REFERENCES

Cheung, Man-Chung (2022). The upside for internet user growth remains high in Southeast Asia. *Insider Intelligence*, May 10. Online: https://www.insiderintelligence.com/content/upside-internet-user-growth-remains-high-southeast-asia.

Mojares, Resil B. (1983/1998). *Origins and rise of the Filipino novel: A generic study of the novel until 1940.* Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.

Ng, Bee Chin, & Francesco Cavallaro (2019). Multilingualism in Southeast Asia: The post-colonial language stories of Hong Kong, Malaysia and Singapore. In Simona Montanari and Suzanne Quay (eds.), *Multidisciplinary perspectives on multilingualism*, 27–50. Berlin: De Gruyter. Online: https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501507984-003.

(Received 10 February 2024)

SIMO K. MÄÄTTÄ & MARIKA K. HALL (eds.), *Mapping ideology in discourse studies*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2022. Pp. 289. Pb. € 20.

Reviewed by KRISTOF SAVSKI
Faculty of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University
15 Karnjanavanich, 90110 Hat yai, Thailand
kristof.s@psu.ac.th

If one were compelled to make a list of core concepts in the array of fields that are in different ways concerned with the relationship between language and society—including not only sociolinguistics but also fields adjacent to it and partly overlapping with it, such as applied linguistics, linguistic anthropology, critical discourse studies, or language policy—a concept that would more than likely appear near the top would be ideology. Reflecting the growing visibility of 'critical' approaches to sociolinguistics, the word ideology for instance appeared in some form in nearly half (forty-three out of ninety-one) of the texts published in *Language in Society* in the twelve months leading up to the time this review was written. While there is thus already a significant amount of literature on ideology available, the concept appears to be so central to the study of language that it merits further work, such as in the form of the edited volume examined in this review. Approaching such a volume as a reader is a challenge, and indeed more so as an editor, considering the broad array of theories, frameworks, and approaches relevant to ideology that can be found across fields like those mentioned above, as well as the different settings in which ideology is investigated and the different methods which such investigations make use of.

Considering the challenging nature of writing about ideology, the general observation must be made that the book does a good job of representing the diversity of its subject, particularly when compared to the mainstream of contemporary scholarship. In this book, this is particularly the case with Francophone theories of ideology, which like other scholarly traditions emerging from spaces outside the

Anglosphere tend to remain on the periphery of mainstream scholarship on language and society despite its commitment to epistemological diversity (see e.g. Kubota 2020). Going significantly beyond widely used concepts like 'governmentality', the book features four chapters with a strong Francophone focus (by Simo K. Määttä, Samuel Vernet, Mariem Guelloz, and Nadia Louar), and is thus potentially a valuable resource for readers with an interest in this tradition of research on ideology. Another area where the book does a good job of representing diversity is when it comes to the types of settings in which ideology is examined, as well as with regard to the data that is used to examine it. Ideology is discussed against the background of language debates (Louar), language teaching (Vernet), immigration debates (Jef Verschueren), applied linguistics research (Elizabeth R. Miller), translation of academic literature (Jyrki Kalliokoski & Anne Mäntynen), child protection services (Eleanor Lutman-White & Jo Angouri), interpreting and mediation in healthcare (Raquel Lázaro Gutiérrez & Jesús Manuel Tejero González), as well as a meta-analysis of how the twin concepts of ideology and discourse are used in language research (Brett A. Diaz & Marika K. Hall). In line with this diversity of settings, a number of methodological approaches are also represented, including the type of textual analysis (e.g. of media data) associated with critical discourse studies, the detailed interactional analysis typical of sociolinguistics, as well as engagements with the semiotic landscape beyond language.

