

**A Gathering of Voices, a 'Legion of Scholarly Decency',
and Bilingual Education:
Fishman's Biographemes as Introduction**

Ofelia García

The City College of New York

**1. Intra/Intertextuality and Fishman's Contribution
to Bilingual Education**

Joshua Fishman's voice in support of bilingualism, bilingual education, and cultural pluralism has been heard loud and clear in all academic arenas. His article, "A gathering of vultures, the 'Legion of Decency' and bilingual education in the USA" (1978a) denounced enemies of bilingualism. Our own gathering of voices echoes a response to those vultures, and forms "a legion of scholarly decency" in defense of bilingualism and bilingual education. As students, friends, and colleagues of Joshua Fishman, this volume pays tribute to his contribution by acting as the intertext of his bilingual education discourse.

In her *Séméotikè: Recherches pour une sémanalyse*, Julia Kristeva has said: "Every text is built as a mosaic of quotes, every text is absorption and transformation of another text" (1969: 146). Fishman's sociology of language, and his shaping of the discipline's contribution to bilingual education, is built on other texts, sometimes those of others, and sometimes his own. In Fishman's case, intertextuality many times absorbs *his own* intratextuality, for often his later texts are transformations of earlier ones (compare, for example, his views on the ethnic mother tongue school in Fishman [1988b: 363-373] with those in Fishman [1949]). Fishman himself has said: "I've never closed a

book, even though I've said I wanted to ... My old work is usually stimulating, open-ended and growing" (García 1990).

Fishman's own life has acted as an important text in the formation of his scholarly text. One can hardly understand Fishman's work without also knowing Fishman the man – the son, the student, and the father; the husband, the teacher, the grandfather, and the colleague; the Yiddish activist, the Orthodox Jew, the helping neighbor in the Bronx, and the supporter of Latino Doctoral students at Yeshiva University. "Biographèmes", defined by Roland Barthes (1953) as elements from the life of writers that are paradigmatically related to their text, are then crucial to our understanding of Joshua Fishman's work.

Inspired on Fishman's intra/intertext, and on the plural quality of his work, this volume is built as an interdisciplinary mosaic approximating an open, rather than closed, text on bilingual education. Roland Barthes has said that "To interpret a text is not to give it meaning, but it is, on the contrary, to appreciate the plurality of which it is made" (1970: 11). And so, Fishman's open text is here not explained, but "pluralized" through the contributor's different voices, different nationalities and ethnicities, their different languages, different disciplines, and their different societal realities.

Fishman's emphasis on the study of language in society parallels closely that of the father of modern linguistics and semiology, Ferdinand de Saussure. In the first decade of the 20th century, Saussure (1916: 16) identified semiology (or semiotics) as the science "which would study the life of *signs* within society" (my emphasis). Only a semiotic study of Fishman's text will now reveal his interest in the use of *language* within society, and especially in bilingual education.

2. Joshua A. Fishman's Intra/Intertext on Bilingual Education

When Joshua Fishman was asked to write his own biography, he entitled it, "My Life from My Work; My Work from My Life" (forthcoming a). Four elements of Fishman's life are important to understand his ideology on bilingual education, a philosophy dominated by the four principles that he outlined in *Bilingual Education: An International Sociological Perspective* (1976a):

- a. Bilingual education as a vehicle to support the "*little languages*" of "little people".
(“Bilingual education is good for the minority group”, p. 11.)
- b. Bilingual education to help stabilize the *functional complementarity* of the languages and cultures in society.
(“Bilingual education is good for language learning and language teaching”, p. 32.)
- c. Bilingual education as an expression of a societal arrangement for the support of true *cultural pluralism* and the development of plural intellectual and educational experiences.
(“Bilingual education is (also) good for the majority group”, p. 3.)
- d. Bilingual education as the means to promote *biliteracy* as a plural expression.
(“Bilingual education is good for education”, p. 23.)

