5

Discourse and Ideology—Why Do We Need Both?

Simo K. Määttä

5.1 Introduction

The uneasy relationship between the concepts of discourse and ideology puzzles most scholars in critical language studies at some point in their career. Indeed, why do we have both *racist ideologies* and *racist discourse*, whereas we prefer to talk about *feminist discourse* rather than *feminist ideology*? And while we can explain *language ideologies* as “cultural conceptions of the nature, form and purpose of language” (Gal and Woolard 1995: 130), we cannot define *racist ideologies* as cultural conceptions of the nature, form, and purpose of racism or race—we would rather define such ideologies as, for instance, *misguided* cultural conceptions of the nature of humankind. Most of us accept *discourse* and *discourses* to be present in all language but many of us consider ideology or ideologies to reside with varying degrees in different discourses. And while we often find discourse to be a concept that is easier to operationalize than ideology when analyzing the data, we prefer ideology as an analytical tool when that data is *about* language—when we examine *language ideologies*.

While these concerns typically dissipate as our careers advance, they reappear once in a while when we teach introductory courses. Typically, we then put the problem aside as unsolvable and adopt provisional solutions such as deliberately using both concepts without a clear distinction, or making ad hoc distinctions that work within a clearly defined discipline or only in the cases that are being examined. Sometimes we also argue that such difficulties and transgressive practices are enriching and even empowering: certain paradigms show their strength precisely by contesting normative definitions.

A self-reflective analysis of the researcher’s position vis-à-vis the objects of inquiry and the research activity itself is an important component of

both critical discourse analysis and linguistic anthropology. Indeed, the examination of the ways in which theoretical concepts, analytical tools, and the very foundations of disciplines are formed, reshaped, or rejected provides crucial information about the general nature of knowledge production in the past, present, and perhaps also in the future. However, the crucial questions “Why this, why now?” and “What is at stake?” need to be asked not only about our data and the themes that are in vogue, but also about the concepts with which we operate.

In this chapter, I will first examine discourse and ideology as contested concepts. Subsequently, I will summarize some of the ways in which they have been used in French discourse analysis, critical discourse analysis, and linguistic anthropology. In conclusion, I will analyze the evolution of the concepts as part of our infinite yet unconscious search for operational concepts, essences, and truth.

5.2 Contested concepts

Discourse has a long history that should be told and analyzed more often: as the *Dictionnaire historique de la langue française* and the *Trésor de la langue française informatisé* (s.v. *discourir* and *discours*) inform us, while the verb *descorre* or *discorre* is attested in Old French as early as the late twelfth century with the meaning “run around,” the noun *discours* was borrowed from Latin and its first known use in French texts goes back to 1530. In Late Latin already, *discours* had referred not only to the act of “running around” but also to a “conversation” or a “meeting,” metaphorically mimicking the often sinuous nature of oral interactions. The meaning soon broadened to cover a “story” or an “oral or written presentation.” Some of today’s linguistic meanings of the term go back to the seventeenth century: in classical linguistic theories *discours* referred to the linguistic expression of thought and the meaning “succession of words constituting language” has been attested in a text from 1613. This meaning is related also to the term *partie du discours*, ‘part of speech,’ attested in French for the first time in 1637.

Therefore, when Saussure uses *discourse* to refer to the result of the process by which the speaker actualizes language (*langue*) into speech (*parole*), he is just reiterating deeply rooted meanings: in the English translations of *Course in General Linguistics* (Saussure 1959: 14, 121; 1983: 14, 123), discourse refers both to “a speech” and to “language use.” Hence, while a *generalized* usage of the standard notion of discourse as “unit of language larger than a sentence” may well go back to the 1940s, the usage is in fact centuries old, so that when French linguists applied the notion of

discourse in the sense of “language put into action” in the 1950s, they did not invent that definition (cf. Sawyer 2002: 434, 436).

