Editors' Foreword[1]

Adam Głaz
Maria Curie-Skłodowska University (UMCS), Lublin, Poland
Issa Kanté
University of La Réunion, DIRE research unit

A medium through which individuals and groups act and interact in the social world (Thompson), language is also a semiotic vehicle for the production and circulation of ideologies and worldviews. In the era of globalization, marked by an explosion of digital communication, and an unprecedented progress in information technology, linguistic ideologies and linguistic worldviews are being constructed and expressed in new contexts. This special issue of *Alizés* 46 brings together studies of language, culture, discourse, linguistic worldview and linguistic ideology, with a particular focus on the insights that emerge when languages, cultures and discursive practices are compared and contrasted. The study of language(s), worldview(s) and ideology/ies is particularly needed in our current world which is becoming more and more language-driven. A political speech, an interview, a diplomatic statement, or even a single social-media post can dramatically influence the international stage, reshape geopolitical relations, affect markets and global trade or lead to the escalation (or de-escalation) of conflicts. The issue explores how linguistic ideologies (cf. Irvine and Gal; Kroskrity; Silverstein; Woolard and Schieffelin, among others) and linguistic worldviews (cf. Bartmiński; Głaz; Hill and Mannheim; Levisen; Underhill, and others) are interrelated at the social, cultural, cognitive and discursive levels in English-speaking contexts with other linguacultural and social contexts through comparison and contrast. Adopting various theoretical approaches and interdisciplinary perspectives, the contributions examine the semiotic, socio-cultural and cognitive processes (social relations, languages and cultures in contact, translation, education, etc.) within which linguistic ideologies and linguistic worldviews are (re)produced and negotiated.

What do we Mean by Linguistic Ideology and Linguistic Worldview?

The notion of "linguistic ideology" is associated with Michael Silverstein's seminal article *Language Structure and Linguistic Ideology*, in which he defines the concept as "any sets of beliefs about language articulated by the users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use" (Silverstein 193). This definition primarily concerns "ideologies about language," as illustrated in Kizzi Edensor and Christelle Exare's contribution to this issue. However, as Woolard and Schieffelin point out, language ideologies also relate to other social, cultural and philosophical phenomena, such as identity, aesthetics, morality, universality and authenticity, as illustrated, in different ways, by James Underhill's contribution and by Ajšić and Vessey's volume reviewed by Miki Mori. As Woolard argues, it is crucial to distinguish ideologies *about* language itself from "ideologies encoded *in* or *through* language." It is also theoretically relevant to consider the relationship between the broader concept of "ideology" and the more specific notion of "linguistic ideology." In Critical Discourse Studies (Schiffrin, Tannen and Hamilton, eds.; Reisigl and Wodak; Van Dijk), ideology is "a perspective (often

[1] DOI: 10.61736/alizes.517

one-sided), i.e. a worldview and a system composed of related mental representations, convictions, opinions, attitudes, values and evaluations, which is shared by members of a specific social group" (Reisigl and Wodak 25). This explicit connection between ideology and worldview echoes Hill and Mannheim's (382) observation that, in many theoretical studies, "where 'world view' would once have served, 'ideology' is often heard, suggesting representations that are contestable, socially positioned, and laden with political interest."

This view also recalls Silverstein's discussion of the Whorfian principle of referential projection or objectification, which constitutes "the basis of what he variously calls the 'world view,' the 'habitual thought patterns,' or the 'natural logic' of speakers" (Silverstein 200–201). He describes this theoretical inclination as "the natives' ideology" regarding the use of their language as a propositional system to represent and talk about things in the world. More broadly, Silverstein (203) views language use as "contextualized social action," which he aligns as the same order of phenomena as any other cultural behavior. He therefore asks whether speakers have a set of beliefs through which they rationalize the use of particular linguistic forms in order to achieve certain socially-understood purposes in certain socially-understood contexts (Silverstein 204). Green-Eneix and Kroskrity (174–175) conceptualize this vision as the "mediational function of language ideologies" through which speakers use ideologies as resources to operate between social structures, language structures and contextualized real-world practices. Kroskrity's recent notion of "language ideological assemblages" further articulates this enlarged perspective. He describes them as dynamic configurations of human actors and their beliefs, feelings and conceptions about language(s) and communication, expressed within individual milieus and the intersubjective worlds, influenced by institutions, political economic structures, state power, technologies, global systems, as well as mediated, mediatized and multimodal forms of expression (Kroskrity 139).