The first two elements in Fishman's life and work (a & b above) relate to his "narrow" loyalty as a Jewish man: his *Yiddish* activism and his Jewish *neo-orthodoxy*. But the last two elements (c & d above) relate to his "broad" loyalty as a man with an intellectual contribution to humanity: his *cultural pluralism* not only in relationship to society in general, but also to the academic/intellectual community of which he is part, as well as his plurality as an avid and *biliterate writer*. Fishman's life reflects his belief that "[n]arrower and broader loyalties must coexist if mankind is to survive in time" (Fishman, 1974). When explaining his support of compartmentalized behavior between minorities and majorities in order to maintain their ethnolinguistic continuity, Fishman said: "The choice is not one between diametric opposites, but between two unaccepted (though opposite) extreme monolithic solutions, on the one hand, and an *ecclectic selection and combination of features*, on the other" (Fishman 1980b: 171, emphasis mine). Fishman's life and work attempts to combine the Ying and Yang of life, and it tries to reach that Supreme Surrealist Point where all antinomies will cease to be contradictory.

We will first turn to Fishman's "narrow loyalty", an eclectic and most often unaccepted view of what it means to be a Jew, which encompasses being both a Yiddish activist (in the tradition of secularists) and a neo-Orthodox Jew.

2.1 *The Yiddish Activist*

Fishman's commitment to the language of the Askhenazy diaspora starts in the "beehive of Yiddish" (Fishman 1981c) which was his parents' home in Philadelphia. His father, a dental mechanic from Bessarabia who had been a member of the Bund in Czarist Russia, and who continued his commitment to Socialism in the US, and his mother, who came to the US from the Ukraine, were fervent Yiddish loyalists. At home they demanded that both Shikl (Fishman's Yiddish nickname) and his sister, Rukhl, speak, read, and write Yiddish. They also organized Yiddish conferences, poetry recitals, theater performances, and other activities. (Much of their Yiddish advocacy efforts are documented in the Fishman Family Archives, The Aaron and Sonia Horwitz Fishman Collection.)

In his biographical account, Joshua Fishman has said: "I continue to try to extrapolate validly and provocatively from the supra-rational concerns, sensitivities, responsibilities, insights, fervent wishes and moral principles that I most frequently derive from 'listening to Yiddish with the third ear'" (forthcoming a: 15). It is obvious that Fishman's experience with Yiddish schools has shaped his ideology about bilingual education. His enrichment model of bilingual education, his support of certain types of bilingual schools, as well as his communicative and functional approach to second language acquisition, are derivatives of his early experience at the Workmen's Circle Schools in Philadelphia. These supplementary Yiddish schools had a linguistic and secular function. Their emphasis was on the development of the students' Yiddish, as well as on their understanding of Yiddish literature and history. At the same time, and in keeping with the narrow and broad loyalties theme, these schools had a Socialist orientation and focused on current events, especially those related to the exploitation of workers. Fishman remembers learning about the Spanish Civil War, about the major role that minority groups such as the Basques and the Catalans had in the resistance. He also remembers marching on picket lines in support of local Unions. At the same time, however, he remembers the very advanced literary program in the school and his broad exposure to literary genres and to modern Yiddish literature. These schools provided a highly intellectual forum in which to discuss social problems, as well as ideas. And he claimed that it was done "at a much higher intellectual level than in public school" (García 1990).

His experience in these schools nourished his vision of enrichment bilingual education, for he learned early that "it was possible to do well, to do *out-*

standingly well in two schools" (García 1990). And he also discovered that things that were learned in one school were easily transferred to the other.

The distinction made by Fishman and Lovas (1972) between Type III schools (Partial Bilingualism) and Type IV schools (Full Bilingualism), and their insightful discussion of these two types of schools, are also a direct result of Fishman's own schooling experience. In schools with a partial bilingual program, "literacy in the mother tongue is restricted to certain subject matter" (1972: 87). And although schools with full bilingualism programs are seen as ideal in the linguistic and psychological literature, Fishman and Lovas warn:

[A] fully balanced bilingual speech community seems to be a theoretical 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.

This criticism of an ideal full-bilingual program was a lesson learned by Fishman not in the literature, but in his early experience with schooling. The Workmen's Circle Schools focused on using Yiddish to teach Yiddish literature, history and the Socialist content of Jewish secularism. The schools did not attempt to teach all subjects in Yiddish, and yet, Fishman himself became successfully bilingual and biliterate. And thus, when it came time to think about typologies of bilingual schooling (especially applicable to the United States), Joshua Fishman did not fall into the trap of supporting an "ideal" kind of full-enrichment program. Rather, he was content with supporting an enrichment program that established particular societal roles for the minority and majority languages.