In its everyday usage, discourse can be a relatively neutral term meaning “talk” or “speech” in languages such as French (*discours*) or Spanish (*discurso*). In this signification, the reference is therefore rather material. In its current scholarly usage, on the other hand, discourse has a variety of meanings: “chunks of language larger than a sentence,” “way of speaking of a particular group or a person,” “system of meaning-formation characteristic of a particular social practice,” “language as social practice in general,” “language-in-action,” “language use,” etc. (for thorough overviews and discussions of different definitions, see e.g. Maingueneau 2005: 64–72 and Schiffrin 1994: 20–43). The scholarly meaning is therefore either adjacent to the common-sense usage or quite distinct from it.

As for the concept of ideology, Eagleton (1991: 1–2) lists 16 different definitions: the thousands of monographs carrying “ideology” in their title show that the concept has been analyzed and its history told many times (see Eagleton 1991 and Thompson 1984 for some of the most comprehensive surveys). Like discourse, ideology has a common-sense meaning: “opinions and beliefs of a particular group or a distorted worldview typical of that group.” However, ideology cannot have a directly material dimension: rather, its materiality is derived from the semiotic usage that is interpreted as expressing or reifying it. In this common-sense meaning, ideology often has a negative connotation as something that is opposed to truth or to accurate knowledge, which is quite ironic if we consider the history of the notion. Indeed, when late eighteenth-century French *ideologue* Destutt de Tracy coined the concept, what he had in mind was a positivist *science of ideas*. But a political connotation and a pejoration arrived quickly: in 1812 Napoleon blamed the ideologues and their “obscure metaphysics” for the debacle he had caused himself, therefore accusing them of precisely the kind of thinking to which they were opposed. The concept of ideology therefore moved from scientific materialism towards the realm of abstract ideas. And when Marx and Engels added the concept to Marx’s general theory of alienation (Eagleton 1991: 67–70), the political dimension became predominant, although positivist aspects continued to lurk in the background. Woolard’s (1998) summary of the different ways of understanding ideology exemplifies both positivist and political connotations: “mental phenomena,” “reflection and expression of the interests or experience of a specific social position,” “signifying practices, ideas, or discourse related to the access to power or to its maintenance,” and “distortion or rationalization of reality.”

1 Ideology thus had a loaded political history and a long usage in politi-
2 cal and sociological theory when discourse analysis appeared in the latter
3 half of the twentieth century. The way in which the two concepts became
4 intertwined is a complicated narrative that can only be schematized here.
5 In the English-speaking world, discourse analysis started as the analysis of
6 language data above the sentence level and evolved towards definitions
7 emphasizing usage and action. Ideology was not a concern. In France and
8 later in the UK, on the other hand, theories of ideology inherited from
9 Marxist thinking were part of the discourse-analytical enterprise from the
10 very beginning.

11 12 **5.3 French discourse analysis**

13
14 According to Maingueneau (1991: 9–14), the emergence of discourse
15 analysis in France was not only a reaction to the inadequacies of North
16 American content analysis: it was a natural continuation of the French
17 and European tradition of philology and textual analysis in an intellec-
18 tual environment marked by the peak of literary structuralism and the
19 merger of linguistics, Lacanian psychoanalysis, and “Althusserianism,”
20 i.e. a popularized version of Althusser’s thinking. In this combination
21 of French epistemological tradition and structuralism, it was important
22 to make a distinction between science (reality or truth) and ideology
23 (imaginary deformation of real relations as ideological representations).
24 Discourse analysis, on the other hand, surfaced in this context as perhaps
25 the most promising science of ideology. And since linguistics had created
26 an autonomous object of study for itself, it was the only discipline in
27 the humanities that had made the “epistemological break” from its own
28 ideology into science and could therefore provide solid foundations for a
29 scientific discourse analysis. But the notion of ideology was also related to
30 the unconscious in the Lacanian version of psychoanalysis. Hence, while
31 Zellig Harris’s 1952 article on discourse analysis was published in French
32 in 1969, the term *analysis*, in post-1968 France, was associated not only
33 with linguistic and textual dimensions but also with a technique of read-
34 ing texts aimed at showing the hidden, unconscious presence of another
35 text, that of *ideology*, in them.

