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They shall yield fruit even in old age;
vigorous and fresh shall they be.
Psalm 92, as quoted by J.A. Fishman
in relation to Yiddish (1991b: 9)

Introduction
Before an intellectual prophet and leader

It has been humbling to reread the scholarly work of Joshua A. Fishman spanning the last 55 years. We both met Fishman after he had been established as the founding father of the Sociology of Language. We knew then that his work had been trailblazing, insightful, inspirational. Being in his presence as a teacher and a colleague was indeed a transforming experience, for he not only taught us well, but also included us in many scholarly enterprises. One of us (García) is frequently heard to exclaim, ‘Everything I know, I learned in Fishman 101.’ But it took this careful rereading of his work, both his early work as well as his recent work, to understand his prophetic vision, evident as early as 1949 when he published the prizewinning monograph, Bilingualism in a Yiddish School.

As Joshua A. Fishman turns 80 years old,¹ we are inspired not only by his gift of intellectual prophesy manifested so early, but also by his extensive scholarly contribution. His fecund scholarship is attested in this volume by the bibliography of well over 1000 items that his wife and partner in the sociolinguistic enterprise, Gella Schweid Fishman, has been able to assemble.² We can say about Joshua A. Fishman what the Psalmist in the epigraph of this article attested, for he continues to yield vigorous and fresh fruit even in old age. As we write, Fishman continues to publish – a total of five books, sixteen articles, and two reviews are currently in press. As we will see, Fishman’s intellectual contributions are important, not only because they anticipate many future understandings, thus rendering his prophesy important, but also because they are broad-ranging, making him a true intellectual giant.
Fishman's workdedicates much attention to leaders who develop and mobilize positive ethno-linguistic consciousness. For example, Bilingualism in the Barrio studies the language consciousness and language loyalty of Puerto Rican intellectuals. And both in his first major research study, 'Language Loyalty in the United States' (1960–1965), as in its update, 'Language Resources in the United States' (1981–1985), the views of ethnic activists received special attention (see, for example, 'Ethnic Activists View the Ethnic Revival and its Language Consequences: An Interview Study of Three American Ethnolinguistic Minorities'). Fishman has also intensively studied the leadership role that Nathan Birnbaum held at the Tschernovits Language Conference on Yiddish (see, for example, Fishman, 1987).

This essay gives attention to the role of Joshua A. Fishman as a leader who has mobilized and energized younger scholars throughout the world to study language and behavior, especially as it relates to ethno-linguistic consciousness. Beyond anticipation and the size of his intellectual endeavor, Fishman has been, and continues to be, a leader in an intellectual field – one who has mobilized hundreds, if not thousands, of scholars, educators, language planners, and government bureaucrats to study multilingualism and to act on its behalf, and especially on behalf of language minorities. At times Fishman has openly expressed his interest in having a leadership role. Writing about bilingual education, he states, '[i]t is my fond and fundamental hope to lead bilingual educators in the USA and elsewhere to consider themselves to be a single community of interest, each learning from the other and correcting each other's experimental and attitudinal limitations' [emphasis ours] (Fishman, 1976: viii). Fishman's scholarship is not only ideologically mobilized, but it is energizing for the rest of us who read him and study him.

Joshua A. Fishman's clear leadership role in the founding and development of the sociology of language is unquestionable and has been well established by various scholars. Fernando Peñalosa (1981: 4), for example, calls Fishman 'the leading figure in the development and characterization of the sociology of language as an identifiable discipline.' According to Glyn Williams (1992: 97), Fishman, 'more than anyone, has been responsible for the development of the sociology of language.' Wright (2004: 11) calls Fishman, 'a key figure in LPLP (Language Policy Language Planning) studies.' In a recent text on sociolinguistics, Florian Coulmas (2005: 158) describes Fishman as the scholar 'who more than anyone else laid the groundwork for the scientific investigation of language shift.' And Spolsky (2004: 188) has lately said: 'The study of the efforts of linguistic minorities to preserve their languages is another field initiated by the creative scholarship of Joshua Fishman. Just as his work pioneered research into language maintenance and the spread of English, so he too inaugurated the field that he calls reversing language shift.' In Dell Hymes' foreword to Fishman's
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first text on the sociology of language, Hymes (1972: v) writes: ‘In several major areas of the field [sociology of language]—language loyalty, language development, bilingualism—Professor Fishman has been a leader in research; at the same time, he has worked to build the field as a whole.’

But which field is it that Fishman has built? It is clear that the work of Joshua A. Fishman goes beyond the two disciplines that the term ‘sociology of language’ evokes. His intellectual enterprise is grounded in language in society, but also encompasses psychology, political science, anthropology, history, education, geography, religion and literature. The danger of continuing to refer to the field that Fishman has so richly developed as ‘sociology of language’ is that it reduces it only to sociological inquiry about language. We propose here, based on Fishman’s own reclaiming of the term ‘sociolinguistics’ (see ‘Growing pains’ section below), that we speak of Fishmanian sociolinguistics, as a way to build a space for the rich interdisciplinary field that he has developed and in which language in society remains at the core.

This essay

Though we are unable to fully do justice to Joshua A. Fishman’s intellectual genius, we nonetheless have found permission to do so in Fishman’s own words, which we quote below. Speaking about the way in which research should and could be done and the way it is done in the real world, Fishman asks:

‘Why is there such a difference? Because researchers are limited in time, funds, ideas and ability; nevertheless, they must do the best they can with what they have. They cannot wait until the best of all possible worlds comes to pass (for it never will), so they try to conduct their studies as best they can.’ (Fishman, 1996: 7)

We have tried to write this integrative essay ‘as best we can,’ knowing full well that it cannot represent or fully grasp Joshua A. Fishman’s profound scholarship.

Because this volume includes Peltz’s integrative essay about Joshua A. Fishman’s work about Yiddish and in Yiddish, we omit the Yiddish category from our analysis. But we acknowledge from the outset the important role that Yiddish has had in Fishman’s work. Fishman has always acknowledged the importance of what he calls ‘listening to Yiddish with the third ear’ in his work (1990: 114).

This integrative essay identifies some of the conceptual threads in Joshua A. Fishman’s work over the last 50 years and attempts to analyze, in Fishman’s (1971: 607) own words, ‘How the worm has turned!’ The essay is organized along conceptual threads that appear interwoven, and even entangled, in Fishman’s own work, often in relationship to each other.
Although artificially separated here, we have chosen to disentangle them for the reader so that we might provide some guideposts as to how Fishman’s thinking has remained the same, and yet has evolved. Sociology of Language, the interdisciplinary enterprise established and developed by Joshua A. Fishman himself, has evolved into what we might call today, because of its integrative and yet distinctive character – Fishmanian Sociolinguistics. Fishmanian Sociolinguistics subsumes the following categories of study:

- language and behavior;
- multilingualism;
- language maintenance/language shift/reversing language shift;
- language spread;
- language attitudes and language and ethnicity/nationalism/identity/religion/power;
- language planning and language policy;
- bilingual education and minority language group education.

In drawing out the threads in this volume, we quote Joshua A. Fishman extensively. We do so because much of his early work has not been reprinted, and it remains out of reach for younger scholars. His words here provide the light to the guideposts that bring his ideas alive.

**Language and Behavior and Fishmanian Sociolinguistics**

**The pioneering efforts**

Trained as a social psychologist, Joshua A. Fishman was strongly influenced during his high school years by the work of Max Weinreich and his son Uriel Weinreich on Yiddish Linguistics. Fishman’s interest in language in different sociocultural settings was evident when, as a young professor of social psychology at The City College of New York, he used Joseph Bram’s Language and Society as a required text. After a brief stay as Director of Research for the College Entrance Examination Board, Fishman returned to his native Philadelphia as Associate Professor of Human Relations and Psychology and Director of Research at the Albert M. Greenfield Center for Human Relations at the University of Pennsylvania, where he taught the first course in Sociology of Language during the 1958/59 academic year. In 1960, after receiving his first major grant for sociolinguistic research for his ‘Language Resources Project,’ Fishman returned to New York City as Professor of Psychology and Sociology at Yeshiva University, where he also served as Dean of the Ferkau Graduate School of Humanities and Social Sciences. From 1966 to 1972 he directed a Doctoral Program in Language and Behavior, which became the first interdisciplinary program at Ferkau, later succeeded by the PhD Program in Bilingual Educational Developmental Psychology (1981 to 89).

Sociolinguistics has a summer seminar at Indiana University, run by the Social Science Research Council. This seminar, which began as the annual summer Linguistics in the U.S. 1962, what would be the social scientist for Bright, Ervin, Rubin and others, the official beginnings of this summer seminar. That by 1964, he had been an editor for the United States Office of Education, home of his first edited volume and related work, which was published fo...

**Definitions**

A 1965 article entitled ‘When? established in an exciting way...toward the sociology of language.

Since languages normally depend heavily on interaction, it is certainly a topic for examination, language behavior is related in many ways...

Fishman defines the...[Examin...behavior: the use of...Briefly put, the sociolinguistic topics related to these are not only language use, but also behaviors toward language...1)

But the sociology of language behavior. Sociology is concerned not only with language use, but also with the social patterns that spur the shaping of language...Language Shift, and Language...

From the beginning,
Sociolinguistics has been said to have taken shape during the 1964 summer seminar at Indiana University’s Bloomington campus, sponsored by the Social Science Research Council and the National Science Foundation. This seminar, which took place within the general framework of the annual summer Linguistic Institute, brought together the major actors of what would be the sociolinguistic enterprise – Gumperz, Haugen, Labov, Bright, Ervin, Rubin and Grimshaw, among others. Although this marks the official beginnings of sociolinguistics for some, Fishman makes clear that by 1964, he had been teaching the sociology of language for five years; he had submitted his ‘Language Loyalty in the United States’ report to the United States Office of Education; and he was putting finishing touches on his first edited volume about the topic, *Readings in the Sociology of Language*, which was published four years later in 1968.

**Definitions**

A 1965 article entitled ‘Who Speaks What Language to Whom and When?’ established in a nutshell the question that sociology of language was to pursue for the next 40 years. In the first major publication to name the field, *Readings in the Sociology of Language* (1968), Fishman describes why the sociology of language is needed:

Since languages normally function in a social matrix and since societies depend heavily on language as a medium (if not as a symbol) of interaction, it is certainly appropriate to expect that their observable manifestations, language behavior and social behavior, will be appreciably related in many lawful ways. (Fishman, 1968: 6)

Fishman defines the sociology of language as an enterprise that:

[E]xamines the interaction between these two aspects of human behavior: the use of language and the social organization of behavior. Briefly put, the sociology of language focuses upon the entire gamut of topics related to the social organization of language behavior, including not only language usage per se, but also language attitudes and overt behaviors toward language and toward language users. (Fishman, 1972a: 1)

But the sociology of language is concerned with more than just language behavior. Sociology of language, Fishman (1991b: 2) says, ‘is centrally concerned not only with societally patterned behavior through language but with societally patterned behavior toward language, whether positive or negative’ [emphasis ours]. It is this belief in social action on behalf of language that spurs the shaping of the subfields of Language Maintenance, Reversing Language Shift, and Language Planning, which we treat later in the chapter.

From the beginning, Fishman talks about sociology of language as an
interdisciplinary and future-oriented field. Sociology of language, Fishman (1968: 6) says, needs 'work and workers with sensitivity and sympathy' and as such, is an inclusive, rather than an exclusive field. The sociology of language is (Fishman, 1968: 5) 'one of several recent approaches to the study of the patterned co-variation of language and society' [emphasis ours].

Growing pains: Sociolinguistics vs. sociology of language.

'And never the twain shall meet?' (1972a: 278)

The term sociolinguistics was broadly used by Joshua A. Fishman during the early developmental phase of Fishmanian sociolinguistics. Publishing the very first textbook under the title Sociolinguistics: A Brief Introduction in 1970, Fishman used the term 'sociolinguistics' to include both behavior toward language (attitudes, movements, planning) and language concomitants of social processes, large and small (societal formation, societal interaction, societal change and dislocation). But Fishman constantly argued for balance and interpenetration between linguistics and sociology, and he pushed linguistics to truly include sociolinguistics:

If economics answers all questions with supply and demand, and psychology with it all depends, then the first contribution of sociolinguistics to linguistics is doubtlessly to make us aware of the fact that the relations and interpenetrations between language and society are 'a little more complicated than that,' whatever that may be. (Fishman, 1972a: 311)

This call for the expansion of linguistics to be more inclusive of social concerns is one that Fishman has continued to make throughout his career:

Certainly, linguistics as a science and linguists as scientists cannot and should not try to escape from the values and loyalties, dreams and intuitions, visions and sensitivities that move them and that touch them. (Fishman, 1982, as cited in 1989: 575–6)

Just a few years after the legendary Bloomington seminar of 1964, Fishman started differentiating what he then called 'modern sociolinguistics' from what he defined as the sociology of language. In 1967, at an International Seminar held in Moncton, Canada, Fishman proposed a critique of 'modern sociolinguistics.' This paper, published as 'The Description of Societal Bilingualism' both in the proceedings of the conference edited by L.G. Kelly in 1967, and also included in the 'Theoretical Addendum' to his 1971 Bilingualism in the Barrio, criticizes the focus of sociolinguistics on micro processes. Fishman (1971: 610) warns that 'We need studies of societal bilingualism that do not get so lost in the minutiae of description (in terms of any current equilibrium model) that they are unable to demonstrate changes in the bilingual pattern as a result of social change.'

By 1972, Fishman was using the term 'sociolinguistics.' In his 1972 book, 1968: 6) says, 'work and workers with sensitivity and sympathy' and as such, is an inclusive, rather than an exclusive field. The sociology of language is (Fishman, 1968: 5) 'one of several recent approaches to the study of the patterned co-variation of language and society' [emphasis ours].

Growing pains: Sociolinguistics vs. sociology of language.

'And never the twain shall meet?' (1972a: 278)

The term sociolinguistics was broadly used by Joshua A. Fishman during the early developmental phase of Fishmanian sociolinguistics. Publishing the very first textbook under the title Sociolinguistics: A Brief Introduction in 1970, Fishman used the term 'sociolinguistics' to include both behavior toward language (attitudes, movements, planning) and language concomitants of social processes, large and small (societal formation, societal interaction, societal change and dislocation). But Fishman constantly argued for balance and interpenetration between linguistics and sociology, and he pushed linguistics to truly include sociolinguistics:

If economics answers all questions with supply and demand, and psychology with it all depends, then the first contribution of sociolinguistics to linguistics is doubtlessly to make us aware of the fact that the relations and interpenetrations between language and society are 'a little more complicated than that,' whatever that may be. (Fishman, 1972a: 311)

This call for the expansion of linguistics to be more inclusive of social concerns is one that Fishman has continued to make throughout his career:

Certainly, linguistics as a science and linguists as scientists cannot and should not try to escape from the values and loyalties, dreams and intuitions, visions and sensitivities that move them and that touch them. (Fishman, 1982, as cited in 1989: 575–6)

Just a few years after the legendary Bloomington seminar of 1964, Fishman started differentiating what he then called 'modern sociolinguistics' from what he defined as the sociology of language. In 1967, at an International Seminar held in Moncton, Canada, Fishman proposed a critique of 'modern sociolinguistics.' This paper, published as 'The Description of Societal Bilingualism' both in the proceedings of the conference edited by L.G. Kelly in 1967, and also included in the 'Theoretical Addendum' to his 1971 Bilingualism in the Barrio, criticizes the focus of sociolinguistics on micro processes. Fishman (1971: 610) warns that 'We need studies of societal bilingualism that do not get so lost in the minutiae of description (in terms of any current equilibrium model) that they are unable to demonstrate changes in the bilingual pattern as a result of social change.'