The way in which Yiddish was taught in the Workmen's Circle Schools has also supported Fishman's vision that bilingual education is "good for language learning and language teaching" (1976a: 32). In *Bilingual Education: An International Sociological Perspective* (1976a) Fishman said: "There is simply no way in which language teaching which focuses on language as a *target of instruction* can fully capture the total impact upon the learner which is available to language teaching which also capitalizes upon language as the *process of instruction*" (1976a: 36, emphasis in the original). This claim, which has been supported in research carried out in Canadian French immer-

sion programs (Cummins and Swain 1986, Lambert and Tucker 1972), was based on Fishman's own personal experience. In the Workmen's Circle Schools there was no emphasis on teaching the structure of Yiddish; children (who were mostly English speaking) were "immersed" in Yiddish and they simply "spoke it, heard it, read it and wrote it" (García 1990).

And such was the hold of Yiddish on Joshua Fishman that it became his first public language. At the age of eight he wrote his first Yiddish poetry (a genre in which his late sister, Rukhl, would later excel), and his first publication was a short story written in Yiddish in 1938 at the age of 12. And at the age of 14, Fishman became the founding editor of a Yiddish youth journal (*Ilpik*, later *Yugntruf*).

Fishman's commitment to Yiddish did not end when he graduated from the Workmen's Circle Schools. Under the sponsorship of Max Weinreich, Fishman continued taking Yiddish courses at the Yivo Institute for Jewish Research while studying for a B.S. and M.S. at the University of Pennsylvania (1944 to 1948) and while doing his doctoral work at Columbia University (1948 to 1953). During those years, he supported himself by teaching in both elementary and secondary Jewish secular schools in New York. And it is most significant that his first publication in English and his first book-length study was devoted to a Yiddish school.

"Bilingualism in a Yiddish School: Some Correlates and non-Correlates" (1949) was written for the Yivo and received the Yivo Social Science Research Award in 1950. Although it remains unpublished, it already raises the important questions about bilingualism and bilingual education that later came to dominate Fishman's work. Speaking of the waste of non-English language resources in the United States, and anticipating his 1956 call in *Language Loyalty in the US* and his 1988 position in *The Rise and Fall of the Ethnic Revival*, Fishman wrote: "America will perhaps some day realize how wasteful, in terms of human emotions, efforts and abilities, and how undemocratic, in terms of basic self-respect, freedom and equality, such a policy has been" (1949: 1).

The research methodology used by Fishman to study the Yiddish-English bilingualism of children in that particular Sholem Aleichem Folshul in 1949 also contains the key elements in Fishman's future research into the Sociology of Language. The "Bilinguality Relationship Scale" used in the 1949 study contains questions that foreshadow Fishman's now famous "Who speaks what language to whom and when": "Do your grandparents speak

Yiddish to you ... usually, sometimes, rarely or never?" "Do you speak Yiddish to your grandparents ... usually, sometimes, rarely or never?" (1949: 7). And the independent variables identified in the study: play preferences, school adjustment, family adjustment, number of friends, self-identity with nationality, and attitude toward Yiddish, are all variables that come up in numerous future studies of language and ethnicity.

It is also no accident that Fishman met his wife, Gella Schweid Fishman, at a date to discuss the possible renewal of *Yugntruf*. Gella, who married Fishman in 1951, was a Yiddish teacher at a Sholem Aleichem school and has remained the champion of Yiddish throughout their lives. And much of Fishman's vision of bilingualism and bilingual education has been shaped not only through his own schooling experience (as a student and teacher), but through Gella's, who had studied in the Jewish Teachers Seminary in Montreal. Gella's dream when they got married was to open a Yiddish school in which she would be the Head Teacher and Shikl would be the Principal (García 1990). And although that dream never materialized, the Fishman home has been school to many young Yiddish activists, and in particular, to their three sons and three grandsons. Just recently, I witnessed the development of "Kemp Fishman", a total Yiddish immersion week-long summer "camp" at the grandparents' for two of their grandsons. And the development of children's books and materials in Yiddish for the grandchildren is a continuation of their experiences as Consultants for a Title VII Bilingual Education Curriculum Center at the New York City Board of Education in the early 1970s. In 1965 Joshua and Gella Fishman established The Aaron and Sonia Fishman Foundation for Yiddish Culture Papers. This Foundation, in memory of Joshua's parents, supports projects that further the use of Yiddish by young people.