36 In early French discourse analysis in particular, the focus was almost
37 exclusively on political texts: all discourse was considered to be political
38 (Maingueneau 1991: 12–13). The objective of discourse analysis was to
39 expose the ultimate truth about ideologies—mimicking the exactitude
40 of mathematics in some ramifications, such as Pêcheux’s. Foucault’s
41 influence, on the other hand, was subterranean yet decisive. While

1 Foucault did not define precise analytical tools suitable for a discourse
2 analysis based on the study of language (Maingueneau 1991: 14) and
3 abandoned linguistic considerations in the early 1970s (Mazière 2005:
4 58), French discourse analysis today separates itself from traditional
5 linguistic analysis in ways reminiscent of Foucault's (1972) *Archeology*
6 *of Knowledge*: while linguistics is concerned with issues such as gram-
7 maticality, discourse analysis is interested in determining the modalities
8 of "enunciation" (énonciation)—that which can or cannot be uttered
9 from a particular position. As for the concept of ideology, it more or
10 less merged with discourse, as the definition of discourse as "attestable
11 overdetermination of all individual use of language" (Mazière 2005: 10;
12 my translation) shows.

13 This partial amalgam of the notions of ideology and discourse appears
14 to originate from Foucault. In *The Archeology of Knowledge*, published in
15 French in 1969, Foucault (1972: 117 and *passim*) defined discourse as a
16 set of statements pertaining to the same discursive formation, governed
17 by the same law of formation, and often corresponding to a particular
18 institution or practice at a given period of time in a given place. Ideology
19 was absent: Foucault preferred not to use that term, for it automatically
20 implies an opposition between ideology and truth, always refers to a
21 subject that is constituted or is being constituted, and is only second-
22 ary to that which is material, infrastructural, and economic (Foucault
23 1980: 118).

24 In the 1970s, French discourse analysis evolved towards pragmatics.
25 However, this major theoretical and analytical shift remained largely
26 local due in part to problems related to the translation of key terms.
27 Indeed, it is not easy to render fundamental concepts in the French tra-
28 dition of pragmatics such as énonciation ('enunciation') and its deriva-
29 tions in other languages (Angermüller 2005). French discourse analysis
30 today makes a distinction between discourse genres and discourse types.
31 *Discourse genres* are more or less what people elsewhere call genres (e.g.
32 television news broadcasts, medical consultations, guidebooks). *Discourse*
33 *types* pertain to an institutional apparatus (e.g. hospital discourse) or are
34 contingent on a particular positioning (e.g. communist discourse). But
35 appellations such as "postcolonial discourse" or "management discourse"
36 contain elements coming from various discourse types and genres; they
37 are confined by the researcher and need to be historically specified.
38 Somewhat heretically against Foucault and Pêcheux, Maingueneau
39 (2005: 72–3) actually prefers the term *discursive formation* for these
40 kinds of discourses, which would be called ideologies within some other
41 paradigms.

5.4 Critical discourse analysis (CDA)

British cultural-studies theories, based not only on Foucault but among other sources also on Gramsci and the Frankfurt School of critical theory, emphasize the discursive construction of reality, the lack of fixed meanings, and the continuous struggle between discourses over hegemony (see e.g. Laclau and Mouffe 1985). Sawyer (2002) has argued that the notion of discourse used in Anglo-American social sciences and humanities is based on a number of misreadings of Foucault and erroneous generalizations, and that it originated from British cultural studies and French Marxists and discourse analysts rather than from Foucault. According to Sawyer, Foucault's notion of discourse was first introduced in order to overcome the lack of historicity in cultural studies. But in the 1980s, when discourse had become the token concept, replacing both language and ideology, a "second wave" of Anglo-American scholars gradually attributed their conceptualization of discourse to Foucault retrospectively, although the way they used the term had already been recycled by cultural theorists and therefore did not correspond to the definitions Foucault had given.