Thus, the papers in this special issue offer new empirical insights into both Silverstein's conception of language as a contextualized social action and Kroskrity's notion of the mediational function of language ideologies. Ina Sîtnic's translation study in this volume, for instance, shows how ideologies concerning taboo language, identity, social hierarchies and subculture operate between linguistic and social structures and contextualized real-world practices. Similarly, Verita Sriratana's study of the use of art, language and parody as tools for transforming the fear of necropower into collective ridiculing laughter – rendering tyranny laughable – demonstrates how ideological beliefs, or more broadly worldviews, mediate linguistic and other semiotic forms to achieve socio-political purposes in specific socio-historical contexts.

The issue's comparative goal between linguistic ideologies and linguistic worldviews needs to be pursued, particularly in light of Brown's characterization of the two notions. He argues (49) that a worldview is "what is believed to be true" whereas an ideology is "what is believed to be right." We do not consider linguistic ideology and linguistic worldview as synonymous concepts, but rather focus on their intersection. Głaz's (*Linguistic Worldview(s)*; "Worldview as Cultural Cognition") perspective on worldview does not exclude the interconnections between the two notions (although the author does not specifically address the concerns that arise with respect to linguistic ideology), particularly if we take into account Woolard's distinction regarding "ideologies *about* language itself" and "ideologies encoded *in* or *through* language." Głaz defines worldview as "the cognitive orientation of an individual or a community, an understanding of the relationship between that individual or community and the world," while linguistic worldview refers to "the view of the world as it is entrenched in language" (Głaz, "Worldview as Cultural Cognition" 35). To complicate matters further, "language" can mean the language system (its lexicogrammatical structure) or its use in specific social and discursive situations – or, as Anthony Webster shows in his analysis of Navajo poetry, a common space within which speakers construct and express meanings.

This perspective is widely shared in this volume, particularly in Roslyn Frank's, James Underhill's, Iwona Kraska-Szlenk's, Anna Wyrwa's, and Adam Głaz's papers. They investigate to what extent language encodes interpretations of reality to symbolize, shape and construct speakers' cultural and social experiences, conceptualizations of things and the relationships between individual language users or communities. Based on Kroskrity's concept of dynamic and mediational dimensions of language ideologies and Głaz's characterization of linguistic worldview, can we consider linguistic ideologies as one of the mechanisms through which linguistic worldviews may be articulated and reproduced?

Why comparisons and contrasts?

Though adopting different strategies and perspectives, the papers in this volume contribute in their own ways to the debate on contrastive and comparative studies of linguistic ideologies and linguistic worldviews. The distinction between the two concepts also points to the importance of comparison and contrast. We believe that ideologies and worldviews cannot be entirely understood by examining languages in isolation, since meanings and functions emerge in relation to human cognition, cultures, social and historical events and their contexts. A contrastive approach (see Kraska-Szlenk; Frank; Wyrwa; and Sîtnic, this volume) enables us to identify and make salient not only correspondences between linguistic systems and conceptualizations, but also their dissimilarities. Thus, the volume offers multidimensional perspectives on comparison and contrast: across languages (English–Swahili, English–Basque, English–Polish and English–Romanian); across cultures (Western/Anglo, Indian, Basque, Polish, Thai, Romanian and African worldviews and ideological perspectives); and across domains and practices (ethnolinguistics, education, translation, literary discourse, parliamentary discourse and political protest). Comparing and contrasting ideologies and worldviews across languages and cultures is an effective approach for finding subtle cognitive-pragmatic differences between them. For instance, Iwona Kraska-Szlenk's analysis shows how in Western cultures (illustrated through American English in her study) time is often reified and then metonymically conceptualized as "a precious thing," while in Swahili linguaculture, the reification of time (*wakati*) is very rare, particularly for an individual's benefit. In a broader comparative approach, Underhill's study brings different fields of research into dialogue; he contrasts the Western tradition of keywords and cultural keywords with the Anglo-Indian perspective to highlight their mutual influence in the reformulation of worldviews.

Thus, the comparative and contrastive approach adopted here does not dilute or demote the weight of any specific worldview or ideological perspective, English-based or otherwise. Rather, we hope it does the opposite: implications, significances and meanings are brought into relief when viewed against a backdrop. A figure needs a background to be such.