Overall, the book sets itself the goal of 'contribut[ing] to theoretical and methodological knowledge about the manifestations of discourse and ideology' (2). A key issue it thus highlights are the often blurry lines between these two widely used concepts, in particular in cases where discourse is used to refer to the semiotic practices associated with an ideology, with the two in turn rapidly adopted in scholarly shorthand as near-synonyms (e.g. 'neoliberal discourse' used interchangeably with 'neoliberal ideology' or 'neoliberalism'). Since the book is an edited collection, it does not offer a single, comprehensive framework (nor does it pretend to), but individual chapters do provide insight into how the concepts may be separated, or indeed whether such a separation is feasible. Teun A. van Dijk, drawing on a significant body of work on the issue, makes a clear distinction between discourse as 'text or talk in their communicative, cognitive and sociopolitical and cultural contexts' (140) and ideology as part of social cognition, the knowledge we share as members of society. Such a differentiation appears clear-cut, since it directs empirical attention to the analysis of 'discourse' (products of semiosis) as manifestations of ideology. However, as discussed by Diaz & Hall, even here difficulties arise when considering the close relationship between thought and meaning-making—is it really sensible to separate ideologies as abstract systems and discourse as concrete manifestations?

The conceptualization of ideology and its (non)differentiation from meaning-making is an aspect that merits reflection from a sociolinguistic perspective at a time when the term has become so widely used. The key question is how the way that it is conceptualized reflects (or does not reflect) wider thinking in the field,

Language in Society **53**:4 (2024)

759

and whether present use of the concept lends greater understanding to this wider thinking. Here, it seems apparent that a gap may be emerging between understandings of ideology as abstract system and the increasingly intense focus of sociolinguistics on the study of agency and dynamicity in language. While translanguaging seems to have for instance acquired great popularity as a result of its 'trans-' orientation—referring to the rejection or relativization of the notion of bordered languages—it is arguably just as crucial to reflect on the implications of its use of the '-ing' ending. This positions language as dynamic and continuously emergent from human action, rather than as a system which exists 'out there' for speakers to draw upon and researchers to study (for a discussion of the background to this, see Li Wei 2018). In Savski (2023), I compared this to the view of 'culture as a verb' proposed by Street (1993), highlighting the inherent instability of what is defined as 'languages' in interaction. From this perspective, we might ask whether current uses of ideology as a concept have followed such an example—are we on the cusp of embracing a view of 'ideology as a verb'? If ideologies are seen as 'socially shared systems of beliefs' (140), do our frameworks acknowledge the inherent instability of such beliefs, the fact that they are open to continuous renegotiation and contestation, or the fact that they do not exist 'out there' separately from meaning-making practices (discourse)?

As a whole, this book makes a meaningful contribution to the resolution of such questions, being much more than a series of chapters dedicated to the 'naming and shaming' of an assorted variety of '-isms'. Guellouz's examination of self-immolation as necropolitical performance, an illuminating discussion of political resistance in Tunisia, is one such case. This chapter looks at how the body can serve as part of the semiotic assemblage mobilized in protest, bringing attention to the acts of defiance that occur around every ideology and underlining the reality that the hegemonic 'common sense' referred to by Gramsci (1971) is not a static formation but a site of continuous struggle. Another notable chapter in this sense is Miller's discussion of ideologies of research in applied linguistics, which engages with the question of how contemporary discourse-focussed research in applied linguistics reproduces materializing and essentializing notions of what qualifies as 'data'. This points to a further key issue in the study of ideology, namely that any such research is in itself ideological, both in the manner that we approach our subject in an empirical sense and in the ways in which our doing such research helps maintain the ideological regimes structuring our professional field. At a time when many questions are being asked in academia about the way that our scholarship can be opened up and moved beyond traditional gate-keeping practices, such a renewed, nuanced focus on ideology is particularly crucial.

REFERENCES

Gramsci, Antonio (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
Kubota, Ryuko (2020). Confronting epistemological racism, decolonizing scholarly knowledge: Race and gender in applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics* 41(5):712–32.

Li Wei (2018). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics* 39(1):9–30.

Savski, Kristof (2023). (Trans)languaging, power and resistance: Bordering as discursive agency. *Language in Society* 1–23. doi: 10.1017/S004740452300012X.

Street, Brian (1993). Culture is a verb: Anthropological aspects of language and cultural process. In David Graddol, Linda Thompson, & Michael Byram (eds.), *Language and culture*, 23–43. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

(Received 2 November 2023)