However, while Foucault's notion of discourse can be seen as an attempt to avoid both dogmatic structural linguistics and dogmatic Marxism, it not only draws on several previous theorizations of discourse but also incorporates many aspects of existing theories of ideology. In fact, we can read *The Archeology of Knowledge* as a filter through which diverse ideas circulating in the French intellectual context of the 1960s were dispersed in several directions, including French discourse analysis and British cultural studies. Hence, a somewhat confusing polyphony of meanings and usages was present in *The Archeology*, and subsequent simplifications and misreadings are due not only to the changes that the concept of discourse experienced over time but also to our natural incapacity to interpret all of the polyphonic layers in texts. Of course, the complexity of Foucault's texts did not help.

And while cultural studies and critical theory certainly had an influence on the genesis of CDA, its conceptualizations of discourse do not appear to be based on just a cursory reading of Foucault. In fact, both Foucault's theorizations of discourse as a practice emanating from an institution and having a tremendous power of materialization, and the old usage reiterated by Saussure—according to which discourse is language put into use—are present in CDA. This epistemology creates the sometimes difficult dual conception of *discourse* (language as social practice) and *discourses* (particular linguistic practices related to a field of action or institution). Thus, Fairclough (1995: 92) defines discourse as social practice

1 related to a field of action or institution, so that we have, for instance, eco-
2 nomic, organizational, managerial, political, and educational discourses
3 (Fairclough 2002: 164), and Wodak (2001: 66) conceptualizes discourse as
4 thematically interrelated linguistic acts, realized in texts and genres across
5 different fields of action.

6 In addition, contrary to later developments in some branches of cul-
7 tural studies, CDA continues to make a distinction between discourse and
8 ideology. When critical linguistics emerged in the UK, ideology was an
9 essential part of the theoretical constellation (Simpson 1993: 6); ideology
10 in fact became a legitimate object of linguistic inquiry (De Beaugrande
11 1999: 267). Thus, Hodge and Kress (1993: 6, first published in 1979) argue
12 that *all* language is ideological and define ideology as “a systematic body
13 of ideas, organized from a particular point of view,” systematically dis-
14 torting reality according to class interests. For the most prominent CDA
15 theorists, on the other hand, while language is “intricately connected
16 with ideological means” and “related to beliefs, opinions and ideologies,”
17 language is not ideological *per se* (Wodak 2007: 1); “all types of discourses
18 are [not] ideologically invested to the same degree” (Fairclough 1992: 91),
19 and “general properties of language and discourse are not, as such, ideo-
20 logically marked” (van Dijk 2006: 115).

21 In CDA, there is indeed both a connection and a distinction between
22 ideology and discourse (see, e.g., Fairclough 1988: 233; van Dijk 2006: 115).
23 However, “the analysis of ideologies must, and should be, based on
24 ideological presuppositions itself” (Billig 2007: 36). Thus, when CDA
25 aims at “unmask(ing) ideologically permeated and often obscured struc-
26 tures of power, political control, and dominance, as well as strategies of
27 discriminatory inclusion and exclusion in language use,” the goal is not
28 to be objective or socially neutral. Indeed, “practitioners of CDA believe
29 that such ostensible political indifference ultimately assists in maintain-
30 ing an unjust status quo” (Wodak et al. 1999: 7). Fairclough (1988: 5)
31 also claims that committed research agendas are not only scientific but also
32 unavoidable in any social science research. On the other hand, constant
33 self-reflexivity is needed (Billig 2007: 47; Wodak 2001: 64), which also
34 implies openness to multiple approaches.

35 36 37 5.5 Sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology

38 In North America, ideology and discourse have had a different history. The
39 importance of philology in linguistics was minor and while many thinkers
40 of the critical school emigrated to the US and were to have a major impact
41 on fields such as literary or cultural studies, their importance for language

1 studies in other disciplines was marginal until critical theory started to
2 gain influence within linguistic anthropology in the 1980s. In addition,
3 systemic-functional grammar, which provided a linguistic basis and departure
4 from utterly formalistic linguistics for many CDA approaches, never
5 gained much of a foothold in North America. Discourse studies continued
6 to be conceived of as studies of chunks of language larger than a sentence,
7 although intention is often added to that definition, as exemplified in
8 R. Lakoff's (2000: 8) definition of discourse as "connected language use for
9 a purpose." Indeed, while the French pragmatic turn of discourse analysis
10 consisted of considerations centered on the role, existence, or agency of
11 the subject, Anglo-American pragmatic discourse analysis concentrated on
12 the illocutionary and perlocutionary effects of the speech act.