The Contributions

The contributions to this special issue have addressed questions concerning linguistic ideologies and linguistic worldviews, as well as their relations with cultures, languages, cognition, power relations, politics and translation. The versatile nature of ideologies and worldviews has been examined in relation to historically colonized contexts, linguacultural contacts, translation practices and higher education. The issue offers both theoretical and empirical studies of linguistic ideologies and linguistic worldviews, highlighting their convergent and divergent patterns across socio-cultural, linguistic, political and geographical spaces. Different discursive genres and forms of figurative language (namely metaphorical conceptualizations, cf. Goatly; Underhill) have also been examined, particularly in political and literary discourse. The issue comprises seven research papers, one critical review paper of a book, followed by the author's response, and a classical book review.

It opens with **James W. Underhill**'s theoretical reflection on the status of keywords in cultural settings. His paper offers a broad perspective on the study of cultural keywords and the changing paradigms through which they are approached. Examining the developments in translation studies, cultural studies, anthropology, linguistic anthropology and ethnolinguistics, Underhill highlights the need for a linguistically informed critique of universals and engages with four major approaches: Anna Wierzbicka's Natural Semantic Metalanguage, Barbara Cassin's Untranslatables, Jerzy Bartmiński's Lublin School of Ethnolinguistics and the JOS Linguistic Worldviews for Europe project, as well as Underhill and Gianninoto's Migrating Meanings project. Advocating a necessary return to Raymond Williams's engaged approach to social, cultural and political worldviews, Underhill also considers work on cultural keywords in India, particularly Nair and deSouza's *Keywords for India*. The paper broadens the comparative perspective beyond established Anglo-Western approaches and asks how keywords and sociolinguistic resources and repertoires such as *nirvana*, *yoga* and *karma* can contribute to the expression and reformulation of worldviews in local, global and glocal contexts.

Iwona Kraska-Szlenk's contribution provides a corpus-based contrastive analysis of the conceptualization of time in Swahili and English. From the analysis of conceptual metaphor TIME IS MONEY as a strong cultural model of American English and Western culture, Kraska-Szlenk examines the extent to which this metaphor is entrenched in Swahili in East and Central Africa. Using corpus-based quantitative and qualitative methodology, her study contrasts concordances and collocations of the Swahili lexeme *wakati* 'time' with those of the English lexeme *time*. The findings reveal significant differences in the conceptualization of time in the two languages, and show that the differences are congruent with sociocultural practices in the respective speech communities.

Roslyn M. Frank's contrastive analysis of dialogic and monologic subjectivity in Basque and English brings another dimension to the comparative study of linguistic worldviews. It examines how different linguistic features contribute to contrasting forms of subjectivity, based on the Basque notion of *elkarrekikotasuna* and its connection to Bakhtin's notion of dialogic addressivity. Three significant cross-linguacultural differences are analyzed, namely: aspects of the demonstrative systems of Basque and English, contrasting fixed expressions in each language, and Basque allocutivity, which morphosyntactically enables the identification of the gender of the addressee. The comparison of these linguacultural features shows how linguistic structures can provide speakers with different resources to construe interpersonal relations and culturally conceptualized forms of subjectivity.

The joint paper by **Kizzi Edensor** and **Christelle Exare** shifts the discussion from linguistic worldview to linguistic ideology in the context of English as a Foreign Language in France. Based on data collected through a questionnaire in 25 French universities, the paper analyzes the role of linguistic ideologies in current English phonology teaching in French higher education. It reveals that prescriptive practices remain dominant, since English phonology courses often rely on native-speaker models and written standards, while linguistic variations are not taken into consideration. These practices are sustained by institutional policies and an ideology, which favor the primacy of written forms (the Guierre School). The paper further illustrates how linguistic ideologies are reproduced, negotiated, but also contested, within the higher-education system in France. There is a need for pedagogical approaches that give greater value to linguistic diversity, and better reflect the actual usage of English.

Ina Sîtnic's translation study focuses on the relationship between taboo language, linguistic ideology, cultural identity and worldview in *Pimp: The Story of My Life* by Robert Beck (Iceberg Slim) and its Romanian translation by Mihnea Gafita. It examines how taboo language in African American Vernacular English conveys social hierarchies, identity and subcultural ideologies. These uses reflect broader linguistic worldviews. The Romanian version of the

novel preserves the source text's worldview, adapts culturally specific expressions, and maintains the narrative voice's expressive and performative force. The analysis shows how translation negotiates social attitudes, power relations and constructions of identity.

Anna Wyrwa studies how worldview encoded in a source text is reconstructed through translation into the target text. She focuses on metaphors deliberately used in the discourse of Polish MEPs during EU parliamentary debates to understand how they are remodeled when translated into English. Although most of the source-text metaphors are translated into English through formally similar mappings, they do not necessarily reproduce the worldview expressed in the source text. Differences in conventionality, stylistic markedness and cultural associations may alter different dimensions of that worldview. The resulting target-text worldviews are analyzed as hybrid formations shaped by the speaker, translator and target recipient. Anna Wyrwa's contribution shows the importance of translation as a site where linguistic worldviews are mediated, transformed and negotiated across languages.

