltsch, E. (1969). Religion, economics, and society. In Birnbaum/Lenzer (Eds.), *Sociology and religion: A book of readings* (pp. 197-204). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc. (Reprinted from Religion, Wirtschaft und Gessellschaft (1913), *Aufsätze zur Geistesgeschichte und Religionssoziologie*, pp. 21-33. Tübingen: 1925. Translated by David Little; revised by Walter Benze. Copyright ©1968 by Beacon Press. By permission of the publisher).
- Trueheart, C. (1996). The next church. *The Atlantic Monthly*, 278(2), 37-58.
- Turner, Bryan S. (1991). *Religion and Social Theory*. (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- Turner, Edith. (1996). *The hands feel it: Healing and spirit presence among a Northern Alaskan people*. DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press.
- Turner, Victor. (1983). Body, brain, and culture. *Zygon*, 18(3), 221-245.
- Turner, Victor. (1989). Liminality and communitas. In V. Turner, *The ritual process* (pp. 94-130). Ithica: Cornell University Press.
- Turner, Victor W., and Bruner, Edward M. (Eds.). (1986). *The anthropology of experience with an epilogue by Clifford Geertz* (pp. 1-44, 373-380). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Waldron, Joan L. (1998). The life impact of transcendent experiences with a pronounced quality of noesis. *The Journal of Transpersonal Psychology*, 30(2), 103-134.
- Walsh, Roger. (1993). The transpersonal movement: A history and state of the art. *The Journal of Transpersonal Psychology*, 25(2), 123-139.
- Walsh, Roger, and Vaughan, Frances. (1993). On transpersonal definitions. *The Journal of Transpersonal Psychology*, 25(2), 199-207.

- Walter, Tony, Hunt, Steve. (1998). Introduction: The charismatic movement and contemporary social change. *Religion*, 28, 219-221.
- Warner, R. Stephen (1998). Religion and migration in the United States. *Social Compass*, 45(1), 123-134.
- Webb, C.C.J. (1945). *Religious experience: A public lecture delivered in the hall of Oriel College on Friday 19 May 1944* Printed, together with a bibliography of his published writings, and presented to him by some of his friends and pupils on the occasion of his eightieth birthday 25 June 1945. London: Oxford University Press.
- Weingartner, Rudolph H. (1962). *Experience and Culture: The philosophy of Georg Simmel*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.
- Westley, Francis. (1977). Search for surrender: A Catholic Pentecostal renewal group's attempt to become glossolalic. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 20, 925-940.
- Whalen, E. (2002). Foreword. In David R. Hawkins *Power vs. Force* (pp.1-7). Carlsbad, CA: Hay House, Inc. (Original work published 1995)
- White, Victor. (1952). *God and the unconscious*. Cleveland: The World Publishing Company.
- Whitehead, Alfred North. (1965a). Religion and metaphysics. In J. E. Smith (Ed.), *Philosophy of religion* (pp. 115-117). New York: The Macmillan Company. (Reprinted with permission of the publisher from *Religion in the Making* by A. N. Whitehead, pp. 83-88. Copyright 1926 by The Macmillan Co., renewed 1954 by Evelyn Whitehead. Used also by permission of Cambridge University Press, New York).
- Whitehead, Alfred North. (1965b). God and the world. In J. E. Smith (Ed.), *Philosophy of religion* (pp. 75-80). New York: The Macmillan Company. (Reprinted with permission of the publisher from *Process and reality* by Alfred North Whitehead. Copyright 1929 by The Macmillan Company, renewed 1957 by Evelyn Whitehead)
- Wilber, Ken. (1983). *A sociable God: A brief introduction to a transcendental sociology*. Toronto: New Press McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Williams, Cyril G. (1981). *Tongues of the spirit: A study of pentecostal glossolalia and related phenomena*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.

- Wilson, David L. (1978). Brain mechanisms, consciousness, and introspection. In A. Arthur Sugarman and Ralph E. Tarter (Eds.), *Expanding dimensions of consciousness* (pp. 3-23). New York, NY: Springer Publishing Company.
- Winkelman, Michael. (2000). *Shamanism: The neural ecology of consciousness and healing*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Winkelman, Michael. (2002). Shamanism as neurotheology and evolutionary psychology. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 45(12), 1875-1887.
- Womack, Sheila A. (1982). From coprolalia to glossolalia: Structural similarities between Gilles de la Tourette Syndrome and speaking in tongues. *The Journal of Mind and Behavior*, 3(1), 75-87.
- Wulff, David M. (1997). *Psychology and religion: Classic and contemporary*. (2nd ed.). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Yamane, David, and Polzer, Megan. (2001). Ways of seeing ecstasy in modern society: Experiential-expressive and cultural-linguistic views. In Susanne C. Monahan, William A. Mirola, and Michael O. Emerson (Eds.), *Sociology of religion: A reader* (pp.70-77). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Zeki, Semir. (1992). The visual image in mind and brain. *Scientific American* [Special Issue], 267(3), 69-76.