Fishmanian Sociolinguistics

By 1972, Fishman was using the term 'sociolinguistics.' In his 1972 book, Fishman (1972a: 278) argued against the usefulness of the term to me of linguistic priorities:

The term [sociology of language] came to stand for an important preoccupation, i.e., the identification of language and society. The term [sociolinguistics] has been seriously in touch with sociolinguistics and with political reality (270, 272)

As such, his 1972 introduction, Sociolinguistics: An Interdisciplinary Social Science

Joshua A. Fishman’s Sociology of Language – in his field. From 1968 to 1972, the term ‘sociolinguistics’ appeared in the title of the journal ‘Language.’ fisher was used by Fishman in his various works, developing programs, and communities. In the 1970s, ‘sociolinguistics’ began to receive more attention, and the field was shaped by Fishman’s work on developing programs, communities, and censuses. In the 1970s, ‘sociolinguistics’ was used by Fishman and others to develop programs and communities. In 1979, ‘The Sociolinguistic Foundation’ (‘Sociolinguistic Foundation’)

Despite the growth of sociolinguistics in the 1970s, Fishman’s work on ‘sociolinguistics’ continued to evolve. By the mid-1980s, Fishman’s work on ‘sociolinguistics’ had taken a different path, and he focused on developing programs and communities. In the late 1980s, Fishman’s work on ‘sociolinguistics’ took a different path, and he focused on developing programs and communities.
By 1972, Fishman was beginning to have doubts about the use of the term ‘sociolinguistics.’ In *Language in Sociocultural Change*, Fishman (1972a: 268) argued against the use of the term ‘sociolinguistics’ saying, ‘It smacked to me of linguistic priority, if not of linguistic imperialism.’ He adds,

> The term [sociology of language] now stands in my mind for the reborn field, whereas ‘sociolinguistics’ has increasingly come to stand for a ‘kind of linguistics’ and, therefore, for a possibly important preoccupation, but for one with which I do not and cannot fully identify. ... [T]he sociology of language must be much more vigorously in touch with social and comparative history, with social geography and with political science than with linguistics. (Fishman, 1972a: 270, 272)

As such, his 1972 introductory text was titled, *The Sociology of Language: An Interdisciplinary Social Science Approach to Language in Society*.

Joshua A. Fishman’s use of the two terms – sociolinguistics and sociology of language – in his work reflects his changing relationships with the field. From 1968 to 1972, he preferred the term ‘sociolinguistics,’ and this appeared in the title of his articles ten times, whereas ‘sociology of language’ was not used in any title during that period. ‘Sociolinguistics’ was used in Fishman’s work from 1968 to 1972 to refer to the language of developing programs, national development, bilingualism, neighborhoods and censuses. In 1972, however, both ‘sociology of language’ and ‘sociolinguistics’ start to appear in titles, with sociology of language receiving more attention. That year, Fishman used the term ‘sociology of language’ in six of his titles, and reserved ‘sociolinguistics’ for only two. Throughout the mid-1970s and 1980s, Fishman referred to his contribution and the field he was shaping as Sociology of Language, and used the term ‘sociology of language’ to refer to his work, although he used the term ‘sociolinguistics’ in a 1973 title in connection to nationalism, and again in 1979 (‘The Sociolinguistic “Normalization” of the Jewish People’), and 1982 (‘Sociolinguistic Foundations of Bilingual Education’).

Despite the growth of the field, by 1990 Fishman signaled that the sociology of language had entered a mid-life crisis. He complained that instead of ‘progressing firmly on two legs, sociolinguistics was trying to move ahead primarily on the linguistic front while merely “shuffling on the social.”’ His was a call to put ‘socio more into prominence’ (1991a: 128). When at the end of the 20th century it became clear to Fishman that sociolinguistics had taken off as a branch of linguistics, leaving sociology behind, he insisted on placing his work within ‘the sociolinguistics enterprise,’ which he envisioned in his edited volume, *Handbook of Language and Ethnic Identity*, as an ‘embrace of both sociology of language and sociolinguistics’ (Fishman, 1999: 152). Throughout the years, Fishman has clam-
ored for inclusion and balance between the linguistic and the social, and he has not ceased to lose hope that the field will work hard to do both: 'The field will only really fulfill its potential when we have the critical mass of case study knowledge that will allow us to aggregate the particular to get a clear view of the general' (Fishman, 2002: x).

With prophetic vision, Fishman had argued in 1972 that the term sociolinguistics would not disappear because 'it is too catchy.' But he opposed the division of sociology of language into two separate parts – one of sociolinguistics of language, and the other of sociolinguistics of society (as Fasold, 1984, did years later) – arguing instead for the interpenetration of language in society and society in language that makes the division impossible. Fishman claimed that language and societal behavior are 'equal partners rather than one or the other of them being "boss" and "giving orders" to the other' (1972a: 301). 'Micro- and macro-sociolinguistics are both conceptually and methodologically complementary,' Fishman (1971: 598) reminds us. Arguing for inclusiveness and expansion in the sociolinguistic enterprise, he says:

I am neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet but I do know what my 'druthers' are and which are so fanciful as to be best kept to myself. I hope that the links between micro and macro will become ever stronger, to the point that they will be viewed much like the links between organic and inorganic chemistry: important and self evident rather than dubious or controversial... Without bridges, the gap between micro and macro will grow... The middle ground is represented by the vision that calls for the relationship between small events or processes and large scale aggregates or structures, for the natural and the formalized, for the empirical as well as for theoretical parsimony.' (Fishman, 1972a: 280)

It is the middle ground that Fishman develops throughout his work, and that is the core of Fishmanian sociolinguistics.

Growth and hopes

Precisely to develop 'the middle ground,' the interpenetration, Joshua A. Fishman founded both a book series and a journal. Since 1972 he has been the editor of Walter de Gruyter/Mouton's Contributions to the Sociology of Language (for a complete list of the volumes published, see Appendix 1). Starting with Fishman's own Advances in the Sociology of Language, the series has published 80 titles of senior and junior scholars from around the world, many of which have become classics. Although published in English, the series was quick to include scholars from developing countries. Early attention was also paid to the developing world. For example, in the 1970s, the titles included language cases in Indonesia and Malaysia, Albania and New Guinea. The most recent books address such diverse language-in-society situations as Mexico's indigenous and Englishes, multilingualism.

Since 1974, Joshua A. Fishman's International Journal of the Sociology of Language has been an academic publication in the field. Reflecting on the character of the journal, Fishman has stated:

(a) interdisciplinary, internationally, beyond narrow geographical
(b) international in content and concern for the status of language communities. (Fishman, 1977: 197)

The growth of the field has seen only three issues appear in the journal, published annually. A list of these is found in Appendix 2, for a list of the volumes published, see Appendix 1. In 2005, the journal has been renamed Multilingualism: Theory, Practice, Policy.

Multilingualism

Multilingualism in Fishman

Joshua A. Fishman's research has had a large impact on the study of other early sociolinguists, particularly on the study of the same language. From its beginning, sociolinguistics has been primarily concerned with bilingual situations that this afforded many opportunities for scholars to work on a larger scale with clearer parameters. Issues in multilingualism:

Bilingual or multilingual studies of language change are a way to gauge sociolinguistic change (or stability) in a population's language (or languages) over time (identity and purpose can vary depending on the context). This has also been a point of debate (particularly by sociolinguists), as language change is not necessarily a linear process, but rather a complex phenomenon that is intertwined with social and economic factors. Fishman has always been critical of the notion that language change is solely the result of linguistic factors, and has emphasized the role of social and economic factors in language change.
The sociology of language, like linguistics and the social, and he has a hard time doing both. He argues that we have the critical mass of people who need to work together to get a full picture.

In 1972 the term sociolinguistics became fashionable. But he opposed the view that linguistics is a separate part of sociolinguistics, as Fasold, Sturtevant and others have. The interpenetration of language in society and the social is impossible. Fishman argues that linguistics is an equal partner to the other disciplines. He and other linguists are much like the links in a chain: important and self-evident.

Without bridges, the gap in the middle ground is representative of the relationship between small events and large structures, for the natural sciences, as well as for theoretical parsi-monism.

Fishman has always been a prophet but I do know what my role is to be best kept to myself. I suspect that macro will become ever more popular as I have reviewed much like the links in a chain. Without the middle ground representatives of the relationship between small events and larger structures, the natural sciences, as well as for theoretical parsimonism.

The International Journal of the Sociology of Language (IJSFL), the most important academic publication in the field of international macro-sociolinguistics. Reflecting on the characteristics of the journal, Fishman describes them as:

(a) interdisciplinary, reaching far beyond the field of linguistics (particularly, beyond narrowly linguistics-focused sociolinguistics),
(b) truly international in content, and
(c) macro-level oriented with a special concern for the status of indigenous and immigrant minority language communities. (Fishman 1997c: 237)

The growth of the field itself is reflected in the fact that in the early years, only three issues appeared each year, but by 1976 four issues were being published annually. After 1981, six issues appeared every year (see Appendix 2, for a list of the IJSFL titles). Again, from the beginning, attention was paid to different areas of the world — issues in the 1970s were dedicated to languages in Turkey, Southeast Asia, Sweden and Finland, Belgium, the American southwest, and to languages as varied as Romani and Yiddish. Since the 1990s, IJSFL has, in Fishman’s words (1997c: 238), ‘provided sociolinguistic endeavor with difficult-to-achieve enchant’. From the beginning, Fishman had a special interest in bilingual situations precisely because of the more marked sociolinguistic variations that this afforded and the possibility of studying this variation with clearer parameters. Recently Fishman (1999) commented on his interest in multilingualism:

Multilingualism

Multilingualism in Fishman sociolinguistic perspective

Fishman’s early interest in Yiddish distinguished him from other early sociolinguists who were interested in language variation within the same language. From the very beginning, Fishman had a special interest in bilingual situations precisely because of the more marked sociolinguistic variations that this afforded and the possibility of studying this variation with clearer parameters. Recently Fishman (1999) commented on his interest in multilingualism:

Bilingual or multilingual settings are very commonly studied in order to gauge sociolinguistic variation (and to relate such variation to the identity and purpose of speakers on different occasions and in different contexts), because the variation between languages is easier to monitor (particularly by sociologists) than is the variation within one and the same language. [emphasis ours] (Fishman, 1999: 153)

Fishman has always been interested in multilingualism as an intra-group phenomenon that is widespread and stable, rather than as an inter-group
process. His early work focused on developing and mobilizing consciousness of minority languages and ethnicities in the United States, a country with a skewed vision of bilingualism as a 'vanishing phenomenon, as a temporary dislocation from a presumably more normal state of affairs' (Fishman, 1971: 584) – see, for example, his books Bilingualism in a Yiddish School, Language Loyalty in the United States, Yiddish in America, and Bilingualism in the Barrio. But very early on (1968), Fishman broadened his attention to include inter-group bilingualism also, as his Language Problems of Developing Nations book demonstrates. His work, however, never abandoned the interest in, and focus on, widespread and stable intra-group bilingualism. In the present era of globalization, when multilingualism is increasingly an intra-group phenomenon within inter-group interactions, Fishman's conception of multilingualism is more valid than ever before.

Fishman's work defines 'multilingualism' as the interaction between bilingualism (preferred by psychologists) and diglossia (preferred by sociologists). (For more on this, see the 'Diglossia' section below.) As such, multilingualism in Fishmanian sociolinguistics focuses on the intra-group widespread and stable use of two or more languages.

**Viewing multilingualism differently**

The importance of Fishmanian sociolinguistics for the study of multilingualism is precisely that it goes beyond the term 'bilingual' as understood in the 1960s by psychologists, linguists and sociologists. Much of Fishman's early work is devoted to debunking the ideas proposed by psychologists on how to study and understand bilingualism, especially the concepts of balanced bilingualism and dominance that were so prevalent in the psychological literature concerning bilingualism in the 1960s.

Speaking against the concept of dominance as tested by psychologists with translation speed tests, Fishman argues that where bilingualism is socially constructed, and not merely an occupation or hobby, very little translation occurs. Speaking against translation speed tests, he wrote: 'such usage makes it exceedingly cumbersome to deal with those bilinguals whose dominant (i.e. most used) language is not their most proficient language...' (Fishman, 1971: 357). Years later, Tove Skutnb-Kangas (1988) would expand upon this difference between function and competence as she developed a definition of mother tongue based on the plural criteria of function, competence, origin and identification.

The debunking of balanced bilingualism and the advancement of Fishman's concept of domains of language behavior (see the next section) reminds us of the notion of plurilingualism that has become so important in the European Union today. European plurilingualism today is defined as 'proficiency, of varying degrees, in several languages and experience of several cultures' (Common European Framework of Reference for Languages, 2002: 168).

For Coste (2001: 15), plurilingualism is not equivalent or even identical to diglossia, being more 'variable, flexible and not as fixed or entrenched a notion that balanced bilingualism was'

Linguists have sometimes misunderstood the concept of diglossia as reflecting two groups speaking of one language and one style, Fishman says in Language Loyalty in the United States, as reflecting two groups speaking of different languages and different styles. Fishman says in Language Loyalty in the United States, diglossia is not a fossilized state of affairs, but an ongoing process that continues to evolve. Fishman and other linguists have studied the effects of diglossia on language use and language attitudes, and have found that diglossia is not random, but is governed by social and cultural factors that influence the members of the bilingual community.

Fishman (1971: 3) has also noted that diglossia is not of interest to the sociolinguist, as it is not of interest to the society or the community, or the norms of usage and the language use. Any speech community that uses more than one language (a bilingual or polyglot community) is not of interest to the sociolinguist, as it is not of interest to the society or the community, or the norms of usage and the language use. Any speech community that uses more than one language (a bilingual or polyglot community) is not of interest to the sociolinguist, as it is not of interest to the society or the community, or the norms of usage and the language use.
For Coste (2001: 15), plurilingualism involves practices and values that are not equivalent or even homologous in different languages, but that are integrated, variable, flexible and changing. This is an expansion of Fishman’s early notion that balanced bilingualism is an impossibility.

Linguists have sometimes been the culprits in contributing to the misunderstandings surrounding bilingualism. Following Weinreich’s (1953) Languages in Contact, linguists have looked at the two languages separately as reflecting two groups, and not one group. In typical Fishman mocking style, Fishman says in 1971 (p. 561): ‘The linguist has traditionally seen his task, in relation to the study of bilingualism, as being similar to that of a housewife looking for smears of wet paint.’ In ways that remind us of the hybridity proposed by Bakhtin (1981) and that is so prevalent in the postmodernist work of scholars like Bhabha (1994), Anzaldúa (1997) and Gutiérrez et al. (1999), and sociolinguists like Canagarajah (2005), Fishman blames linguists for having a model of pure monolithic langue that leads them to find interference only as something harmful. He argues for studying the bilingual varieties as varieties in their own right. Fishman (1971: 562) claims: ‘Like other people bilinguals constitute speech communities characterized by certain general social patterns of rights, obligations daily round and interactions.’ The ways in which languages are used are not random, but are governed by norms of bilingual usage understood by the members of the bilingual community itself.

Fishman (1971: 3) has also pointed out that second language acquisition, a favorite topic of study for many psycholinguists who study bilingualism, is not of interest to the sociology of language since ‘bilingualism is acquired by exposure to, and interaction with, a community that lives in accord with the norms of usage and that is involved in the normal process of change to which most communities and most norms are exposed.’ Fishman warns:

Any speech community is characterized by definite norms of language and behavior, which not only encompass the speech varieties (or languages) that exist within the speech community for its own internal communicative needs but also relate them to the types of other-than-speech behaviors – the interactions, the mutual rights and obligations, the roles and statuses, the purposes and identifications – in which various networks within the community are engaged. It follows that the description and measurement of an individual’s bilingualism (as of an individual’s repertoire range with respect to the language varieties that exist even within monolingual communities of any complexity) should reflect and disclose the sociolinguistic norms of the speech networks and the speech community of which he is a part, precisely because these sociolinguistic norms underlie the individual’s bilingualism. (Fishman, 1971: 3)
Referring to the spread of English 33 years later, Brutt-Griffler (2004: 138) expands upon this concept to propose 'macroacquisition' as the 'acquisition of a second language by a speech community. It is a process of social second language acquisition, the embodiment of the process of language spread and change, or language change through its spread."