Fishman's experiences with Yiddish schooling, Yiddish language development and the relationship of Yiddish to Jewish ethnicity has informed much of Fishman's work on bilingual education, bilingualism, and the sociology of language. But yet, Yiddish itself was not an object of study until 1973, when Fishman assisted Shlomo Noble in the translation of Max Weinreich's *Geshikhte fun der yidisher shprakh* (*History of the Yiddish Language*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980). Since then, four book-long publications have related the Sociology of Language concerns that Fishman discovered through Yiddish to Yiddish itself, yielding again a dynamic continuous intertext in which *Never Say Die! A Thousand Years of Yiddish in Jewish*

Life and Letters (1981d), *Readings in the Sociology of Jewish Languages* (1985b), *Ideology, Society and Language: The Odyssey of Nathan Birnbaum* (1987a) and the forthcoming, *Yiddish: Turning to Life: Sociolinguistic Studies and Interpretations*, reflect and interact with more general and earlier works, such as *Readings in the Sociology of Language* (1968), *Advances in the Sociology of Language I & II* (1971a and 1972a), and *The Sociology of Language: an Interdisciplinary Social Science Approach to Language in Society* (1972d).

Again, Fishman's life and work provides an open and continuous intertext, in which, as in the famous Chinese boxes, one contains the other. His intellectual contribution is the work of a weaver, "a patchwork" or "a fusion" as Humpty Dumpty would have said, for Fishman himself has said: "I have never found that an initial idea was full of holes, just incomplete" (García 1990). As an experienced weaver, able to combine two worlds, two languages, two schools, he looks for the threads that unite, rather than the holes that separate; but he also looks for the different colors and textures of the threads, so that the rich cultural tapestry which he weaves is a "multisplendored" one ("The entire beast is a multisplendored thing", Fishman has said, 1976a). And thus, he can also say: "The unity of mankind is a unity of fate and not a unity of face; it is a unity of ultimate interdependence, not of ultimate identity" (Fishman 1978d: viii).

2.2 *The Neo-Orthodox Jew*

In keeping with the philosophy of not closing the book, not finding the holes but the distinct threads, Joshua and Gella Fishman moved from the secularism of Yiddish to a modern, orthodox Jewish traditionalism which does not reject Yiddish. With characteristic nonconformity, Fishman attributes their initial interest in Jewish Orthodoxy to their participation in a Sholem Aleichem summer camp ran by a Jewish secular traditionalist by the name of Lehrer. It was there that Joshua and Gella first saw the need for a life style that went beyond just a different language in order to guarantee ethnolinguistic continuity (García 1990). The change in life-style was gradual and did not fully take place until the early 1970s when the family lived in Israel (1970-1973) while Fishman participated in the Ford Foundation study of Language Planning processes in East Pakistan, India, Indonesia, and Israel.

But the Fishman's kosher kitchen and their strict compartmentalization of secular and religious behavior may be the practical realization of one of

Joshua Fishman's most important theoretical contributions. One can hardly read his definition of diglossia without thinking of the Fishman's kitchen: "[I]f 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" (1972b: 140). This is not to say that the kosher kitchen came before diglossia, because even chronologically that would be incorrect. But in Fishman's search for ethnolinguistic intergenerational continuity, he had to adopt a life-style that was clearly separate from his secular one. And orthodoxy and diglossia are thus deeply interrelated, just as his Yiddish activism and diglossia are also intertwined.

2.3 *The Cultural and Intellectual Pluralist*

Joshua A. Fishman's interest in cultural pluralism started early, when at eight years of age he began stamp-collecting, and thus learned the names (even in non-Latin letters) of the countries and their location in the map (Fishman, forthcoming a). And it was also stamp collecting that first encouraged his copious multinational correspondence, for he regularly wrote to US ambassadors all over the world requesting stamps. And to this date, Fishman does not hesitate to write to the most remote corners of the world, to the most renown international scholars, to ask for information about a particular problem, to request a contribution for a particular journal or book, to give advice and help, so that many of his own books and scholarly contributions are built on others' quotes, others' stories. For example, his forthcoming *Reversing Language Shift* required a copious and intricate correspondence with international scholars who provided the context from which the case studies were written. Fishman's intertext is not solely built on published "closed" works, but on an open dialogue with others who informally contribute to his work, comment upon it and share in the multiple revisions.