Verita Sriratana's contribution pursues the comparative perspective of the issue to study language, art and humor in political resistance. It compares what at first glance look like very different contexts, both geographically and culturally: Poland's Orange Alternative (*Pomarańczowa Alternatywa*) and Thailand's youth-led pro-democracy movement. The author analyzes the use of language and parody as tools to transform the affective atmosphere of fear induced by the authorities of necropower into collective ridiculing laughter. Humor is not simply a form of entertainment but emerges as a way to challenge political authority and render tyranny laughable. The comparison also shows the mediational function of linguistic and semiotic practices in specific sociopolitical contexts. Ideological beliefs and worldviews are articulated through artistic, linguistic and parodic forms, which can in turn contribute to collective action and resistance, such as pro-democracy causes, as well as feminist and LGBTQINA+ rights campaigns. This surprising but eye-opening comparison between Poland and Thailand demonstrates how similar practices of linguistic and artistic subversion may emerge in distinct historical and political contexts.

Although this article compares two non-Anglophone countries (Poland and Thailand), it engages with English Studies in various ways. It examines how the Anglophone literary and cultural world is used as a repertoire of resistance in non-Anglophone contexts, and explores English as a semiotic resource for international visibility through parody, intertextuality, and translation. For instance, Thai activists, in their struggle to abolish the *lèse-majesté* law, projected themselves as Harry Potter fighting their own version of Lord Voldemort. Other Anglophone semiotic forms are also analyzed: the three-finger salute (an allusion to *The Hunger Games*); Bob Marley's famous reggae song *No Woman, No Cry*, which becomes *No Woman, No Kraj* (*kraj* means "country" in Polish); and the reference to Lady Gaga's *Born This Way* in Thailand's post-Marriage Equality Pride celebrations. The article, grounded in a postcolonial theoretical framework, articulates the key notion of "epistemic violence" with Spivak's concept of "worlding" and Mbembe's "necropolitics."

Through **Adam Głaz**'s critical review paper of Carsten Levisen's *Postcolonial Semantics* – followed by Levisen's response – this special issue turns explicitly to the question of linguacultural worldviews in postcolonial contexts. Głaz's review underlines the originality of Levisen's engagement with the linguacultural sphere of Bislama in Vanuatu and his "semantics of listening and understanding." He then questions some of the book's assumptions and/or proposals and invites further discussion within linguaculture, worldview, linguistic semantics and postcolonial reality.

In his response, **Carsten Levisen** answers some of the main questions raised by Głaz, and welcomes the dialogue by pointing out the potential for comparative research between the South Pacific and the Indian Ocean. He does not, however, accept or agree with all the points articulated by the reviewer, inviting further discussion. Thus, the review and the response

broaden the issue's comparative horizon towards future postcolonial and multipolar perspectives on meaning-making and linguacultural worldviews.

The last contribution to the special issue is **Miki Mori**'s book review of Adnan Ajšić and Rachelle Vessey's edited volume *Current Approaches to Language Ideology and Metalinguistic Discourse* (2025). She argues that the volume brings together innovative and empirically grounded approaches to the field, and constitutes a timely and substantial contribution to contemporary debates on language ideology research. The review highlights the relevance of the book for both scholars working on language ideology and readers who may be interested in the analytical scope or methodological foundations of the concept. Mori's review provides a valuable final point of reference for this special issue and reaffirms the growing importance of language ideology as a field of theoretical and empirical inquiry.

Conclusion

Taken together, the contributions to this special issue demonstrate that linguistic ideologies and linguistic worldviews are not fixed linguacultural systems or forms. They emerge from historical contacts and interactions between languages, cultures, institutions, communities and individuals, which enable their reproduction, transformation and evolution through discursive practices (in Fairclough's broad sense 72–93) and other semiotic practices. The issue's call for comparisons and contrasts is not simply for methodological procedures, but also for empirical tools to test assumptions and uncover embedded values or underlying conceptualizations that may remain unperceived when linguistic and cultural practices are considered in isolation. In this perspective, the issue has not sought to provide a unified analysis of linguistic ideologies and linguistic worldviews, but has attempted to bring different approaches into dialogue. It thus invites further research to explore the evolution of linguistic worldviews and ideologies, their interactions and mediational functions across languages, cultures and sociopolitical contexts.