Fishman's criticism of how bilingualism has been studied also extends to sociologists who have not conducted their own self-reports but who have depended on governmental censuses. Fishman questions the traditional social categories that sociologists use and cries out for lower-order validation of such categories with different populations, in diverse situations. Fishman's early contributions include the development of instruments that could be used to assess language use and behavior (see, for example, Bilingualism in the Barrio).

Joshua A. Fishman's ways of looking at multilingualism have given psychologists, linguists and sociologists new understandings about how languages function in stable, widespread, intra-group bilingualism. As Fishman (1971: 605) himself said, 'instead of witch-hunting for bilingual interference, modern sociolinguistics recognizes the linguistic repertoires of bilingual speech communities as an instance of the repertoires that characterize all functionally diversified speech communities.'

A Fishmanian sociolinguistic model for the study of multilingualism: Methodological propositions

Joshua A. Fishman's early work provided a sociolinguistic model for studying multilingualism and at the same time it advanced theories about how multilingualism functioned in society. Both the theoretical and the methodological propositions were founded on the sociocultural contextualization of the data, as well as the interrelationships of the parameters.

An important methodological contribution made by Fishman's early work was his proposal that researchers have to identify with the speech community they are studying. This is a position that Fishman has maintained throughout his scholarly life. In 1991, he said: 'The sociology of language, like all of social science, is inevitably perspectival and a good bit of any observers' values and beliefs therefore rub off on his or her observations' (1991b: 8). And in his recent article on 'sociolinguistics' in the Handbook of Language and Ethnicity (1999: 160) he added: 'Without adequately taking into consideration the 'insider' views, convictions and interpretations, no full or richly nuanced understanding of the behaviors being researched is possible.'

In Bilingual Education: An International Perspective (1976), Fishman talks about his focus not only on empirical data, but also on communicating feelings and values. The preface starts out by saying:
This is a partisan volume. Not only is it unabashedly in favor of bilingual education, it is strongly in favor of a certain context for bilingual education: a context that values it as enrichment for one and all. ... I have written this book because I want to bring this view, and the data and reasoning on which it is based, to teachers, teacher-trainees, educational administrators, a wide variety of other educational specialists, and educationally concerned laymen. ... I hope I will be pardoned for feeling deeply and for communicating feelings and values in addition to information and conclusions. I believe it is my duty as an empirical researcher to do the former as well as the latter because bilingual education urgently requires not only attention and understanding but also sympathy, assistance and dedication. (Fishman, 1976: viii)

Fishman has defended this ‘voice from within,’ even when the political tide supports research that is contrary to this position and has left him with little funding for research. In his book titled, In Praise of the Beloved Language (1996a), he explains:

The chief debit of the ‘voice from within’ is that it is self-interest biased, but at least it is admittedly so. However, the voices from without are also necessarily biased -- in perspective and in expected audience and reward (and therefore, also in self-interest) -- no matter how much they dress themselves up in the garb of science, objectivity, theory and fashionable philosophy or ideology. Like insider views, outsider views too are often reductionist and simplistic (and therefore, neither fully informed nor informing), a charge that outside viewers have long hurled at insider viewers. (Fishman, 1996a: 119)

But to this insider’s view, Fishman, the researcher, has always added an analytical perspective. In his book Language and Nationalism (1972b), he speaks about how the three nationalist movements that are at the center of his life – Yiddish secularism, Hebrew Zionism and the African American movement – have shaped his interest in language and nationalism. But he describes how he obtained scholarly distance:

I have decided to do so [understand them better] by engaging in a once removed, twice removed, thrice removed mode of analysis, in the hope that the wider canvas would illumine the narrower, while the narrower passion would drive me on to examine one hidden corner after another in the broader picture. (Fishman, 1972b: xiii)

As a way to study multilingualism, the Fishmanian sociolinguistic model (1971) relies first on ethnographic observations through which behavioral or attitudinal clusters associated with different speech varieties
Fishman’s methodological contributions to large-scale social investigations consist of the early development of self-report instruments, censuses, questionnaires, interview guides and word association tests, that were then subjected to factor analysis, analyses of variances and multiple regression analyses. But methodology to him is subservient to the topic at hand. In what was to be his second large scale sociolinguistic study, *Bilingualism in the Barrio*, Fishman (1971: xiii) says: ‘It is one of the hallmarks of scientific social inquiry that methods are selected as a result of problem specifications rather than independently of them.’ This is an area to which Fishman has always paid attention. As Research Director of the College Board in the late 1950s, he used correlations, regressions and identification of predictors that attempt to approximate criteria, but he demanded that selection and admissions to college must be anchored in a philosophy of education (Fishman & Passanella, 1980).

Throughout his work, Fishman has been concerned with the tension between group data and individual data, but he has not been moved to give one up for the other. He sustains:

> The need to summarize and group language usage data necessarily leads to some loss of refinement when proceeding from specific instances of actual speech in face-to-face interaction to grouped or categorized data. However, such summarization or simplification is an inevitable aspect of the scientific process of discovering meaning in continuous multivariate data by attending to differential relationships, central tendencies, relative variabilities and other similar characterization. (Fishman, 1972a: 91)

Because the same process may result in differences in varied cases, Fishman proposes that a comparative method be used to find cross-cultural and diachronic regularities. As early as 1968, he suggested four scenarios for comparative work with language groups being the same or different, and similar or dissimilar with regards to primary sociocultural processes and contact types. The four resulting scenarios are (Fishman, 1972a: 103):

1. *same* language group in two separate interaction contexts: *similar*;
2. *same* language group in two separate interaction contexts: *dissimilar*;
3. *different* language groups in two separate interaction contexts: *similar*;
4. *different* language groups in two separate interaction contexts: *dissimilar*.

As Fishman’s conceptual universe grew, his methodology continued to reflect his positive attitude toward the minority speech community or the problem that he was studying. He also developed ways of continuing to compare and contrast his thinking on particular sociolinguistic situations with others, and his own thing ‘not be the best of all possible books that he dedicates to the Beloved Language (1996a: 4) proceeds to compare the following questions:

- What are the positive expressions by peoples in space?
- Are there any regular space?
- Are there more common which are which?
- Are some themes more some themes now be have become more common all the time.

With considerable detail, Fishman provides categories for the content and context.

Fishman is mostly interested, rather than individuals.

The individual, any individual’s perspective of social reality is determined in terms of who he is or who he is on the other hand, is construction that are demonstrated dispositions and idiosyncratic values and statistical tests between-group variance. The former is sufficiently great to statistically significant’. (Fishman, 1980)

Yet Fishman often also published a book to the man who had called the First Yiddish Language Congress, 1908 – Nathan Birnbaum.

Fishman’s 2001, *Can Thinker Studies that puts to the Test* and *Reversing Language Shift* tests his own conceptualizations reflect and expand upon his Threatened Languages be Saved...
with others, and his own thinking with those of others in what he says may
'not be the best of all possible worlds.' This is evident, for example, in the
book that he dedicates to positive ethnohistorical consciousness, _In Praise of
the Beloved Language_ (1996a). Drawing from examples of the many
languages that make up the composite of languages in the book, Fishman
(1996a: 4) proceeds to compare the answers that these texts reveal about the
following questions:

- What are the positive views about their vernaculars that have been
  expressed by peoples the world over?
- Are there any regularities in these views, across time and across
  space?
- Are there more common and less common themes and, if so, which
  are which?
- Are some themes more distinctly European and others less so, or have
  some themes now become rather uncommon in Europe while they
  have become more common elsewhere?

With considerable detail, Fishman tells us how he went about creating the
categories for the content analysis.

Fishman is mostly interested in social factors, dimensions and parameters,
rather than individuals:

The individual, any individual, is merely error variance from the
perspective of social research. Each individual’s behavior is over-
determined in terms of his or her personal dynamics. Social research,
on the other hand, is concerned with factors, dimensions and parameters
that are demonstrable over and above the varying tendencies,
dispositions and idiosyncrasies of unique individuals. All of our much
vaunted statistical tests are built upon this very principle: to contrast
between-group variance with within-group variance. Only when the
former is sufficiently greater than the latter do we call our findings ‘sta-
tistically significant’. (Fishman, 1987: 2)

Yet Fishman often also pays attention to individuals. He devotes an entire
book to the man who had captured his imagination as the organizer of the
First Yiddish Language Conference in Austro-Hungarian Tcherneviš in
1908 -- Nathan Birnbaum.

Fishman’s 2001, _Can Threatened Languages be Saved?_ is a collection of case
studies that puts to the test his theoretical conceptualizations about
Reversing Language Shift (see below). In many contributions, Fishman
tests his own conceptualizations, and in so doing, draws other scholars to
reflect and expand upon his own theories and cases. In the preface to _Can
Threatened Languages be Saved?_ Fishman (2001) writes:
Just as any single-authored volume inevitably overestimates the degree of coherence and confirmation vis-à-vis the author’s views, any multi-authored volume is likely to reveal a reverse imbalance, over-representing differences and disconfirmations relative to the views of that same particular author’s approach. (Fishman, 2001: xiii)

One of us (García) always remembers Fishman, the teacher, saying that ‘increasing the variance’ was important in all research. It is a lesson that Fishman the scholar has always acted upon, demanding that the voices of ‘little people’ and ‘little languages’ also be included.

Recently, Fishman has chided the ethnographic revolution of the postmodern world for paying little attention to ethnicity and not considering poetic and romantic imagery and folk analogies. As he puts it,

We have often championed late modernizers and ‘native peoples,’ but we have even more commonly focused our intellectualizations from modernization to post-modernization without letting these peoples speak their own words or disclose their own hearts and minds. (Fishman: 1996a: 120)

Fishman has never closed the door to ways of looking deeply in various ways. About his work, he has said:

I feel strongly that there is more ‘out there’ (even more to the sociology of language) than science can grasp, and I have a personal need for poets, artists, mystics and philosophers too for a deeper understanding of all that puzzles me. (Fishman, 1990: 123)

A Fishmanian sociolinguistic model for the study of multilingualism: Theoretical propositions

Domains

One of the main early concepts proposed by Fishman to study multilingualism was that of *domain*. The concept of domain, Fishman explains, was first elaborated among *Auslandsdeutsche* students in pre-World War II multilingual settings. Domains are defined, regardless of their number, in terms of institutional contexts and their congruent behavioral co-occurrences. They attempt to summate the major clusters of interaction that occur in clusters of multilingual settings and involving clusters of interlocutors. (Fishman, 1971: 586). Domains allow scholars to make connections between clusters of interaction and interlocutors and more concrete social situations.

The interest in defining ‘domains’ grew out of Fishman’s methodological concern that analytic parameters be in touch with reality and be abstracted from domain—appropriate persons, places and times. Domains structure the data of social behavior. Fishman tells us that domain variance is the

Fishmanian Sociolinguistics uploaded by...parsimonious and additionally clusterable occurrence, style, etc.) is habitual to another. (Fishman, 1971)

Throughout his work, he sugges...family domain, saying that: “It depends upon it for encouragement.” (Fisher, 1982). And much later, when The 100 Shift (RLS, see below), Fishman now generational mother tongue was possible. That which is not possible in the Graded Intergenerational Maturity (GIM) Stage 6 – the stage in which the language is the normal language and within the family – is impossible. Commenting on globalization it has been made possible by recent changes in the family over the power of language. (Fishman, 1999)

Nothing can substitute the imbedded in real community RLS success as intergenerational wissenschaft (the intimate community, the family) another via bonds of kinship (relationships and purpose) is the real

Diglossia

Another of the major contributions to the study of societal multilingualism has been the concept of *diglossia* as proposed by Fishman to describe a society that uses two languages, one representing the education and other domains of the workplace. Fishman (1966) defined diglossia to the national or supranational societal bilingualism. He was referring to the existence of a stabilized phenomenon between two languages. (Fishman, 1966)

If the roles were not kept separate, and if a part of their association with those domains of activity and identity would displace the other or merged. (Fishman, 1966)
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most parsimonious and fruitful designation of the societally or institutionally clusterable occasions in which one language (variant, dialect, style, etc.) is habitually employed rather than (or in addition to) another. (Fishman, 1972a: 80)

Throughout his work, Fishman has reserved a special place for the family domain, saying that: ‘Multilingualism often begins in the family and depends upon it for encouragement if not for protection’ (Fishman, 1972a: 82). And much later, when he proposes his model for Reversing Language Shift (RLS, see below), Fishman (1991a: 113) declares: ‘Without intergenerational mother tongue transmission, no language maintenance is possible. That which is not transmitted cannot be maintained.’ This is why in the Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale proposed in his RLS model, Stage 6 – the stage in which language X (the minority or non-dominant language) is the normal language of informal, spoken interaction between and within the family – is crucial to language maintenance and RLS. Commenting on globalization and the multimodal discourses that have been made possible by recent technology, Fishman insists on the power of the family over the power of the Internet, stating that:

Nothing can substitute for face-to-face interaction with real family imbedded in real community. Ultimately, nothing is as crucial for basic RLS success as intergenerational mother tongue transmission. Gemeinschaft (the intimate community whose members are related to one another via bonds of kinship, affection and communality of interest and purpose) is the real secret weapon of RLS. (Fishman, 2001: 458)

Diglossia

Another of the major contributions of Joshua A. Fishman to the study of societal multilingualism has been his extension and expansion of the concept of diglossia as proposed by Ferguson (1959). Ferguson used diglossia to describe a society that used a H(igh) variety of a language in religion, education and other domains, and a L(ow) variety in the home and lower work sphere. Fishman (1964) traces the maintenance and disruption of diglossia to the national or societal level and extends it to include cases of societal bilingualism. He warns that ‘socially patterned bilingualism can exist as a stabilized phenomenon only if there is functional differentiation between two languages’ (Fishman, 1971: 560) and says:

If the roles were not kept separate (compartmentalized) by the power of their association with quite separate though complementary values, domains of activity and everyday situations, one language or variety would displace the other as role and value distinctions became blurred or merged. (Fishman, 1972a: 140)
Fishman renders the compartmentalization between the H(igh) and L(ow) language in the form of a diagram:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
H \\
L \\
\end{array}
\]

with the line between the two indicating functional separation, a boundary. Fishman explains that without diglossia, stable balanced bilingualism cannot be obtained, and continues:

From the point of view of sociolinguistics, any society that produces functionally balanced bilinguals (i.e. bilinguals who use both their languages equally and equally well in all contexts) must soon cease to be bilingual because no society needs two languages for one and the same set of functions. (Fishman, 1972a: 140)

Diglossia provides the impetus for language maintenance or shift, which we will discuss later. Fishman declares:

Without separate though complementary norms and values to establish and maintain functional separation of the speech varieties, that language or variety is fortunate enough to be associated with the predominant drift of social forces tends to displace the others. (Fishman, 1972a: 149)

In 1987, in the book that he dedicates to Nathan Birnbaum, the organizer of the First Yiddish Conference in Tschernevitsi in 1908, Fishman reiterates:

A culture that can no longer control its own boundaries is doomed to a cultural version of the ‘acquired immune deficiency syndrome.’...There must be a boundary that cannot be overstepped. (Fishman, 1987: 138)

Diglossia, as the stable maintenance of two complementary value systems and thus two languages, is expressed in two complementary sets of domains. Fishman distinguishes bilingualism from diglossia as follows:

[Si]mbilingualism is essentially a characterization of individual linguistic versatility while diglossia is a characterization of the societal allocation of functions to different languages or varieties. (Fishman, 1972a: 145)

In 1967, Fishman published his now famous and much cited ‘Bilingualism With and Without Diglossia; Diglossia With and Without Bilingualism.’ In this article, he outlined four possible situational cells:

1. diglossia with bilingualism;
2. diglossia without bilingualism;
3. bilingualism without diglossia;
4. neither diglossia nor bilingualism.