Fishman's multinational interest has allowed his broad definition of bilingual education within an international context. One of his major works on bilingual education is precisely the study of its international sociological perspective (1976a). Besides using the international context in order to enlighten the US bilingual education reality, Fishman has contributed much to its shaping. When Crosain Seamus from Ireland was asked for a personal testi-

mony bearing tribute to Joshua Fishman on his 60th birthday, he wrote: "Few Irishmen and no foreigner have contributed so significantly to the shaping and clarification of language policy in Ireland over the past few decades". In fact, Fishman has been deeply involved in the shaping of bilingual education policies in many countries of the world, especially in Ireland and most recently, in the Basque country.

In a recent interview with this author (García 1990), Fishman said: "I've cultivated the world by reading and correspondence. I've read a lot, written a lot, spoken a lot ... I'm a student of countries.... Very early on I established a file on every country and every language, and very soon I came to realize that there was non-symmetry between languages and countries". It is this early realization of the existence of language minorities in an international context, reflected in his personal situation as a Yiddish speaker in an English speaking society, that shapes Fishman's advocacy of language minorities.

It is important to underline that Fishman's fascination with cultural pluralism was not limited to an interest in an exotic international context or a multinational elite. We must remember that his early intellectual readings on the subject were those of two Jews whose theoretical stance on cultural pluralism was always applied to their immediate reality in the United States: Louis Adamic and Horace Kallen. And Fishman's early interest in cultural pluralism was also a direct result of the Socialist ideology of the Workmen's Circle Schools in Philadelphia and of the secularist Yiddish tradition. In school he engaged early in discussions of social problems, exploitation of workers, oppression of minority groups. And he recalls with affection the "Holiday of Nations" that was celebrated in the Yivo Summer Camp, with each bunk taking on the identity of a different people of the world and singing their songs in Yiddish (García 1990). This celebration of cultures, focusing not only on their surface features but also on their deep socio-historical issues, shapes Fishman's attack of what he calls the "trivializations of biculturalism that are currently common in US bilingual education programs" (Fishman 1977b: 43). This trivialization consists of portraying the marked culture only through "show and tell" items ("thingification") or costumed pageantry and "song-and-dance". These early attacks of the cultural component of bilingual education programs, or of what has become known as "multicultural education", anticipates recent criticism of this movement in the light of the anti-racist literature (see, for example, Cummins 1988, Mullard 1985, 1988). Criticizing current schools efforts in promoting biculturalism and multicultur-

ism, Fishman continues: "The basic ingredient lacking in all of the above approaches ... is the finespun web of ethnic self-beliefs, behaviors and *Weltanschauung* that are reflected primarily in intragroup life" (1977b: 43). It is the belief that "[i]n the United States tradition, *unum* and *pluribus* go hand in hand" (1989b: 652) that makes Fishman a constant critic of Title VII bilingual education and its "transitional and transethnicizing" components, and a committed supporter of the ethnic mother tongue schools.

Just as he has studied the enrichment context of international elite bilingual schools, the cultural pluralistic context of ethnic mother tongue schools in the United States has been the object of much of Fishman's scholarly attention. As early as 1964, Fishman co-authored an article with Vladimir Nahirny entitled "The ethnic group school and mother tongue maintenance in the United States", later reprinted in *Language Loyalty in the United States*. And almost twenty years later, he returned to the study of these schools (see, for example, 1980a,b and 1985a). In effect, these studies are expansions of his 1949 study of a Yiddish school.

Fishman's vision of cultural pluralism has never reduced the importance he attaches to the ethnolinguistic minority's command of the majority language. He has devoted much time to studying the spread of English (see, for example, Fishman, Cooper and Conrad 1977), at the same time that he contributes to the stabilization of English in a diglossic or triglossic pattern with other societal languages.