13 As Maingueneau (2005: 66–8) notes, defining discourse analysis as the
14 study of elements larger than a sentence or a clause might be due to a
15 desire to appear more respectable and visible within mainstream linguistics
16 as opposed to doing confusing work at the margins. According to
17 him, definitions of linguistic discourse analysis such as "language-in-use"
18 or Schiffrin's 1994 characterization of discourse as "everyday spoken
19 discourse" would be difficult to apply in disciplines where questions of
20 institutional positioning from which ideologies emanate are at stake. In
21 fact, conversation analysis had a major impact on the development of
22 discourse studies in North America and foundations were sought not only
23 in linguistics and pragmatics but also in anthropology and sociology.

24 As a result perhaps, while the political aspect has not been rejected
25 altogether, the criticism expressed within sociolinguistics and linguistic
26 anthropology has focused mainly on the shortcomings and domination
27 of linguistic formalism and the related notion of linguistic nationalism,
28 perhaps in an attempt to legitimize new conceptions of language that were
29 incompatible with linguistic orthodoxies. Indeed, the birth of sociolinguistics
30 in the 1960s can be seen as a reaction against "the thrust of Chomsky's
31 approach" (Hymes 2000: 312). Ideology, on the other hand, was largely
32 discarded in traditional forms of sociolinguistics (Labov 1979: 329), in
33 which relatively stable sociological categories such as *community* were used
34 without challenging them (Heller 2008: 509–12), and language was still
35 seen as a regulated system reflecting society or indicating social change
36 (see e.g. Labov 1972: 111). But as Gumperz and Gumperz-Cook (2008)
37 show, when the agendas of sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology—
38 which were historically interrelated, for example, through the importance
39 of ethnography in both—started to merge, focus shifted from community
40 to *identity* and the political dimension of language. And when critical theory
41 entered linguistic anthropology, all previous concepts were contested.

Ideology appeared in this framework of later developments of studies on linguistic relativism and the role of language in the formation of worldview (Blommaert 2005: 171), first as a rational explanation of analogical linguistic change and a structure tending to regularize usage (Silverstein 1979). Linguistic anthropology and sociolinguistics have strongly emphasized not only the manifestation of language ideologies in a particular language community or nation but also the criticism of Western linguistics, including sociolinguistics. Thus, questioning the ideological foundations of linguistics, Romaine (1994: 12) inquires whether the very concept of a discrete language is a European construct, fueled by literacy and standardization, and whether methodological traditions of linguistic classification rather than the reality of communicative situations guide the identification of distinct languages. Woolard (1998: 25–7) gives a list of linguistics’ biases: linguists have constructed languages according to their own discursive practices, exoticized native languages and nonnormative language varieties, and based their theories of language on Western linguistic and cultural ideologies. Cameron (1990: 92) denies a notion of language characterizing it as “an organism or a passive reflection” and appeals for the acknowledgement of its nature as “a social institution, deeply implicated in culture, in society, in political relations at every level.”

Ideologies in this linguistic–anthropological sense therefore correspond to Mannheim’s (1936: 57–61) notion of *particular ideologies* as instrumental tools of power shaped to the aims and purposes of specific actors. Thus, Kroskrity (2000: 8) argues that “language ideologies represent the perception of language and discourse that is constructed in the interest of a specific social or cultural group.”

5.6 Comparing the paradigms

CDA and some applied linguistics approaches harder to situate within a paradigm have also criticized linguistics and sociolinguistics. Thus, in his criticism of sociolinguistics, Fairclough (1988: 22) argues that “emphasis should be on language use, but language use conceived as socially determined,” i.e. on discourse. Pennycook (1998: 84) contends that although language issues have become politicized, the underlying notion of language has not been questioned; rather, the political component has been added to the existing elements.