Fishman devotes most of these diglossias with bilingualism, as Paraguay where Guarani, religion, government and fairly large speech communities roles, as well as access to the languages.

The second cell (diglossia) is that for the most part ‘ecological’. In these polities, the elites say they have never really formally acquired them repertoires were discontinuous means of translators or interpreters.

Bilingualism without diglossia has occurred in restless and rapid social changes. Finally, there are very rare diglossias. But as the world has become diglossia it has acquired so certain requirements control, but not necessarily.

Speaking about the relations of languages, Fishman explains:

The result of such behavior becomes a requirement although it does become, with such membership, nor will it become, a diglossia. (Fishman, 1985, cited)

Despite the insistence on the relationship between two languages in many cases, diglossia is maintained, Fishman posits more than cultural separationism. Fishman supports ‘language maintenance action with American core the language of the immigrants acknowledges the interaction.

In a world that is continually changing, modernization cannot be interminably delayed.

When Fishman conceives of the reception of the Yish functions, with X religion.
Fishman devotes most attention to the fruitful bilinguality of the first of these (diglossia with bilinguality) which he illustrates with examples such as Paraguay where Guaraní is used at home and Spanish is used in education, religion, government and work. Social groups in this cell are usually fairly large speech communities that offer a range of compartmentalized roles, as well as access to those roles to its members (Fishman, 1971).

The second cell (diglossia without bilinguality) is exemplified by polities that are for the most part 'economically underdeveloped and unmodernized.' In these polities, the elites speak one language and the masses another, but they have never really formed a single speech community — 'their linguistic repertoires were discontinuous and their inter-communications were by means of translators or interpreters' (Fishman, 1972a: 143).

Bilingualism without diglossia exists in social groups with great social unrest or rapid social change, such as is the case of immigrants and refugees. Finally, there are very few societies where neither diglossia nor bilingualism occur.

But as the world has become more interdependent, Fishman's concept of diglossia has acquired some fluidity. In 1985 he warns that diglossia requires control, but not the 'freezing' of intercultural boundaries. Speaking about the relationship between English and Dutch in the Netherlands, Fishman explains:

The result of such boundary maintenance is that English never becomes a requirement for membership in the Dutch ethnoculture, although it does become a widespread skill advantageously associated with such membership. ... It [English] is definitely not intended to be, nor will it become, an inside language of Dutch society at large. (Fishman, 1985, as cited in 1989: 227)

Despite the insistence that there must be some functional allocation between two languages in order for stable intra-group bilingualism to be maintained, Fishman posts that he espouses cultural pluralism, rather than cultural separatism. For North American ethnolinguistic minorities, he supports 'language maintenance within the framework of mutual interaction with American core society' (Fishman, 1972a: 22). Fishman increasingly acknowledges the interdependency of a globalized world:

In a world that is continually more and more interactive and interdependent, modernization can be delayed and 'locally colored,' but rarely can it be interminably delayed or fully controlled. (Fishman, 1996a: 93)

When Fishman conceptualizes the field of Reversing Language Shift (RLS), he concedes overlapping and interactive functions. But he insists on the protection and stability of what he calls the X-ish functions, in the face of Y-ish functions, with X representing co-territorial threatened languages,
and \( Y \) denoting unthreatened or less threatened languages. Fishman (1991b: 85) explains that 'Bilingualism is protective of X-ishness and interactive with Y-ishness' [emphasis ours].

Fishman (2001) acknowledges that threatened languages (\( Th \) below) usually aspire to discharge the powerful functions of employment, higher education, mass media, government, etc. That is, threatened languages aim to fulfill those functions that diglossia had previously noted as High, as well as the informal and less powerful functions to which it had been previously relegated (previously noted as Low).

But Fishman describes a more realistic and initial goal for threatened languages in which some of the social functions that had previously been relegated to the more powerful (or High) language; for example, secondary education or local employment; would be shared with the non-threatened language (\( n-Th \) below). Fishman represents this diglossic relationship, with powerful functions above the line, as:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{n-Th/Th} \\
\text{Th}
\end{array}
\]

That is, although the Th(reatened) language, previously noted as L(ow), may share some of the functions of the n(on)-Th(reatened) language, previously noted as H(igh) in the more formal and powerful domains, the informal domains of intimacy and informality, and especially home, must be reserved solely for the Th(reatened) language. In other words, there must not be any fluidity over the horizontal line, and the Th(reatened) language carefully guards its functions in the home domain.

Fishman warns that RLS's goal is not just to elevate the threatened language so that it is in a position to assume powerful functions. It must also guard the invasion of the non-threatened powerful language into the less powerful domains, especially the family, where it can destroy the possibility of intergenerational transmission by destroying the creation of any mother tongue speakers within one generation. It is especially X, the threatened language, that has to be functionally separated. Fishman explains:

When intragroup bilingualism is stabilized so that X-ish has its functions and Y-ish has its functions and these two sets of functions overlap minimally, then X-ish will have its own space, functions in which it and it alone is normatively expected. (Fishman, 1991b: 85)

Facing the threats of globalization in the 21st century, Fishman acknowledges the importance of the 'Big Brother language.' He concedes that: '[A]n internal societal re-allocation of languages to functions is pursued that will also be partially receptive of the culturally stronger Big Brother language' (Fishman, 2001: 7). Speaking of what he calls late- and later-modernizer languages, he states that they:

Fishman's initial interest in language maintenance has been extended to encompass its larger cultural and social context. His interest in language maintenance has been to highlight its role in the larger cultural and social contexts that he identifies as (Fishman, 1991b:

1. Habitual language use
2. Psychological, social, and political stability or change in
3. Behavior toward language behavior or overt beh
may find that multilingualism and multiliteracy are actually their best options for more quickly attaining both symbolic vernacular recognition on the one hand and the greater material advantages that are associated with languages of wider communication on the other. (Fishman, 1999: 161)

Language Maintenance/Language Shift/Reversing Language Shift

Language maintenance/language shift

Language maintenance and language shift have been important fields of inquiry in the sociology of language from the very beginning (‘Language Maintenance and Language Shift as a Field of Inquiry,’ 1964). They were originally defined thus:

The study of language maintenance and language shift is concerned with the relationship between change or stability in habitual language use, on the one hand, and ongoing psychological, social or cultural processes of change and stability, on the other hand. (as cited in Fishman, 1971: 603, note 3)

In 1968, Fishman revisits this definition and extends it by saying:

The study of language maintenance and language shift is concerned with the relationship between change (or stability) in language usage patterns, on the one hand, and ongoing psychological, social or cultural processes, on the other hand, in populations that utilize more than one speech variety for intra-group or for inter-group purposes.’ [emphasis ours] (Fishman, 1968: 76)

Fishman’s initial interest in intra-group multilingualism was quickly extended to encompass inter-group processes, as he faced the developing world and his interest in language planning (see below). It is this extension that he highlights in his revised definition:

The three main topics of language maintenance and language shift are identified as (Fishman, 1964, 1968):

(1) habitual language use and the measurement of degree and location of bilingualism along sociologically relevant dimensions;
(2) psychological, social and cultural processes and their relationship to stability or change in habitual language use;
(3) behavior toward language, including attitudinal behavior, cognitive behavior or overt behavior.

In a style that is typical of Fishman throughout his career, he articulates his theoretical conceptualization of language maintenance and language shift
by presenting a series of counter-arguments to his thinking, which he then critiques (Fishman, 1972a):

1. Language maintenance is a function of intactness of group membership or group loyalty, particularly nationalism;
2. Urban dwellers are more inclined to shift. Rural dwellers who are more conservative and isolated are less inclined;
3. The most prestigious language displaces the less prestigious language.

To the first argument, Fishman provides counter-evidence from such varied ethnotonguistic groups as the Guayqueris of Venezuela, the lower caste groups in India, the Raetoromans in Switzerland and the Auslandsdeutsche in the midst of Polish and Ukrainian majorities. He concludes:

Language maintenance may depend most on nationalist ideologies in populations whose lives have otherwise been greatly dislocated and it may also depend least on such ideologies in those populations that have best preserved their total social context against the winds of change. (Fishman, 1972a: 97)

Fishman then makes the point that language loyalty and language revival movements are mostly urban phenomena, and gives example of some low prestige languages that have historically displaced more prestigious ones. By doing so, Fishman proposes that the same process may have different outcomes in different societies and at different times. He says, for example:

Urbanization may result in language shift away from hitherto traditional language in some cases, in language shift back to traditional languages in other cases, while revealing significantly unaltered maintenance of the status quo in still others. (Fishman, 1972a: 100)

The significance of this quote is that it contains the germinating seeds for Fishman's later work on reversing language shift (RLS)—see next section.

With a vision that well anticipates Richard Ruiz's (1984) division of language ideology as viewing language as a problem, as a resource, or as a right, Fishman says about language in the United States:

The recommendations advanced here are derived from the point of view that language maintenance in the United States is desirable, in that the non-English language resources of American minority groups have already helped meet our urgent national need for speakers of various non-English languages, and that these resources can be reinforced and developed so as to do so to a very much greater extent in the future. [emphasis ours] (Fishman, 1972a: 18)

Fishman Sociolinguistics ( ...

The seeds for RLS are also reinforced by the Conservation of a Neglected Language method which puts Fishman in the position of fighting on behalf of threatened languages.

[M]ost social scientists (design, instrument construction, interpretation) than with energizing action, involvement or segments of the community that applied settings can. In developments, the leap of a language activist is still rarely attempted (ours) (Fishman, 1972a: 161)

Fishman, however, dares to encourage to admit his values. 'Recommendations leading to espouse certain values. Pursuit of the art of the possible.' Clearly the seeds for RLS were sown.

Reversing language shift

While many scholars of languages in the world today have been language maintenance and preservation of Threatened languages, Fishman himself is seeking from a different method—something can be done to assert language and to prevent the time and effort can be mobilized where it is necessary and desirable. Polled answers in the affirmative, a set of questions to tackle first ... and with which to achieve those functions among speakers. Fishman proposes his Grade model, the higher the score, the lower the priority among group.

The GIDS provides a way for the various factors in the state of their languages (X).

Stage 8: X spoken by social groups
Stage 7: X spoken by people linguistically active, but
The seeds for RLS are also in Fishman’s 1966 article titled ‘Planned Reinforcement of Language Maintenance in the United States: Suggestions for the Conservation of a Neglected National Resource.’ This article already puts Fishman in the position of recommending and planning social action on behalf of threatened languages. He explains:

[Most social scientists feel more comfortable with diagnosis (study design, instrument construction, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation) than with therapy (recommendations for action, planning action, involvement with action-oriented branches of government or segments of the community)....] Although it is frequently admitted that applied settings can provide powerful stimulation for theoretical developments, the leap from the role of scholar to that of consultant or activist is still rarely attempted among behavioral scientists. [emphasis ours] (Fishman, 1972a: 16, 17)

Fishman, however, dares to make the leap to activist, and also has the courage to admit his values and biases – his social philosophy. He tells us, ‘Recommendations leading to language reinforcement imply a willingness to espouse certain values, and to assist certain groups in an informed pursuit of “the art of the possible.”’ [emphasis ours] (Fishman, 1972a: 19). Clearly the seeds for RLS were sown in the 1960s and early 1970s.

**Reversing language shift (RLS)**

While many scholars complain about threatened and endangered languages in the world today, Fishman has turned his conceptualization of language maintenance and language shift into a program of social action. Threatened languages, Fishman (1991b) reminds us, are not replacing themselves demographically and are unrelated to higher social status. But something can be done to assist them: resources such as intelligence, funds, time and effort can be mobilized. Fishman first establishes that RLS is both necessary and desirable. Posing the question, ‘Can anything be done?’ he answers in the affirmative, and suggests that one has to decide ‘which functions to tackle first ... and which specific steps to take in order to (re)gain those functions among specific target populations’ (Fishman, 1991b: 12). Fishman proposes his **Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale (GIDS)** where, the higher the score, the lower the language maintenance prospects of a group.

The GIDS provides a way by which groups can assess the threatened state of their languages (X) and can mobilize resources on their behalf:

**Stage 8:** X spoken by socially isolated old folks;

**Stage 7:** X spoken by people who are socially integrated and ethnolinguistically active, but beyond child-bearing age;
Stage 6: X is normal language of informal spoken interaction between and within all three generations of family, with Y reserved for greater formality and technicality than those common of daily family life;

Stage 5: X is also used for literacy in home, school and community, but such literacy is not reinforced extra-communally;

Stage 4: X is used in lower education that meets requirements of compulsory education laws;

Stage 3: X is used in lower work sphere, outside of the community, and involving interaction between both speech communities;

Stage 2: X is used in lower governmental services and mass media, but not higher levels;

Stage 1: X is used in higher level educational, occupational, governmental and media efforts.

The crucial stage beyond which there is no intergenerational mother tongue transmission, and therefore, no possibility of language maintenance is Stage 6. As we noted before, ‘Face-to-face interaction with real family imbedded in real community,’ Fishman (2001: 458) reminds us, ‘is the real secret weapon of RLS.’ Reacting to the importance that scholars of multimodal discourse give to the web community (Jewett & Kress, 2003; Kress, 2003), Fishman (2001: 455) says that ‘community and ‘virtual community’ are not the same thing at all as far as intergenerational mother tongue transmission are concerned.’

Groups that fall between stages 5 and 8 are attempting to work out some kind of diglossia, what Fishman sees as the program minimum of RLS. Groups that fall between stages 1 and 4 have transcended diglossic status, and are in search of increased power sharing.

RLS is especially important in the 21st century as a way to balance globalization. Fishman says:

RLSers aim at nothing more than to achieve greater self-regulation over the processes of sociocultural change which globalization fosters. They want to be able to tame globalisation somewhat, to counterbalance it with more of their own language-and-culture institutions, processes and outcomes. (Fishman, 2001: 6)

Thus, RLS theoretical contributions make room for both – globalization and particularism. Fishman (2001) points to the important multilingual and multi-ethnic interactions that will be necessary in the world of the future:

The languages of the world will either all help one another survive or they will succumb separately to the global dangers that must assuredly await us all (English included) in the century ahead. (Fishman, 2001: 481)
Language Spread

As we have seen, Fishman's sociology of language was first concerned with the measurement of habitual language use and the sociocultural processes leading to or inhibiting language maintenance and language shift in immigrant settings. But from the beginning, Fishman also turned to the study of the opposite side of this coin, namely the diffusion process of a language of wider communication. In 1967, he published the first article that was to deal with this topic: 'The Breadth and Depth of English in the United States.' The spread of English offered a new perspective for the study of language maintenance and language shift. On the one hand, English was widely present in very different societal contexts. On the other hand, it was present in many educational systems, and was often more read than spoken. Furthermore, sociocultural processes, and especially the role of power, were more visible in the study of English language spread than in the study of language maintenance and shift of immigrant communities. Fishman says:

Bilingualism is repeatedly skewed in favor of the more powerful, with the language of greater power being acquired and used much more frequently than that of lesser power. (Fishman, 1976, as cited in 1989: 241)

About English, Fishman adds:

On the whole, English as an additional language is more learned than used and more used than liked. The three (learning, using and liking) are little related to each other. (Fishman, 1976, as cited in 1989: 254)

The fact that English is not particularly liked worldwide is linked to its power. Fishman asserts:

Small languages and weak polities in the modern world quickly realize that they require strong partners to protect and complement them. Large languages and strong polities lack this realization and, therefore, run a particular risk of parochialism, provincialism, and philistinism—a risk that is all the more terrifying because miscalculations derived therefrom can have truly calamitous results. (Fishman et al., 1977: 334)

It is a lesson for the United States and the powerful English-speaking world that Fishman delivers again and again.