The international/intercultural/intereducational/interlinguistic/intertextual character of Fishman's intellectual contribution, can only be understood in the "open" and "plural" context in which he views traditional academic disciplines. Fishman (1976a) has said that bilingual education is an interdisciplinary activity. And in fact, this is just how he defines all academic and intellectual endeavors. Cultural pluralism, this time relating to the academic/intellectual society of which he is part, informs and transforms his work.

Joshua Fishman's own academic training was interdisciplinary in nature. His early training in Yiddish linguistics at the Yivo, his B.S. and M.S. in Education, his Ph.D. in Education and Social Psychology, his post-graduate work at the Social Science Research Council, prepared him early on for his interdisciplinary venture.

From the beginning of his academic career, Fishman maintained a "plural" and interdisciplinary character. During his years as Assistant Director and then Director of Research at the College Entrance Examination Board

(1955-1958), Fishman held his first teaching job in the Department of Psychology at the City College of New York. Even then, he used Bram's *Language and Society* (1955) for the course he taught on Social Psychology. When in 1958 he became Associate Professor of Psychology and Human Relations at the University of Pennsylvania and Director of Research at Albert Greenfield Center for Human Relations, he started offering a year-long course called "Human Relations and Language". This course consisted of one semester of "Psychology of Language" and one semester of what he then called "Sociology of Language".

It wasn't until 1964, after four years at Yeshiva University, when he came into contact with "official sociolinguistics" during the seminal Summer Linguistic Institute at Indiana University. Funded by the Social Science Research Council's Committee on Sociolinguistics, and chaired by Charles Ferguson, this Institute brought together the other major actors in what would be the sociolinguistic enterprise: Gumperz, Labov, Bright, Ervin, Rubin, Grimshaw, among others.

Joshua Fishman's contribution to the sociolinguistic venture has been a major one. Although he has expressed disappointment with the narrow linguistics-only approach of today's sociolinguistics, he has chosen to impact upon it by reminding linguists of the importance of "the shell", rather than by alienating "Sociology of Language". Reacting to criticism by a linguist that his work is "tantamount to cracking an egg, pouring out its contents and concentrating on its outer shell", Fishman has said:

I have never argued with this implication of peripherality ...; I have merely insisted that the shell too is part of the egg and that without it the so-called "contents" would soon be little more than an intellectually trivial, formless and lifeless mess. (Fishman, forthcoming a: 15)

And thus, rather than developing an organized and closed Sociology of Language enterprise, Fishman's interest in macro-sociological, historical and quantitative aspects of language continue to impact on sociolinguistics. His editorship of *The International Journal of the Sociology of Language* since 1974 and of the Mouton de Gruyter series on "Contributions to the Sociology of Language" are proof of his broad and encompassing definition of sociolinguistics and sociology of language.

Joshua Fishman has continuously tried to shape the interdisciplinary nature of the academic preparation required for students of Sociology of Lan-

guage. After his Deanship at Yeshiva University (the Graduate School of Education from 1960 to 1963 and Ferkauf Graduate School of Humanities and Social Sciences from 1964 to 1966), Fishman proposed the merging of Education, Liberal Arts and Behavioral and Social Sciences saying that: "[Teacher 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). His Doctoral Program in Language and Behavior (1966-1972) became the first interdisciplinary program at Ferkauf, later succeeded by the recent Ph.D. Program in Bilingual Educational/Developmental Psychology (1981-1989).

But in keeping with the narrow and broad loyalty theme in Fishman's life, his link to a Jewish institution, Yeshiva University, and to a Department of Psychology within the University, has made it difficult to develop a following of students of Sociology of Language educated to Fishman's liking. At Yeshiva University, Fishman has had to teach courses outside of the sociolinguistic enterprise to psychologists with little interest in Sociology of Language or ethnolinguistic minorities. Yet, his teaching of courses such as Medical Anthropology and Test Construction have allowed him to conserve his interdisciplinary and pluralistic focus. In recent years, the presence of the Latino Doctoral students in the Bilingual Educational/Developmental Psychology Program at Yeshiva University has been living proof of his commitment to cultural pluralism.