Bibliography

Ajšić, Adnan, and Rachelle Vessey, editors. *Current Approaches to Language Ideology and Metalinguistic Discourse*. 1st ed., Routledge, 2025.

Bartmiński, Jerzy. *Aspects of Cognitive Ethnolinguistics*. Equinox, 2009.

Brown, Jason. "Ideologies, Worldviews, and Personalities." *Reflective Practice of Counseling and Psychotherapy in a Diverse Society*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2019, p. 33-52.

Fairclough, Norman. *Discourse and Social Change*. Polity, 1992.

Głaz, Adam. "Worldview as Cultural Cognition." *LaMiCuS - Language, Mind, Culture and Society*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2017, p. 34-50.

Głaz, Adam. *Linguistic Worldview(s): Approaches and Applications*. Routledge, 2022.

Goatly, Andrew. *Washing the Brain: Metaphor and Hidden Ideology*. John Benjamins, 2007.

Green-Eneix, Curtis A., and Paul V. Kroskrity. "Diversifying the Concept of Language Ideologies, and Exploring Their Assemblages: A Dialogue With Paul V. Kroskrity." *Journal of Education, Language, and Ideology*, vol. 3, no. 1, Aug. 2025, p. 171-190, https://doi.org/10.67372/hz72pq37.

Hill, Jane H., and Bruce Mannheim. "Language and World View." *Annual Review of Anthropology,* vol. 21, 1992, p. 381-406.

Irvine, Judith T. and Susan Gal. "Language Ideology and Linguistic Differentiation." *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Polities, and Identities,* edited by Paul Kroskrity. Santa Fe, N.M.: School of American Research Press, 2000, p. 35-83.

Kroskrity, Paul. “Language Ideological Assemblages within Linguistic Anthropology.” *Crossing Borders, Making Connections: Interdisciplinary Linguistics*, edited by A. Burkette and T. Warhol, Mouton de Gruyter, 2021, p. 129-141.

Levisen, Carsten. *Postcolonial Semantics. Meaning and Metalanguage in a Multipolar World*. De Gruyter, 2024.

Mbembe, Achille. *Necropolitics*. Translated by Steven Corcoran, Duke University Press, 2019.

Nair, Rukmini Bhaya, and Peter Ronald deSouza, editors. *Keywords for India. A Conceptual Lexicon for the 21st Century.* Bloomsbury Publishing, 2020.

Reisigl, Martin, and Wodak Ruth. “The Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA).” *Methods of Critical Discourse Studies*, edited by Wodak Ruth and Meyer Michael. 3rd revised edition. London: Sage, 2016, p. 23-61.

Schiffrin, Deborah, Deborah Tannen, and Heidi E. Hamilton, editors. *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis.* Blackwell, 2001.

Silverstein, Michael. “Language Structure and Linguistic Ideology.” *The Elements: A Parasession on Linguistic Units and Levels*, edited by Paul Clyne, William F. Hanks, and Carol L. Hofbauer, *Chicago Linguistic Society*, 1979, p. 193-247.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. “The Rani of Sirmur: An Essay in Reading the Archives.” *History and Theory*, vol. 24, no. 3, 1985, p. 247-272.

Thompson, John B. “Language and Ideology: A Framework for Analysis.” *The Sociological Review*, vol. 35, no. 3, 1987, p. 516-536.

Underhill, James W. *Creating Worldviews: Metaphor, Ideology and Language.* Edinburgh University Press, 2011.

Underhill, James W., and Mariarosaria Gianninoto. *Migrating Meanings. Sharing Keywords in a Global World*. Edinburgh University Press, 2019.

Van Dijk, Teun A. “Politics, Ideology, and Discourse.” *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics*, 2nd ed., edited by Keith Brown, vol. 9, Elsevier, 2006, p. 728-740.

Webster, Anthony K. *Intimate Grammars: An Ethnography of Navajo Poetry*. University of Arizona Press, 2015.

Wierzbicka, Anna. *Understanding Cultures through Their Key Words*. Oxford University Press, 1997.

Williams, Raymond. *Keywords. A Vocabulary on Culture and Society*. 1976. Oxford University Press, 1983.

Woolard, Kathryn A. “Language ideology.” *The International Encyclopedia of Linguistic Anthropology*, 2020, p. 1-21.

Woolard, Kathryn A., and Bambi Schieffelin. “Language Ideology.” *Annual Review of Anthropology*, vol. 23, 1994, p. 55-82.