But from the beginning, Fishman also explains that the spread of English does not have to result in the loss of local languages. This early position reminds us of Louis-Jean Calvet's (1999) 'gravitational model' of diglossia, a model that proposes that today's spread of global powerful languages like English can coexist and not threaten local languages. In fact, Fishman,
Cooper and Conrad (1977) prophesy that the use of local languages might increase as a result of English language spread:

English is clearly the major link-language in the world today and that alone shows signs of continuing as such, at least in the short run, while the use of local languages for official literacy/education-related purposes is also likely to increase. (Cooper & Conrad, 1977: 56)

In 1980, in an article titled ‘Language Maintenance and Ethnicity,’ Fishman had already identified the two contradictory trends that according to Muraits and Morris (2004) characterize languages in the globalized world of the 21st century:

(1) the spread of a single lingua franca (English) ‘for supra-local, econotechnical, political, diplomatic, educational and touristic purposes’;
(2) the recognition of more languages than ever before ‘for governmental and governmentally protected functions.’ (as cited in Fishman, 1989: 220)

And yet, Fishman, Cooper and Conrad call for the English-speaking world to assist the rest of the world in preserving their local vernaculars. Fishman says:

International sociolinguistic balance rests on the spread of English, the control of English, and the fostering of local/regional/national vernaculars. ... Of these three, the one that is currently most dynamic is that relating to the vernaculars, many of which are straining for further recognition. Thus it becomes all the more crucial not only whether native speakers of English can hold on to their technological superiority but also whether they can really meet the ‘others’ halfway in the crucial sociopsychological arena of mutual acceptance. [emphasis ours] (Fishman et al., 1977: 335)

Fishman pursues this topic of the role of English in former British and American colonies in the book he edits with Andrew Conrad and Alma Rubal- López, Post-Imperial English: Status Change in Former British and American Colonies 1940–1990. In a series of case studies authored by different scholars, Fishman studies the presence of English along seven dimensions – elementary education, tertiary education, print media, non-print media, technology/commerce/industry, governmental services and operations and indigenous informal usage. Although most cases confirm the presence of English especially in the econotechnical realms at the supra-local level, Fishman concludes that there is no evidence of alienation from the local culture, and certainly no evidence of linguicide. Despite the threats to endangered languages, which Fishman acknowledges and has spent his academic life trying to protect and save, it is the need for assis-
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tance to local indigenous vernaculars that Fishman's work emphasizes. In other words, he wastes no intellectual energy trying to stop the spread of English. He acknowledges that:

The socioeconomic factors that are behind the spread of English are now indigenous in most countries of the world and part and parcel of indigenous daily life and social stratification. (Fishman, 1996b: 637)

So it is the role of the vernacular, and its weaker (or at least weakening) status in indigenous daily life that is important for Joshua A. Fishman, with language attitudes and ideologies playing an important role in the shaping of that role.

Language Attitudes and Language and Ethnicity/
Nationalism/Identity/Religion/Power

Language attitudes

Fishmanian sociolinguistics has always included research aimed at discovering 'the nature, determinants, effects and measurement of attitudes' (Cooper & Fishman, 1974: 6). That is, affective behaviors always have had a place in sociology of language studies, alongside overt behaviors and cognitive behaviors. But Fishman has also signaled the contradictions between affective and overt behaviors. In an article on 'Language: Policy in the USA,' Fishman (1989: 408) comments that 'it is possible for language attitudes to improve in compensatory fashion as both use and knowledge decrease.'

In 1996, Fishman dedicated an entire book to language attitudes. His In Praise of the Beloved Language. A Comparative View of Positive Ethnolinguistic Consciousness is an attempt to understand language attitudes towards the vernacular. Fishman makes clear that although nationalistic movements have used these attitudes in mobilizing populations, positive ethnolinguistic consciousness is not in itself nationalism. Fishman also acknowledges that positive ethnolinguistic consciousness is not the only type of language consciousness. Language consciousness can also be inter-ethnic, and even supra-ethnic in the case of shared lingua francas.

The concept of positive ethnolinguistic consciousness ties the understandings of language attitudes with those of language identity and language and nationalism which we will discuss below. Fishman explains that:

The phenomenology of most ongoing positive ethnolinguistic consciousness recognizes a ... reality in which the ethnic language, the ethnic identity and the ethnic culture (behaviors, beliefs, artifacts) are all completely intertwined. It is this very intertwining that constitutes the 'heart of the matter.' (Fishman, 1996a: 61)
Despite this intertwining, we address each of these components individually below.

**Language and ethnicity**

In a 1997 essay entitled ‘Language and Ethnicity: The View from Within,’ Joshua Fishman explains that the term ethnicity is derived from the Greek ‘ethnos’ and shares its negative semantic load of ‘unrefined.’ The earliest Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible used the term ‘ethnos’ as the counterpart to the Hebrew ‘gey’ which meant ‘god-obeying.’ When the terms race, national origin and culture became inapplicable because they were no longer useful, the term ethnicity was brought to the fore.

In an early article that Fishman published in 1965 entitled ‘Varieties of Ethnicity and Varieties of Language Consciousness,’ Fishman says:

> Ethnicity refers most basically to a primordial holistic guide to human behavior ... An all-embracing constellation, limited in its contacts with the outside world, limited in its consciousness of self, limited in the internal differentiation or specialization that it recognizes or permits; a 'given' that is viewed as no more subject to change than one's kin and one's birthplace; a 'given' that operates quite literally with these two differentiations (kinship and birthplace) uppermost in mind; a 'given' in which kinship and birthplace completely regulate friendship, worship and workmanship. (as cited in Fishman, 1972a: 180)

More than 15 years later, in an article entitled ‘Language Maintenance and Ethnicity,’ Fishman (1989: 180) defines ethnicity as ‘peopleness, i.e. belonging or pertaining to a phenomenologically complete, separate, historically deep cultural collectivity; a collectivity polarized on perceived authenticity.’ Ethnicity, Fishman says much later, is about macro-group ‘belongingness’ or the identification dimensions of culture. He distinguishes it from culture by saying that ethnicity is both narrower than culture and more perspectival than culture, that is, ‘the attribution of ethnicity is fundamentally subjective, variable and very possibly non-consensual’ (Fishman, 1997b: 329). But Fishman (1972a: 180) warns that ‘primordial ethnicity is a web that comes apart and becomes segmentized, bit by bit during periods of sociocultural change.’

Of language, Fishman (1996a: 61) says: ‘Language is an intimately experienced and highly valued verity, a palpable object of esteem, affection, reverence and dedication.’ According to Fishman (1989: 673), language ‘is both part of, indexical of, and symbolic of ethnocultural behavior.’ The ‘beloved language,’ he tells us is ‘flesh of our flesh and bone of our bone’ (Fishman, 1996a: 91).

The fact that language is the link to ethnicity is a constant thread throughout all of Fishman's work.
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[Language is the recorder of paternity, the expresser of patrimony and the carrier of phenomenology. Any vehicle carrying such precious freight must come to be viewed as equally precious, as part of the freight, indeed, as precious in and of itself. The link between language and ethnicity is thus one of sanctity-by-association. (Fishman, 1989:32)]

In the book that he devotes to positive ethnolinguistic consciousness, In Praise of the Beloved Language, Fishman (1996a) explains that language is a symbol system of the human species. Every vernacular can become symbolic of the speech community, utilized intergenerationally and for cultural boundary-maintenance. Some languages have a sanctity dimension, that is, they are expressed as the spirit or the soul of the ethnonational collectivity. Some are outright Holy languages in which the word of God and the disciples and prophets was spread – Biblical Hebrew, Koranic Arabic, Sanskrit, Pali, Classical Mandarin, Javanese, Syriac, Latin, Greek, Coptic, Armenian, Ethiopic, Old Church Slavonic and several scriptural languages of the Eastern Orthodox Churches. The majority of the world’s ethnocultures, Fishman (1997b) reminds us, are predominantly inked to traditionally associated religions. Most of the time the language and ethnicity link is clear, denoting kinship, heritage, hearth and home.

In ways that remind us of the work on linguistic ideologies of anthropologists today (Irvine & Gal, 2000; Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004; Woolard, 1998), Fishman (1991b: 388) explains that language ‘not only implies and reflects core boundaries but it constantly creates and legitimizes them as well.’ Fishman (1997b) further points out that the link between language and ethnicity is variable; that is, sometimes language is a prime indicator of ethnicity, and at other times it is marginal and optional. Ethnicity itself ‘waxes and wanes and changes in response to more powerful and encompassing developments’ (Fishman, 1983, as cited in 1989: 686).

Fishman also introduces the concept of language as a resource, and as a worldwide societal asset. He dedicates much of his work to understanding Benjamin Lee Whorf’s contributions and especially what he calls ‘Whorfianism of the third kind’ (Fishman, 1982). Whorf, a student of Edward Sapir, had extended Sapir’s argument that each language represents a worldview, and posited that particular languages carve up experience according to their structures and categories. But beyond the linguistic relativity and the linguistic determinism hypotheses that Whorf posed, and that have been discarded as untenable, Fishman (1989: 568) values Whorf as a ‘neo-Herderian champion of a multilingual, multicultural world in which “little peoples” and “little languages” would not only be respected, but valued.’ The work of Johann Gottfried Herder (1744–1803) is cited frequently by Fishman, who supports Herder’s views that the mother tongue expresses a nationality’s soul and that:
Language was also the surest way for individuals to safeguard (or recover) the authenticity they had inherited from their ancestors as well as to hard it on to generations yet unborn, and finally, that worldwide diversity in language and in culture was a good and beautiful thing in and of itself, whereas imitation led to corruption and stagnation. (Fishman, 1972b: 46)

The link between language and ethnicity can be 'energized by collective grievances.' Fishman (1996a: 161) explains. He suggests that the relationship between language and ethnicity is not uni-directional:

Just as ethnic identity is fostered by intergroup grievances, so the language use corresponding to such identity is fostered. Thus when use of one's ethnically associated language is restricted or denigrated, the users who identify with it are more likely to use it among themselves than if no such grievance existed. (Fishman, 1996a: 154)

Taking sides, as always, with those who grieve, Fishman warns:

When the late-modernizing or late-autonomy-gaining worm finally turns, it will necessarily disturb the peace and quiet of those who have attained recognition earlier and at the latecomers' expense. But in their own eyes the latecomers' 'turning' will not only seem justified but long-overdue and, indeed, merely following an example well established in the surrounding world of nations and peoples. In the pursuit of ethnolinguistic dreams, what's sauce for the goose is oft-times considered sauce for the goslings as well, whether or not this is realistic or desired by the now older, wiser and fatter geese. (Fishman, 1996a: 91)

Fishman (1996a: 93) warns us that ethnolinguistic consciousness of what he calls 'late' or 'peripheral' languages will 'continue to alarm self-satisfied neighbors' and disturb the peace of those who are already contextually comfortable.' The only way to work out this dilemma is 'greater reciprocal bilingualism, with each side evincing a willingness to compromise “its position maximum”' (Fishman, 1996a: 93).

Responding to scholars and critics who view the process of globalization as making ethnicity and language differences unnecessary, Fishman notes:

Some of the very processes of globalization and post-modernism that were supposed to be most deleterious to purported 'parochial' identities have actually contributed most to their re-emergence as 'part-identities.' The increasing ubiquity of the civil state, of civil nationalism and, therefore, of a shared supra-ethnic civil nationalism as part of the identity constellation of all citizens, has resulted in more rather than less recognition of multiculturalism at the institutional level and a more widespread implementation of local ethnicity as a counterbalance to civil identity. (Fishman, 2001)

As globalization has advanced, it has become more salient in a way that is responsible for the socalled 'post-national' RLS, as well as the transformation of the speakers. Fishman proposes:

With increased intensification of competition, on the one hand, and traditional life in the face of 'supra-ethnically' mode of the other hand, a protest is cultivated. Under these conditions not only can transformative (Fishman, 2001: 330)

According to Fishman (2001), the 'localization' is important:

[The coming of globalization makes 'localization' even more important than for state-nation] (Fishman, 2001: 455)

Language and nationalism

Joshua A. Fishman devotes a good deal of his book Nationalism (1972b). In that book, Fishman distinguishes between the group, Fishman says 'is more localistic' than nationality. The developed beyond primordial bonds that do not need a state (Fishman, 1972b: 3). Nation, is largely or increasingly internal to (Fishman, 1972b: 5). A state, external control, and unilaterally predominant nationality.

Fishman also distinguishes between the beliefs, values and behaviors avowed ethnocultural self-i-
counterbalance to civil nationalism at the level of organized part-identity. (Fishman, 2001: 460)

As globalization has advanced, the link between language and ethnicity has become more salient in consciousness. And it is precisely globalization that is responsible for the social action language programs proposed by RLS, as well as the transformation of many threatened languages and their speakers. Fishman proposes that:

With increased intensities and frequencies of intergroup contacts and competition, on the one hand, and with the resulting weakening of traditional life in the face of cultural influences that are experienced as "supra-ethnically" modern (rather than as specifically "other-ethnic"), on the other hand, a protective and differentiating counteraction is often cultivated. Under these circumstances, the language and ethnicity link can not only become the basis of social action but it can also be transformative for those among whom it is salient. (Fishman, 1997b: 330)

According to Fishman (2001), it is precisely globalization that makes "localization" important:

[T]he coming of globalization in certain aspects of human functioning makes "localization" even more important in modern part-identity, equally so for state-nation, nation-state and sub-state populations. (Fishman, 2001: 455)

**Language and nationalism**

Joshua A. Fishman devotes an entire book to the topic of *Language and Nationalism* (1972b). In the two long essays that make up that book, Fishman distinguishes between the concepts of ethnic group, nationality and nation on the one hand, and state, polity or country on the other. Ethnic group, Fishman says "is simpler, smaller, more particularistic, more localistic" than nationality. Nationalities are "sociocultural units that have developed beyond primarily local self-concepts, concerns and integrative bonds" that do not necessarily have their own autonomous territory (Fishman, 1972b: 3). Nation, however, is "any political-territorial unit which is largely or increasingly under the control of a particular nationality" (Fishman, 1972b: 5). A state, polity or country may not be independent of external control, and unlike a nation, does not always have a single predominant nationality.

Fishman also distinguishes between nationalism and nationism. He defines nationalism as "the more inclusive organization and the elaborated beliefs, values and behaviors which nationalities develop on behalf of their avowed ethnocultural self-interest..." (Fishman, 1972b: 4). Nationism, how-
ever, is the ‘cluster of behaviors-beliefs-values pertaining specifically to the acquisition, maintenance and development of politically independent territority’ (Fishman, 1972b: 4). Fishman (1972b: 194) explains further that ‘Nationism – as distinguished from nationalism – is primarily concerned not with ethnic authenticity but with operational efficiency.’

Nationalism often uses language as the link with a glorious past and as a link with authenticity, either directly by claiming that the mother tongue is a part of the soul, or indirectly by widespread oral and written imagery. According to Fishman (1972b), nationalism is ‘transformed primordial ethnicity’ that leads to functioning on a larger scale. Language Loyalty, the title of Fishman’s first major study of languages in the United States, is a component of nationalism.

Fishman has always distinguished between positive ethnolinguistic consciousness and nationalism. He defends his interest in positive ethnolinguistic consciousness by declaring, ‘I draw a line ... between contributing to an understanding of positive ethnolinguistic consciousness and fostering an acceptance of nationalistic horrors’ (Fishman, 1996a: 5). And to the question of whether positive ethnolinguistic consciousness, and for that matter, nationalism, can also be put to negative use, Fishman (1996a: 6) replies: ‘It certainly can, but so can word processors, education, motherhood, cherry pies and early spring.’