Academically and intellectually, Fishman's life reflects his personal *eclectic* choice as a Yiddish activist and a neo-Orthodox Jew. At Yeshiva University, colleagues in the School of Psychology found it difficult to understand his work and interest as a Psychologist/Sociologist/Linguist/Yiddish scholar. They also found it difficult to understand his commitment to ethnolinguistic minorities all over the world (and to Latinos, in particular, within the institution), at the same time that he was committed to Jewish ethnolinguistic continuity. He, however, never asked for understanding or inclusion, he merely continued to insist that history, society, culture and language be seen as an intricate part of studies of human psychology.

2.4 The Plural Writer

Joshua Fishman has been an avid writer and bold editor all of his life. When at fourteen he needed a forum for the publication of his Yiddish writing, he

did not hesitate to start a journal for children. When years later he wanted to develop a field of study which he had shaped, he did not hesitate to contact Mouton to start both a journal for the Sociology of Language, as well as a book series. One can hardly ignore the primary force of the Word in a religious sense when studying Joshua Fishman's work.

In the Hebraic and Christian tradition, "The Word was God" (John 1:1-3). In India, "the Word is the Imperishable, the firstborn of the eternal Law, the mother of the Veddas, the navel of the divine world" (Taittiriya Brahm, 2,8,4). In the same sense, Fishman, the writer, has created the reality of Sociology of Language, while at the same time conserving its plural and generative aspects. 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, forthcoming a)

Fishman's words reflect this puzzlement by the dense and poetic style which characterizes his work. Even the results of his most quantitative studies are not expressed in absolute terms, for as he said very early: "Research operations ... are never-ending, for their value resides in their provocativeness and in their fruitfulness with respect to future research" (Fishman 1959: 62). And Fishman's words constantly provoke others. He writes quickly and avidly (in long-hand before the computer age, and with two fingers at the keyboard since then), and the process often reminds us of the "automatic texts" of the Surrealist writers, who like him, were searching for the Supreme Point where all contradictions cease to exist.

Fishman's text is plural because it is a constant intra-text, and the 544-item bibliography which Gella Fishman has compiled (G. Fishman, forthcoming) bears witness to the many reprints of Joshua Fishman's work. His text is plural because it reflects others' intertext, not just that of Ancient texts such as the Bible, but even those of his contemporary colleagues whom he engages in continuous correspondence. But the plural and generative character of his writing is a direct result of his biliteracy: the concrete understanding that the Word is multiple even as a *signifiant* and certainly as a *signifié*.

During the last decade, Gella Fishman has devoted much time to the creation of the inter-generational Fishman Family Archives. Presently located in the Archives Room of the Fishman home in the Bronx, the many file cabinets

in the Joshua A. Fishman Collection bear witness to the proliferation of Fishman's written word.

3. Our Intertext on Bilingual Education

The voices in this volume interact with those of our colleague, friend and teacher, Joshua A. Fishman, in extending the plural text which informs work on bilingual education.

This is an interdisciplinary text, and thus, there are contributions of anthropologists (Trueba), linguists (Abdulaziz, Baetens Beardsmore, Bratt Paulston, Clyne, Sridhar), psychologists (Cummins, Hakuta), sociologists (Verdoodt), Yiddishists (Roskies), bilingual education policy makers (Benton, Sibayan, Zondag), bilingual education pedagogues (Casanova, Torres), as well as interdisciplinary bilingualism/bilingual education specialists (Skutnabb-Kangas, Hornberger, Mackey). It is often difficult to place the contributions and the authors within a discipline, since following Fishman, all voices are interdisciplinary, reflecting the nature of the bilingual education activity.

This text is also international in scope, containing contributions about bilingual education in Africa (Abdulaziz), Australia (Clyne), Canada (Mackey and Roskies), Friesland (Zondag), India (Sridhar), Luxembourg (Baetens Beardsmore and Lebrun), New Zealand (Benton), Philippines (Sibayan), Sweden (Skutnabb-Kangas), as well as the United States (Casanova, Cummins, Hakuta, Hornberger, Paulston, Torres). Some of the articles address policy and curricular issues with regards to the minority language, whereas others focus on the majority language. Some consider the enrichment aspect of bilingual education for some students (Clyne, Sibayan), for some ethnic communities (Mackey) and for some multilingual societies (Baetens Beardsmore); others focus on the language maintenance aspects of bilingual education for the ethnolinguistic minority (Casanova, Roskies) and on its language revitalization features (Benton, Zondag); still others look at ways in which bilingual education could stabilize the functions of the societal languages (Abdulaziz, Sridhar). All the articles, however, support bilingualism in society, and consider how bilingual education could promote that goal.