Language and identity

In Language and Nationalism, Fishman (1972b) refers to the continued need for identity in the latter part of the 20th century:

The need for identity, for community, to make modernity sufferable, is greater than it was and will become greater yet, and woe to the elites in universities, governments and industries – who do not recognize this, or even worse, who consider it to be only a vestigial remnant of nineteenth-century thinking. (Fishman, 1972b: 83)

And facing the globalization of the 21st century, Fishman speaks against the social disorganization of post-modern and supra-ethnic societal functioning:

[...]nationality has not fully satisfied the Pandora’s box of human longings, i.e., it has neither created nor corresponded to an inner reality that responds or corresponds to various other ‘wave lengths’ in human social motivation as well. (Fishman, 1996a: 58)

Fishman concedes that today ‘ethnic identity is contextually constructed’ and that ‘group membership may be multiple’:

The global and the specific are now more commonly found together, as
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event to different social, present in the same individual, and to benefit from diverse expression (Fishman)

This conviction that multiple cultural experience is constant for Joshua A. Fishman, a sociolinguist, in his International Sociological Perspectives, is not only present in the multiple-group membership.

But Fishman objects to the term ‘imagined communities.’ Communities are imagined, but they are not imaginary. (Fishman 1997)

Although ethnicity is imaginary, we never interact with each other as abstractions, it is an abstraction which the social imaginary ... Somewhere between racism, neither blindly predefined, and its allotropes are possible members of the organization in terms of membership, which show little sign of worldwide in their absence.

Because ethnic identity is inherently more conscious than major social movements (Petryna) tells us. But this does not mean that all humanity.

Language and power

Fishman’s work in defense of nation- centered on his conviction that there is a democratic climate of expression in the enforcement of Language Mainstreaming.

Our political and cultural identification groupings do not always lead to develop behavior patterns. Our national creativity can be more shallow when our intelligence is blocked and when alien...
partial (rather than as exclusive) identities, because they each contribute to different social, emotional and cognitive needs that are co-present in the same individuals and societies and that are felt to require and to benefit from different languages in order to give them appropriate expression (Fishman, 1999: 450).

This conviction that multiple-group membership is possible is an early constant for Joshua A. Fishman. For example, in *Bilingual Education: An International Sociolinguistic Perspective* (1976), he points out that the human cultural experience is different from plant or animal evolution precisely because of its capacity for multiple memberships. He says: 'It [human cultural experience] not only exhibits but can be aware of and can value multiple-group membership' (Fishman, 1976: 8).

But Fishman objects to the concept introduced by Anderson (1983) of 'imagined communities.' Communities, according to Fishman, may be imagined, but they are not *imaginary*. He agrees with Richard Jenkins' (1997) position, on which he draws extensively:

> Although ethnicity is imagined [in the sense that most members will never interact with each other face to face and that, therefore, the group is an abstraction which they must conceive of an identify with], it is not imaginary ... Somewhere between irresistible emotion and utter cynicism, neither blindly primordial nor completely manipulable, ethnicity and its allotropes are principles of collective identification and social organization in terms of culture and history, similarity and difference, that show little sign of withering away ... It is hard to imagine the social world in their absence. (Fishman, 1996a: 447)

Because ethnic identity is a sociopsychological variable, minorities are more conscious than majorities of their own ethnic identity. Fishman (1996a) tells us. But this doesn't mean that ethnic identity doesn't exist for all humanity.

**Language and power**

Fishman's work in defending minority and immigrant languages is centered on his conviction that languages have to be safeguarded to ensure a democratic climate of expression. In 1966, in an article entitled 'Planned Reinforcement of Language Maintenance in the United States,' Fishman writes:

> Our political and cultural foundations are weakened when large population groupings do not feel encouraged to express, to safeguard, and to develop behavior patterns that are traditionally meaningful to them. Our national creativity and personal purposefulness are rendered more shallow when constructive channels of self-expression are blocked and when alienation from ethnic-cultural roots becomes the
necessary price of self-respect and social advancement, regardless of the merits of the cultural components of these roots. (1966, as cited in 1972a: 23).

Using languages in ways that describe the positioning of power differently, but that attest to unequal relations of power nonetheless, Fishman (1990: 113) describes his work as ‘centralizing the periphery’ and working on the ‘cultivation of marginality’ (Fishman, 1990: 115). Reflecting on his attraction for the periphery, he says:

The periphery magnifies and clarifies. Above all, it refuses to take matters for granted. It refuses to confuse peripherality with unimportance, or weakness in numbers or in power, with weakness vis-à-vis equity, justice, law and morality (Fishman, 1990: 113).

Since the 1990s, some sociolinguists have focused on the relationship between inequality and power and language and society (Fairclough, 1989; Pennycook, 1989; Tollefson, 1991, 1995). Pierre Bourdieu (1991) has posited that linguistic practices are symbolic capital that is distributed unequally in the linguistic community. Fishman’s work is indeed cognizant and aware of the economic and social rewards that some languages hold. In fact, one of his most recent co-edited books (with Martin Pütz) is titled, ‘Along the Routes to Power’: Explorations of Empowerment through Language. But Fishman is even more concerned with the non-material values that are so important in the whole sociolinguistic enterprise. Fishman warns that by focusing so much on power, a ‘reductionist school of thought’ is ‘missing the real elephant’ (Fishman, 1991b: 19). In introducing the field of Reversing Language Shift, Fishman critiques this reductionism:

The entire intellectually fashionable attempt to reduce all ethnolinguistic movements to problems of ‘who attains power’ and ‘who gets money’ is exactly that: reductionist. It reduces human values, emotions, loyalties and philosophies to little more than hard cash and brute force. These misguided attempts, regardless of the great names associated with them and the pseudo-intellectual fashionableness that they occasionally enjoy because of their purported ‘realism,’ inevitably impoverish rather than enrich our understanding of the complexity of human nature and of sociocultural reality. They cannot help us grasp the intensity of ideals and idealism of commitments and altruism, that are at the very heart of much social behavior in general and of RLS behavior in particular.

And it is not the flea but the elephant that is being overlooked by such reductionist schools of thought. (Fishman, 1991b: 19)

Fishman cautions that it is not language alone that is standing in opposi-
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Xians are invariably biased to the economic rewards of personal knowledge of Yish stores. In these rewards, the economic cost is often more than it usually is. For Xians are not the only one that benefit. Societally weaker language productions. It is not laborers to disproportionally in Xian, nor is the glocalism usually does not begin. And, that being the case, the integrity becomes almost always, education... does not begin to develop sound, materialist or even anything higher cultures to have. It is merely the most elementary needs? (Fishman, 2001)

Language and religion

Joshua A. Fishman’s interactive Maintenance and Perpetuation American Ethnic and Religious Loyalty in the United States and attention to language use, language and religion as two patterns in language loyalty in the U.S.

How many of us, even religious in America, keep up on our shores, rate, Polish-Americans were leaders toward language state of affairs almost all New England? How many that convulsed several actions for well over half...
Fishmanian Sociolinguistics (1949 to the Present) 37

tion to the power potential of people who speak $X$ languages (threatened) in interaction with those who only speak $Y$ (non-threatened):

Xians are invariably bilingual ... and, therefore, in no way cut off from the economic rewards that are presumably inherent in Yish. ... If only knowledge of Yish stood between Xish workers and Yish-controlled rewards, the economic well-being of the former would be much better off than it usually is. Furthermore, the economic reward dimension is not the only one that defines Xish individual and social identity ... Societally weaker languages always need more than mere economic rationales. It is not labour-market access but economic power which is disproportionately in Yish hands and that is a problem that will rarely be overcome on linguistic grounds alone. As a result, even Xian bilingualism usually does not lead to any redistribution of economic power and, that being the case, the maintenance of Xish identity and cultural intactness becomes all the more important for community problem solving, health, education and cultural creativity. Vulgar materialism ... does not begin to do justice to the nuanced and completely interrelated human values, behaviours and identities that are essentially non-materialist or even anti-materialist in nature. ... Isn’t it the mark of higher cultures to have other than material values, the latter being merely the most elementary expression of individual and group needs? (Fishman, 2001: 453)

Language and religion

Joshua A. Fishman’s interest in language and religion is not new. ‘The Maintenance and Perpetuation of Non-English Mother Tongues by American Ethnic and Religious Groups’ (italics ours) was the subtitle of Language Loyalty in the United States (1966). Many of the chapters of that book pay attention to language use and religion. In the Preface, Fishman names language and religion as two of the important factors spurring his interest in language loyalty in the United States. He asks:

How many of us, even among professional historians or students of religion in America, know that a Polish national Catholic Church grew up on our shores, rather than in Poland proper, because so many Polish-Americans were distressed by the policy of American Catholic leaders toward language and culture maintenance? Or that a similar state of affairs almost came into being among Franco-Americans in New England? How many of us know about the language problems that convulsed several German and Norwegian Lutheran denominations for well over half a century, or of the language issues that have
influenced Jewish ethnic, religious and intellectual life in America? (Fishman, 1966: 10)

In particular, the chapter in *Language Loyalty in the United States* by John E. Hofman on ‘Mother Tongue Retentiveness in Ethnic Parishes,’ included a study of language use in the sermons and instruction in Roman Catholic, Greek Catholic and Eastern Orthodox ethnic parishes.

But it was only recently that Joshua A. Fishman devoted an entire volume to the topic of language and religion. Co-edited with Tope Omoniyi, *Explorations in the Sociology of Language and Religion* (2006) includes contributions from Brazil, USA, Nigeria, Singapore, Australia, Israel, England, Germany, Georgia, Scotland and South Africa. And the Sociolinguistics Symposium 16 in Limerick, Ireland will include a panel on the Sociology of Language and Religion in honor of Joshua A. Fishman’s 80th birthday during the summer of 2006.

**Language Planning and Language Policy**

The language problems of developing nations were an early scholarly interest of Joshua A. Fishman, one pursued with his lifelong friend and colleague, Charles A. Ferguson. In 1968, Fishman, Ferguson and Das Gupta edited *Language Problems of Developing Nations*, one of the first texts in the field that became Language Planning and Policy.

**Language policy**

Fishman differentiates between language planning and language policies, a distinction that other scholars tend to ignore, or minimize (see, for example, Spolsky, 2004). Language planning, Fishman maintains, is the processes that come after language-policy decisions have been reached (1972b). Fishman identifies three types of language policies for three corresponding types of societies:

1. **Type A: Amodal**. There is consensus in these societies that there is neither an overarching sociocultural or political past and no indigenous Great Tradition (a Great Tradition being a ‘widely accepted and visibly implemented belief and behavior system of indigenously validated greatness’ (Fishman, 1972c: 194)). Usually a Language of Wider Communication (LWC) is selected as a national or official language.

2. **Type B: Unimodal**. There are long-established sociocultural unities with rather well-established political boundaries. There is a single Great Tradition available. Usually a single indigenous or indigenized language is selected as the national language.

3. **Type C: Multimodal**. There are conflicting or competing multiplicities of Great Traditions. The nation must stand for a supra-nationalistic goal,
since nationalism is associated with traditional regional (sub-national) identities. Usually regional official languages are selected, and a LWC is selected as co-official. Bilingualism is expected.

**Language planning**

Fishman (1973: 24–25) defines language planning as a ‘set of deliberate activities systematically designed to organize and develop the language resources of the community in an ordered schedule of time.’ But like all planning, language planning also requires a justification for the movement in the specified direction. Fishman’s model of language planning is based on Haugen’s original conceptualization of the field (Haugen, 1966) which included four categories: (1) norm selection, (2) codification, (3) elaboration and (4) implementation. Fishman likewise speaks of code selection, codification and elaboration. He posits, however, that language planning can foster unity and authenticity via differentiation of two sources: (1) undesirable external linguistic influences and (2) internal linguistic alternatives.

Fishman studies language planning from two vantage points: (1) status planning and (2) corpus planning. He cautions that status planning is usually embroiled in conflictual inter-ethnic struggles, since it is the area of material statuses and rewards (Fishman, 1997b). Corpus planning, on the other hand, consists of tending to the ‘outer vestments (nomenclature, standardized spellings, grammars and stylistic conventions) that modern pursuits and modern institutions require’ (Fishman, 1997b: 337). Although Fishman posits that language policy precedes language planning, his study of First Congresses (1993) made him aware of an embryonic stage of language planning in which no authoritative policy decisions have yet been reached.

Fishman (1994) has responded to the neo-Marxist and post-structuralist critiques toward language planning (Luke & Baldauf, 1990; Tollefson, 1991), while recognizing the difficulties with the field: (1) that it is conducted by elites, (2) that it reproduces sociocultural and econotechnical inequalities, (3) that it inhibits or counteracts multiculturalism and (4) that it espouses world-wide Westernization and modernization. According to Fishman:

> Authorities will continue to be motivated by self-interest. New structural inequalities will inevitably arise to replace the old ones. More powerful segments of society will be less inclined to want to change themselves than to change others. Westernisation and modernisation will continue to foster both problems and satisfactions for the bulk of humanity. Ultimately language planning will be utilised by both those who favor and those who oppose whatever the socio-political climate may be. (Fishman, 1994: 98)
Fishman’s latest work is focused on the status agenda in corpus planning and the interpenetration of both – the pair of Siamese-twins, he calls them. He explains:

It is a gossamer web that they weave. It cannot be woven out of praises alone, for were there nothing but praises to be uttered for the beloved language as it is, then corpus planning itself would be unnecessary if not impossible. On the other hand, it cannot be fostered by emphasizing the current debits of the beloved language, for were that to be done it would play into the hands of its detractors and opponents. (Fishman, 1996a: 114)

Although Fishman understands that people in general do not like the prospects of social intervention in languages and their uses, he argues that it is inevitable if all languages are to be seated ‘at the table’:

If one seeks a place at the table of the respected and the self-respecting, if one seeks a share in the good things of the world, not least among them being respect, comfort and security, then one’s beloved language too must be elevated. The language symbolizes the people, it represents them, it speaks volumes for them, and if they are to be heard and heard-out, then it must speak from a position of honor and security as well. However, the circular interconnectedness between language and people is also fully matched by a circular interconnectedness between status planning and corpus planning. One cannot make a silk purse out of a sow’s ear and an effective elevation in status can rarely be attained or maintained without considerable change in the language itself. And so it inevitably comes about that the beloved language, whose loveliness was initially given in nature, and, indeed, is seen as part of its own ineffable nature, comes to require intervention so that it can more rapidly become visibly and audibly suitable for the new and higher functions that are pursued on its behalf. (Fishman, 1996a: 92)

Developing this concept further, Fishman (2000) has suggested that all language planning, whether corpus planning or status planning, is related to a super factor of independence/interdependence. Fishman proposes four different categories that are organized around the different poles of independence and interdependence:

1. **Ausbau/Einbau. Ausbau planning** is a building away process motivated by a desire to distance a language from its structurally similar big brother. This is the case of Urdu/Hindi, of Macedonian/Bulgarian, or of Landsmål/Ryksmål. Linguistic distancing is an indicator of a wish for independence and distancing – social, cultural and political.
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Einbau planning, on the other hand, refers to drawing two languages closer together, emphasizing similarities and interdependence. This is the case of the current Romanian treatment of Moldavian, or of former Soviet treatment of Ukrainian and Belarusian.

(2) Uniqueness/Internationalization. Planning for Uniqueness and Authenticity requires ensuring that language is independent of others. This is why, for example, St Stephen of Perm developed a writing system for Komi based on a similarity to the traditional Komi decorative designs. Planning for internationalization, on the other hand, wishes for interdependence with the modern scientific and technological ways of naming. This was the case, for example, of Atatürk who Westernized Turkish based on French influences that he thought would make Turkish capable of modern use.

(3) Purification/Regionalization. Planning for Purification is related to Ausbau and Uniqueness, but it differs from Ausbau in that the fears are not directed against the ‘Big Brother’ alone. And it differs from Uniqueness in that a single source of contamination is rejected. Purification has been a factor in planning for the independence of the revival of Hebrew, for example, from the contamination of Yiddish. Planning for Regionalization, on the other hand, has to do with Sprachbund, an entire cluster of sister languages that are acceptable sources for borrowings and influences. For example, Turkic languages are the resources for Central Asian languages; Malay and Indonesian are resources for each other; and Nordic languages are resources for one another, with the exclusion of Danish.

(4) Classicization/Vernacularization. There are many examples of planning for classicization: Hindi (from Sanskrit), Tamil (from Old Tamil), Arabic (from Quranic Arabic). Planning for vernacular use, however, favors popular usage.

In the end, Fishman (2000: 114) tells us, ‘all corpus planning that is oriented toward modernization and interaction with [the] community of modern peoples and nations must also settle for [an] inevitable degree of interdependence as well.’ Language planning, he explains,

when engaged in under auspices of modernization and with modernization as the goal, generally results in making languages even more capable of translating American life, even when suffusing the translations with the aura and the pretense of greater or lesser degrees of indigenization.’ (Fishman, 2000: 50)
Bilingual Education and Minority-Language Group Education

Scholarly interest

Bilingual education was Joshua A. Fishman’s earliest area of study (‘Bilingualism in a Yiddish School: Some Correlates and Non-correlates,’ 1949). Almost 60 years ago, this study already contained the motivations for the development of the sociology of language. Garcia (1991) has pointed out that the ‘Bilinguality Relationship Scale’ used in the study contains questions that foreshadow Fishman’s now famous ‘Who Speaks What Language to Whom and When.’ And the independent variables of the study – play preferences, school adjustment, family adjustment, number of friends, self-identity with nationality and attitude toward Yiddish – are the same variables that Fishman later explores in studies of language, ethnicity and schooling. Fishman’s familiarity with the Yiddish Workmen’s Circle Schools in Philadelphia prepared him for his work on bilingual education.

Fishman’s first major research project and publication, Language Loyalty in the United States (1966), dedicates a chapter to ‘the ethnic group school and mother tongue maintenance in the United States,’ a topic that he has pursued throughout his lifetime. Once the Bilingual Education Act was passed in 1968, many publications on bilingual education followed. Fishman devoted three more books to the topic of bilingual education: Bilingual Education: An International Sociological Perspective (1976); Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives. Social Science (1977); and Bilingual Education for Hispanic Students in the United States (1982). And in 1979 he released his final report for the National Institute of Education on ‘The Ethnic Mother Tongue School in America.’ Between 1970 and 1985, Joshua A. Fishman published 15 articles on the topic; these were reprinted again and again.11

Fishman devotes a great deal of effort to documenting the existence of Ethnic Mother Tongue Schools (EMT schools) because:

These schools must be included in our educational, social and intellectual bookkeeping, more for the sake of our national well-being than for their sake, since even the United States cannot afford to overlook some 6000 schools attended by as many as 600,000 children. (Fishman, 1980: 236)

Furthermore, he explains: ‘Rather than reflections of foreignness, ethnic community mother tongue schools are actually reflections of dealing with both indigenousness and mainstream exposure’ (Fishman, 1980: 243).

It is important to point out that Fishman was never ‘led astray’ by the frenzy that surrounded The Bilingual Education Act, that is, Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. His work, both that of Language Loyalty in the United States, and also the research that later became Bilingualism in the Barrio, was frequently quoted in the deliberations that led to the passage of the Bilingual Education Act in 1968. And some of his termi-
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ology, especially the word ‘transitional’ to substitute for ‘compensatory,’ has been adopted by governmental, scholarly and popular circles. His support for the education of language minorities, especially Spanish-speaking minorities, has been unquestionable. The 1982 volume edited with Gary Keller and dedicated to Hispanic students is precisely a reflection of this support. In addition, his concern about public bilingual education for poor Latino and Native American students has been approached through the prism of the importance of ethnic-mother-tongue schools, organized and supported by the ethnolinguistic group itself.

Education

Joshua A. Fishman has defined education broadly. As Dean at Yeshiva University, he proposed the merging of Education, Liberal Arts and Behavioral and Social Sciences saying that ‘[Education] is first and foremost an intellectual endeavor striving to increase knowledge about man and the process whereby he learns, grows, changes and influences others’ (Congressional Record A, 3594, July 11, 1966).

Fishman has also claimed that schools cannot ‘go at it alone.’ In an article entitled ‘Minority Mother Tongues in Education’ he says:

[E]ducation is a socializing institution and must never be examined without concentrating on the social processes that it serves and the social pressures to which it responds. (as cited in Fishman, 1989: 467)

Fishman (1989: 467) goes on to say that ‘[S]chools alone cannot guarantee the continuity of cultures, if for no other reason than that schools are generally no more than intervening (serving) rather than independent (causal) variables with respect to such continuity.’

That schools are just inter-vening variables is an important idea in Fishman’s early defense of public bilingual education. He cautions that:

Because there are so many other pervasive reasons why such children [poor minority children] achieve poorly, the goals of majority-oriented and -dominated schools (and societies), removing this extra burden above – and leaving all else as it was – does not usually do the trick, particularly when the teachers, curricula and materials for bilingual education are as nonoptimal as they currently usually are. (Fishman, 1976: 28)

For bilingual education to succeed, general support is needed. Fishman (1976: 111) contends that: ‘net only is community consensus needed if bilingual education is to succeed, but . . . help of the unmarked language community is needed every bit as much as, if not more than, that of the marked language community.’ His interest in bilingual education was concerned with increasing knowledge about speech communities – both language
Early typologies and warnings

In 1970, Joshua A. Fishman and John Lovas published the now well-known ‘Bilingual Education in Sociolinguistic Perspective’. Two years after the implementation of the United States’ Bilingual Education Act, Fishman and Lovas identified the features still lacking: (1) lack of funds, (2) lack of personnel, (3) lack of evaluated programs. This contribution provided insights into societal bilingualism that educators, psychologists and linguists involved with bilingual education programs had been missing.

Fishman pointed to three different language situations in communities that planners of bilingual education should be aware of:

1. a community in the process of language shift;
2. a community determined to maintain its own language in many or all social domains;
3. a community with one or more nonstandard varieties in one or more languages and their differential use from one societal domain to another and from one speech network to another.

And he warned that bilingual education (BE) programs must ascertain the sociolinguistic situation of the community before one program or the other is chosen.

Fishman (1972d: 89) proposes a typology of bilingual education based on different kinds of communities and school objectives:

1. **Type I. Transitional BE**, where the mother tongue is used in early grades until the dominant language is developed. This program corresponds to an objective of language shift.
2. **Type II. Monoliterate BE**, where both languages are used for aural-oral skills, but literacy skills in the mother tongue are not pursued.
3. **Type III. Biliterate BE—Partial Bilingualism**, where fluency and literacy in both languages are pursued, but literacy in the mother tongue is restricted to certain subject matter, usually which relates to the ethnic group. Ethnic-mother-tongue day schools are generally of this type.
4. **Type IV. Biliterate BE—Full Bilingualism**, where both languages are used as media of instruction for all subjects, and students develop all skills in both languages in all domains.

Fishman warns that although full biliterate-bilingualism programs seem to be desirable, there are dangers in pursuing them, saying:

A fully-balanced bilingual speech community seems to be a theoretical impossibility because basically we have functionally equivalent two languages if they are of program does not respect to societal reality.

Continuing to develop the speech communities, Fishman 's (1972) where he attempted he had developed for language has developed a proposal for a set of policies, advancing by a definition of policy, by that name:

1. **Type A policies**: There is intended to be school-worthiness because not believed to have intense selection for educational use and is often the standard language (LWC). Examples of some such as Gambia and Sierra
2. **Type B policies**: There is an additional tradition that is reserved for written languages and students are of the policies are most part of the
3. **Type C policies**: Several communities. Each locality must take the other localities. Students and also in another tongue

Fishman not only proposes a few types of policies where the LWC is spoken or whether to adopt the curriculum. Another consideration for policies occurs when policies have a high type of policy, where the LWC presents great difficulties for acceptance. But the biggest concern was precisely that it is artificial.
impossibility because balanced competence implies languages that are functionally equivalent and no society can be motivated to maintain two languages if they are really functionally redundant. Thus, this type of program does not seem to have a clearly articulated goal with respect to societal reality. (Fishman, 1976: 89)

Continuing to develop the link between types of education and types of speech communities, Fishman published ‘Bilingual and Bidialectal Education’ (1972) where he attempted to apply to bilingual education the model he had developed for language planning in ‘National Languages and Languages of Wider Communication in the Developing Nations’ (1969). Fishman (1972a: 332–337) proposes three different types of language education policies, advancing by a quarter-century the field that was later known by that name:

(1) **Type A policies**: None of the mother tongue varieties are considered school-worthy because they’re not tied to any great tradition and are not believed to have integrative potential. The educational authorities select for educational use a language which is not a mother tongue, and often is the standard variety of the language of wider communication (LWC). Examples of these policies are countries in West Africa such as Gambia and Sierra Leone.

(2) **Type B policies**: There is an internally integrative great tradition, but additional traditions must also be recognized. Usually the standard is reserved for written language and education is bidialectal. Teachers and students are of the same speech community. Examples of these policies are most parts of Switzerland and Germany.

(3) **Type C policies**: Several competing great traditions exist usually regionally. Each locality must teach a link language for communication with other localities. Students will be educated in their own mother tongue, and also in another tongue. Examples: Belgium, Switzerland or India.

Fishman not only proposes alternatives, but discusses their consequences and points out to infelicities in each of the types of policies. In Type A policies where the LWC is chosen for education, Fishman indicates that teachers must nevertheless begin by using the mother tongue of the pupils. Another consideration for this type of language education policy is whether to adopt the curriculum and standards set where the LWC is spoken or whether to develop these indigenously. An even greater problem occurs when polities have a high rate of illiteracy. It is well known that this type of policy, where the LWC used in education is not the mother tongue, presents great difficulties for adult literacy.

But the biggest concern with this type of language education policy is precisely that it is artificial and may not result in educational success.
Fishman points, however, to the reality that many indigenous groups insist on this type of education, regardless of limitations. That is, it is not simple imposition of the most powerful that results in such language education policies. Representing the powerful standard or dialect with a capital D (before Gee, 1996) had suggested the D for his use of Discourse), Fishman writes:

The insistence on D and D only (for all students for all subjects) is potentially nonfunctional even though it may be a widely shared view rather than one imposed from without in many ways. It artificializes education to the extent that it identifies it with a variety that is not functional in the life of the community. (Fishman, 1972: 334)

Type B policies, in which the D is used for some subjects and a more indigenous variety is used for other subjects, also presents additional questions. For example, policies would have to decide what should be taught, in which language, and for how long.

**International perspectives and advantages**

In 1976, Fishman published *Bilingual Education: An International Sociological Perspective*, a book that he had been working on since 1972 when he was Visiting Professor of Sociology at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. The book includes the results of an empirical study that focuses on three specific criteria across 100 of the 1000 secondary bilingual education programs:

1. What are the averaged grades awarded across all subjects and all years of study?
2. How do bilingual secondary schools compare to monolingual secondary schools in their immediate areas serving comparable populations insofar as averaged grades are concerned?
3. How pleased are students with respect to their bilingual secondary schooling in terms of its impact on their academic, personal and social development? (Fishman, 1976: 94–95)

The resulting published work was a significant contribution to the field of bilingual education. It communicated Fishman’s (1976: ix) support for the field (‘bilingual education is “good for everybody”’). Part 1 of the book proposes and then defends the four principles in which Fishman bases his support of bilingual education:

1. bilingual education is good for the majority group;
2. bilingual education is good for the minority group;
3. bilingual education is good for education;
4. bilingual education is good for language teachers.

The arguments for bilingual education that Fishman presents in this book are eerily relevant to the needs of education because it respects the economic possibilities in bilingual education provided that equalitarian and equity aspects of bilingual education are kept in mind.

If bilingual education could serve to help each of them some degree, some via the ‘other’ group.

Fishman points out that the economic possibilities in bilingual education might see this as selfish, and allows for economic self-interest to be considered, by the teachers’ but is considered more importantly, for Americans, or other ethnic groups.

Fishman’s intention in writing the book is clearly to provide a behavioral framework for bilingual educators and to serve as a ‘single community of interest’ and to correct each other’s errors (Fishman 1976: viii). He prophesied that bilingual education is important and becomes even more relevant in the very same time that more complex languages (like English) are also gaining acceptance although they may not significantly contribute to the overall growth of bilingual education.

A significant contribution to the field of bilingual education is good for education. For example, Krashen (1996, for example) acknowledges the significant contributions in this regard by bilingual education is good for second language teaching.

Fishman (1976: 36) values the significance of bilingual education for the field. The teaching bilingual education learning for the field is invaluable.
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book are eerily relevant today. For example, Fishman supports bilingual education because it responds to multiple-group membership, a concept prevalent in post-modern scholarship. He writes: ‘Only bilingual and bicultural education provides for multiple memberships and for multiple
loyalties in an integrative fashion...’ (1976: 9). He also supports the social
equality aspects of bilingual education, saying:

If bilingual education does nothing else, it at least equalizes the children of marked- and unmarked-language backgrounds by providing each of them some instruction via their own mother tongue as well as some via the ‘other’ group’s mother tongue. (Fishman, 1976: 119)

Fishman points out that yet another advantage of bilingual education is the economic possibilities that it affords bilinguals. He notes that others might see this as selfish, and clarifies:

Economic self-interest is presumably acceptable if pursued by the oil lobby, by the teachers’ unions, and by our most reputable universities, but is considered meanly divisive if pursued by Hispanics, Native Americans, or other ethnics. (Fishman, 1989: 408)

Fishman’s intention in writing a book on international bilingual education is clearly to provide a cross-cultural dimension that would guide and lead bilingual educators everywhere, allowing them to consider themselves a ‘single community of interest, each learning from the other and correcting each other’s experimental and attitudinal limitations’ (Fishman, 1976: viii). He prophesied that bilingual education would continue to be important and become even more important as English spreads, saying:

We seem to be living in a period of world history in which a larger number of local languages are being given educational recognition at the very same time that a relatively few world languages (primarily English) are also gaining wider currency. Both of these trends, disparate though they may appear to be on the surface, are contributing to the overall growth of bilingual education. (Fishman, 1977: 31)

A significant contribution of this book is the chapter that argues that bilingual education is good for language teachers, a foreshadowing of what Krashen (1996, for example) advanced decades later as the advantage of bilingual education over TESOL. Fishman makes two important theoretical contributions in this regard: (1) that the increased contextualization provided by bilingual education is important for language learning, and (2) that second language teaching must target specific communicative functions.

Fishman (1976: 36) values bilingual education for ‘its maximization of language learning for the communication of messages that are highly significant for senders and receivers alike.’ This position is related to
Krashen’s (1979) comprehensible input hypothesis and his idea of i+1 for second language learning – representing input (i) plus a bit more (+1) than the student already knows). But Fishman’s ideas are also related to Vygotsky’s concept of scaffolding, and to what second language educators today have translated as more contextualization, relevance and immediacy (Gibbons, 2002; Walqui, 2002).

Fishman (1976: 38–39) also points out that second language learners need languages for restricted ranges of functions, and that teachers ‘ought to specify the contexts in which the student plans to use the target language.’ Furthermore:

No one knows how to speak a language appropriately in all contexts in which it is used, because no one has access to all the societal roles in which the language is used and which constrain language usage. (Fishman, 1976: 39)

In the 21st century, as we saw above, the European Union has advanced the concept of plurilingualism for all its citizens. The CLIL/EMILE pedagogy that is being developed (Baetens Beardsmore, 1999) clearly specifies language functions and targets, with second languages being used to teach only certain subjects and for certain functions.