The book is divided into five sections, each reflecting a different aspect of the Sociology of Bilingual Education, and each echoing and pluralizing the words of Joshua A. Fishman that title each of the sections:

- Section I : “Ethnicity recognized and liberated”
Languages in Education: Theoretical Considerations
- Section II : “We all need rhinoceros and orangutans”
Languages in Education: Planning
- Section III : “Multilingualism for minnows and whales”
Languages in Education: Policies and Implementation in an International Context
- Section IV : “Yes, Virginia, we too have language problems”
Languages in Education: US Policies and Politics
- Section V : “The beast as a multisplendored thing”
Languages in Education: Practices

And following the plural construction of Fishman’s discourse, the epigraphs which I have placed before each of the articles echo the words which title each of the sections. The Fishman discourse is then expanded by the contributors; thus creating the plural intra/intertext which this volume attempts.

In the first section, articles by Skutnabb-Kangas and Trueba provide the *theoretical underpinnings* for the recognition of ethnicity and the inclusion of cultures, as well as languages, in education. The articles in the second section address *language planning issues* in education. Verdoodt describes a study that should precede use of regional languages in education. Two case studies of language in education planning then follow, one in three East African countries (Abdulaziz) and the other one in India (Sridhar).

The third and fourth sections contain articles that address bilingual education *policies*. The *international* context is described in section three with contributions about the past and present school policies on the use of Luxembourg (Letzeburgesch), German and French in Luxembourg (Baetens Beardsmore and Lebrun), Frisian in Friesland (Zondag), Maori in New Zealand (Benton), and Yiddish in Montreal (Roskies). The *US* bilingual education policies that have turned outright political are discussed in section four. The first two articles in this section (Casanova and Cummins) must be read as reflections of each other. The discussion of the politics of bilingual education research by Casanova and Cummins contextualize for the reader the first person account of the researcher which follows (Hakuta). The last article in this section discusses and clarifies the numerous typologies of bilingual education and portrays one successful enrichment program (Hornberger).

Practices of bilingual education are discussed in the last section. The first two articles of this section, present two successful experimental programs to promote bilingualism, one in Acadia, Canada (Mackey), and the other in Australia (Clyne). The article which follows (Torres) discusses active pedagogy within the bilingual education classroom. Finally, the last two articles focus on children’s acquisition of English. One is a first person account by a major Philippine language planner of his own education through English (Sibayan). The other is a brave attempt by a Swedish American to discuss language practices within the bilingual classroom and their relationship to children’s acquisition of English (Paulston).

A word must be said about my own voice as it has been influenced by reading Fishman’s work. I was a Fellow in the NEH Seminar that Fishman conducted at Yeshiva University in 1981. Since then I have been involved in the Ph.D. Program in Bilingual Educational/Developmental Psychology at Yeshiva University, teaching occasional courses on Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, helping students complete Pre-Doctoral Projects and Doctoral Dissertations, but most of all, continuing to learn from Joshua Fishman. In the last decade, he has provided me with more guidance and support than I had a right to expect, meeting with me frequently, discussing my work, sharing his, sending me articles, giving me books.

Since 1980 I have taught in the School of Education at City College in New York. It might be a coincidence that Fishman’s first full-time academic job was, like mine, at City College, and that the Chair of my Department, Miriam Dorn, had been the Fishman’s eldest son’s Kindergarten teacher and shares with Gella a Yiddish Canadian experience. But beyond these coincidences, the multiple magic boxes of Fishman’s life and work continue to give meaning to mine. As the wife of a linguist, Ricardo Otheguy, and mother of three bilingual children, Eric, Raquel, and Emma, as a Latina born in Cuba who grew up in a Hispanic neighborhood in New York City, I have often gathered strength as a wife, mother, ethnic advocate, and committed bilingual educator from the Fishman’s family context, and especially from Gella. The best lesson learned has been the human one.