**Critic of the Bilingual Education Act**

Although a supporter of bilingual education, Fishman makes his antipathy towards the Bilingual Education Act clear, and he denounces its monolingual goals:

The Act was primarily an act for the Anglicification of non-English speakers and not an act for Bilingualism. ‘Bilingualism’ has become a newspeak euphemism for non-English mother tongue. ‘Bilinguals’ are thus non-English mother tongue speakers; bilingual teachers are those who teach them / bilingual programs are those that Anglicify them....

The act is basically not an act for bilingualism, but rather, an act against bilingualism. [emphasis ours] (Fishman, 1989: 405)

The bilingual education programs supported by Title VII (presently Title III of No Child Left Behind) rarely have interest either in the minority language or in the minority child. Instead in many schools the only interest is the rapid acquisition of English.

About the US government’s lack of interest in developing and teaching the minority languages, Fishman (1989: 469) proposes, ‘There is no or little constructive interest among the central authorities in how well they are taught in their own language, since these learnings are not considered by national authorities to be really in the national interest.’ And about the lack of interest in the minority child, he explains:

If there are still doubts - initial instruction via the disdarded language, because of the overwhelming societal dominant language, intellectual, emotional and future of his or her minority

Fishman is interested in the teaching of the mother language precisely because of its role in the minority community. He reveals that translation programs do not have the

**Transitional vs. enrichment bilingual education**

From the very beginning, Fishman et al. point out the ethnifying aspects of transition bilingual education:

If a non-English mother tongue is not to be taught, then in true vocabulary, disease bacillus itself. A language is a language added in slow stages in the disease of the patient to throw the Beaver all-American vocabulary.

Fishman cautions that translation programs are not the minority language:

As for the ‘common garden’ bilingual education, there is a growing body of evidence that it is doing more harm than good, and its participation in the education system of academic achievement is marked. (Fishman, 1989: 469)

He refuses to give scholarly reasons as to why the learning of the second language should not be trivialized by it being the mother tongue. This is an example of instruction via the disdarded language, because of the overwhelming societal dominant language, intellectual, emotional and future of his or her minority.
loyalty, Continuity and Change. If there are still doubts as to the psycho-educational advantage of initial instruction via the minority child’s mother tongue, it is only because of the overwhelming concern for that acquisition of the societally dominant language rather than for his or her more pervasive intellectual, emotional and self-definitional development or for the future of his or her minority community. (Fishman, 1989: 468)

Fishman is interested in the protection and development of the minority language precisely because of its advantages for the minority child and the minority community. He reveals that many of the public bilingual education programs do not have the child’s best interest at heart.

**Transitional vs. enrichment bilingual education**

From the very beginning, Joshua A. Fishman stood against the trans-ethnifying aspects of transitional bilingual education. Much of the volume *Bilingual Education: International Perspectives* is devoted to speaking against transitional/compensatory models, as well as in favor of enrichment bilingual education. In Fishman’s ironic style, he conceptualizes *transitional bilingual education* as a disease and explains how it is that using the mother tongue can lead to language shift:

If a non-English mother tongue is conceptualized as a disease of the poor, then in true vaccine style this disease is to be attacked by the disease bacillus itself. A little bit of deadened mother tongue, introduced in slow stages in the classroom environment, will ultimately enable the patient to throw off the mother tongue entirely and to embrace all-American vim, vigor and stability. (Fishman, 1976: 34)

Fishman cautions that transitional bilingual education is simply bad for the minority language:

As for the ‘common garden variety’ of American transitional bilingual education, there is a growing suspicion that for the marked group child, it is doing more harm to native language mastery and to native community participation than whatever good it may be doing in terms of academic achievement, English mastery or participation in unmarked role. (Fishman, 1972a: 46)

He refuses to give scholarly attention to transitional bilingual education because it is only a small part of the education of a child. Years later, he explains that mother tongue education, should not be trivialized by evaluating merely the degree to which initial instruction via the disadvantaged language maximizes acquisition and mastery of the advantaged one. To do so is not only tantamount to
adding insult to injury; it is also to lose sight of the true relationship between language, society and culture. (Fishman, 1989: 479)

Fishman (1972a: 48) also warns that ‘[t]ransitional-compensatory bilingual education is scheduled to “self-destruct” in the not too distant future.’ He explains this self-destruction in the following way:

If it does not succeed in improving the English mastery of those assigned to it, it would necessarily be called to task, and discontinued since such improvement is its major avowed purpose. However, should it succeed in this restricted task, then it would be discontinued purportedly as being no longer necessary. The result may well be a species of the ‘double bind’ so well known in the etiology of schizophrenia, with compensatory bilingual education characterized by not having enough leverage or opportunity with respect to the dominant (Anglo) society in order to successfully negotiate progress toward economic-social-political status roles for its clientele, on the one hand, and then, in addition, not having enough of an economic-social-political base within its own ethnic environments to foster real respect, mastery and attachment to the ethnic mother tongues either. [emphasis ours] (Fishman, 1977: 23)

Fishman refers to this ‘double bind’ (‘damned if you do; damned if you don’t’) of the Bilingual Education Act throughout all his writings on the subject (see for example, Fishman, 1978). And in the 21st century, the success of the anti-bilingual education referenda in California, Arizona and Massachusetts seem to be a reflection of Fishman’s early vision regarding the difficulties that public bilingual education was to face in the future.

At the same time that Fishman (1976: 8) attacks transitional bilingual education, he advances his passion for ‘enrichment for one and all’, rather than merely as compensation for down-and-out minorities or as a group-maintenance opportunity for reawakening ones’ [emphasis ours]. In fact, he states (1976: 9): ‘It is the poor little rich kids who most desperately need bilingual and bicultural education.’ Advancing again by decades the coming of ‘English Plus,’ Fishman says: ‘In the long run it means just as much mastery of English plus more vibrant cultural pluralism, both for the minorities and for the majority as well’ (Fishman, 1976: 121).

Two-way dual language bilingual education

Joshua A. Fishman establishes that it is important for ethnolinguistic minorities to first become heard and socially equal before they can stress interdependence with majorities. Speaking of the case of the United States, Fishman proposes:

America’s non-English speaking minorities may very well have to
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place greater stress upon more effective forms of education if they can afford the equal, as a goal to aim at from the very top.

Nevertheless, Fishman has much to offer towards educational reform. There is a vision of America that, a vision of America, that we all would think of as a shared dream, and Fishman promises: ‘to crown the ocean with our children, to crown the sea.’ (Fishman, 1989: 415)

But he again warns that school systems found in the United States are not making the most of the opportunities that are available to them.

Fishman advances the view that a school system should have different linguistic profiles – enrichment or maintenance education but he warns that these approaches are not the same:

If both types of children can benefit from education that is enriched or by enrichment courses that have been attained.... However, both types of children are not restricted to the schools and their cultural or maintenance policy within communities, and Fishman argues that the enrichment policy that is available in urban life as a contribution to urban culture.

Indeed, Fishman foresees that bilingual programs are encountered in many forms and in many places, and the educational philosophy does not come only in English. Finally, he notes that Americans hold different views of what constitutes bilingual education, and with different linguistic profiles, the notion of a one-way dual language program for children of different ethnic backgrounds, and others of African descent, is a complex issue.
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place greater stress upon good bilingual education and other, even more effective forms of social protest and social equalization before they can afford the equanimity of stressing good intergroup relations as a goal to aim at from a position of strength. (Fishman, 1977: 42)

Nevertheless, Fishman has a vision that these goals of social equalization may be possible in a better future. He says:

There is a vision of American magnanimity involved, but more than that, a vision of American possibilities, opportunities, appreciations, sensitivities, that we all should savour. ‘Brotherhood’ does not mean uniformity. A shared diversity can be the true meaning of the American promise: ‘to crown thy good with brotherhood from sea to shining sea.’ (Fishman, 1989: 415)

But he again warns that school cannot go at it alone to impart this vision. Fishman advances the vision of joint schooling for students with different linguistic profiles – what we today call two-way dual language education – but he warns that this goal cannot be restricted to the schools alone:

If both types of children can ultimately wind up in the same classroom, one motivated by transitional and maintenance considerations and the other by enrichment considerations, an optimal modus vivendi will have been attained,... However, if enrichment language policy is limited or restricted to the schools alone, it will fail as surely as either transitional or maintenance policy when similarly restricted. What is needed is an enrichment policy that views the multilingualization of American urban life as a contribution to the very quality of life itself. (Fishman, 1989: 414)

Indeed, Fishman foresees the problems that two-way dual language bilingual programs are encountering in the United States today, as their enrichment philosophy does not correspond to the view of bilingualism that most US citizens hold (García, 2006).

With regard to the participation of English-speaking students in such programs, Fishman (1989: 405) warns that the 'realities of urban demography being what they are, such magnanimity does not go much beyond the co-presence of Blacks and Hispanics.' Indeed today it is mostly Latinos with different linguistic profiles who make up the student-body of two-way dual language programs. And it is students of color, African-Americans and others of African descent, but also Indians, Pakistanis and many others, who make up the English-speaking part of most two-way dual language programs.
Conclusion

Summing up the scholarly achievements of a seminal thinker like Joshua A. Fishman is a daunting task. We who have followed in his footsteps often find that it is like following a giant—we have to make a huge effort to understand what he has done, even as we recommend to our students that they read carefully, and also read between the lines. And as we compare our own meager work to his, we often find ourselves thinking that no matter what the topic is, Fishman has already taken care of it. He has already written about it, presaging later developments, laying out the groundwork. We find ourselves stumbling to make our own contributions fit, and make sense. It is this ‘Olympian overview’ that Fishman provides that makes everything else seem inconsequential—we can only provide examples from other contexts that corroborate what he has written, or at best add a detail here and there that extends his ideas into an area that was previously ignored or forgotten.

But there is another aspect of his work that makes it different from work in other disciplines or fields, and that is his tremendous humanity, his caring about languages and peoples, and the careful, avuncular mentoring he has extended to all who work in this paradigm. The atmosphere is one that encourages and fosters exploration and innovation, rather than the kind of adversarial infighting one finds in other fields and disciplines. We are grateful that we work in an area that is exemplified by this magnanimous spirit, and can encourage students to continue to read his work and learn from it.

Notes
1. In 1991, on the occasion of Joshua A. Fishman’s 65th birthday, four volumes were published in his honor. John Benjamins published three Focusschrift in Honor of Joshua A. Fishman on three different sociolinguistic topics: Bilingual Education (Ofelia García, ed.), Language and Ethnicity (J.R. Dow, ed.) and Language Planning (David F. Marshall, ed.). In addition, Mouton de Gruyter published The Influence of Language on Culture and Thought: Essays in Honor of Joshua A. Fishman’s Sixty-Fifth Birthday (Robert L. Cooper and Bernard Spolsky, eds).
2. The bibliographic inventory compiled by Gella Schweid Fishman and included in Cooper and Spolsky (1991) contained a total of 718 items. Today, the bibliographic inventory contains a listing of more than 1200 entries.
4. Fishman’s work is widely cited in the literature. A search of Google Scholar, in summer 2005, yielded 181 references. Appendix 3 lists the titles and numbers of those references attested by Google Scholar where there were two or more citations.
5. Because this volume includes (in Part 3) an exhaustive bibliography of Joshua A.
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Fishman’s work, in the references section at the end of this chapter we include only the works from which we quote directly.

6. Joshua A. Fishman received his PhD in Social Psychology from Columbia University in 1953.

7. García (1991) includes a more extensive biography of Joshua A. Fishman that readers might find helpful. Readers are also referred to Fishman, 1990.

8. For more on the role of this seminar, see Fishman (1997a) in Paulston and Tucker (eds).

9. The researchers on Auslandsdeutsche were primarily German scholars concerned with what had happened to the German language during emigration, i.e. im Ausland. The most important pioneer in this field was Heinz Kloss (Kloss, 1940).

10. It should be noted that this usage differs from Kloss (1929), who first proposed it, as well as later versions of it (e.g. Kloss, 1967). The term Eingeboren, however, is Fishman’s own.


12. This article was reprinted in 1972 in Bernard Spolsky’s The Language Education of Minority Children.
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Forster, P.G. The Esperanto Movement.


Mehrotra, R.R. Sociolinguistics.
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38 Fishman, J.A. (ed.) *From Conceptualization and Performance to Planning and Maintenance.*

41 Cooper, R.L. (ed.) *Sociolinguistic Perspective on Israeli Hebrew.*
43 Fishman, J.A. (ed.) *Face-to-Face Interaction.*

1984 45 Fishman, J.A. (ed.) *The Decade Past, the Decade to Come* (10th anniversary issue).

55 Mehrotra, R.R. (ed.) *Sociolinguistics Surveys in South East and Southeast Asia.*
56 Cooper, R.L. (ed.) *Sociolinguistic Perspectives on Theoretical and Applied Issues.*

59 Jernudd, B.H. *Chinese Language Planning: Perspectives from China and Abroad.*

68 Dow, J.R. (ed.) *New Perspectives on Language Maintenance and Language Shift I.*

1988 69 Dow, J.R. (ed.) *New Perspectives on Language Maintenance and Language Shift II.*
70 Ó Rianáin, P. (ed.) *Language Planning in Ireland.*
71 Rickford, J.R. (ed.) *Sociolinguistics and Pilgrim-Creole Studies.*
74 Coulmas, F. (ed.) *Language Planning and Attitudes.*

1989 75 Mehrotra, R.R. (ed.) *Sociolinguistics in India.*
78 Janicki, K. (ed.) *Sociolinguistics in Poland.*
80 Coulmas, F. (ed.) *Current Issues in Language Planning and Language Education.*
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82 Haarmann, H. and Hetteling, H. *German, Dutch.*
83 Coulmas, F. (ed.) *Zur Konsolidierung der Übersetzerforschung.*
84 Coulmas, F. (ed.) *Spanisch als zweiter Sprache.*
85 Pollard, V. (ed.) *Caribbean Englishes.*
86 Coulmas, F. (ed.) *Persian Studies.*
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90 Fishman, J.A. (ed.) *Yiddish.*
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98 Coulmas, F. (ed.) *Attitudes towards Language.*
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116  Coulma, F. (ed.) 'Singles' Issue: Language Politics and Accommodation.
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1997

1998
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139 Hennoste, T. (ed.) Estonian Sociolinguistics.

2000
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>An examination of the process and function of social stereotyping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>In Praise of the Beloved Language: A Comparative View of Positive Ethnolinguistic Consciousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Language maintenance and ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Introduction: Some empirical and theoretical issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Linguistic human rights from a sociolinguistic perspective (with R.E. Hamel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Language modernization and planning in comparison with other types of national modernization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Bilingual education: Current perspectives. The social science perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Critiques of language planning: A minority languages perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>English only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Advances in the Study of Societal Multilingualism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of citations</td>
<td>Publication date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Minority Languages and Agendas

In the history of ethnic minorities, consciousness of the significance of history and modus vivendi takes place much later in history and cultures. Accordingly, although not in control of major political and administrative methods of remembering their past, they often lack the formal, adversarial process to ensure the spread of information. To some extent, these efforts emerge to counter the influence of the dominant languages and institutions, and such initiatives are likely uncoordinated.

In 19th century Europe, a movement of scholarly research academies arose. By the end of that century, the academic clamor for this high level of scholarly effort grew. Although Jews, and particularly Hasidim, were actively involved in yeshivot (centers of study of sacred texts written in Hebrew, Aramaic and Yiddish), the literature of the 18th century centered on the study and development of the language of the Jewish community. The 18th century saw the language of the Jewish community, and by the beginning of the 19th century, arguments and planned for the development of the language became central to the culture of most of...