But while the agendas of CDA and American linguistic anthropology overlap to a large degree and although similar analytical tools inherited from sociolinguistics and conversational analysis are used, there is not much interaction (Blommaert 2005: 9). This lack appears to be due at

1 least partly to different conceptions of data. On the other hand, the most
2 important hindrance for the different approaches to have a fruitful dia-
3 logue resides in divergent definitions of fundamental theoretical concepts.

4 On a superficial level, the researcher's stance towards his or her own
5 research appears to be the most important difference between CDA
6 and linguistic anthropology: while injustice is the starting point for
7 CDA and the unraveling of discrimination and hidden domination
8 the goal, linguistic anthropology aspires to announce its verdict from
9 a neutral position with the aim of merely describing and explaining. It
10 is therefore not a coincidence that a major object of study of linguistic
11 anthropology has been the concept of language ideology rather than,
12 say, racist ideology. The study of linguistic commodification can be
13 conceived as part of the same evolution of the concentration on the
14 very notion of language.

15 But there is more and more interaction between the disciplines—the
16 painful distinction between ideology and discourse today is largely due
17 to the clash between concepts coming from different disciplinary tradi-
18 tions and having often incompatible itineraries and histories behind
19 them. In traditional sociolinguistics and pragmatics, discourse is “lan-
20 guage put into use” or “chunks of language larger than a sentence”
21 (think of *discourse markers*). In linguistic anthropology, we encounter a
22 similar theorization of discourse, but also denominations focusing on
23 the function, such as “evaluative discourse” (Kroskrity 2009: 46). Apart
24 from such conceptualizations of discourse, familiar from conversation
25 analysis (see e.g. Ariel 2009), we also have conceptualizations in which
26 discourse is named on the basis of the topic that circulates within it, such
27 as “discourses of endangerment” (Heller and Duchêne 2007). Ideologies,
28 on the other hand, appear to be based on a practice, a social institution,
29 or a topic such as “ideologies of storytelling” (Kroskrity 2009), “media
30 ideologies” (Gershon 2010), or language ideologies. Often, however, the
31 distinction between ideology and discourse is not quite clear, as the defi-
32 nitions quoted by Woolard (1998; see section 5.2 of this chapter) show.
33 When such theorizations are used in CDA and (other) paradigms influ-
34 enced by a cultural-studies reading of discourse and ideology, confusion
35 is inevitable.

36 37 **5.7 Conclusion: operational concepts, essences, and truth** 38 **or why this now?** 39

40 In Europe, ethnographic fieldwork was largely confined to disciplines
41 such as dialectology or sociology, whereas CDA and French discourse

analysis have centered on texts and discourses emanating from institutions through which the circulation of power is regimented, such as politics, governments, and the media—discourses thought to be particularly *ideological*, functioning as expression of those ideologies. This textual and linguistic basis or “bias” as well as the concentration on phenomena present in one’s own culture have been criticized (e.g. Blommaert 2005: 35, 235). In the tradition of linguistic anthropology and ethnography of communication, on the other hand, the emphasis has been on “real” language use (conceived as discourse) revealing its secret, including ideologies focusing on a particular concept or activity, through ethnographic data gathering and observation. Besides, the requirement to do research and produce knowledge on phenomena other than those pertaining to one’s own culture has been strongly accentuated in the anthropological tradition, which also explains its openness to postcolonial theory.

This conception of ethnography has now entered CDA (see e.g. Krzyżanowski 2011) and European discourse analysis, pushing researchers to identify *cases* of discourse and (if mostly language is at stake) cases of language ideologies in contexts larger than just written texts. Thus, increased interdisciplinary communication does not prevent practices, such as the search for cases of discourse(s), that people distancing themselves from discourse analysis perceive as fallacious (cf. Blommaert 2005: 236). In fact, this could be an inevitable outcome of divergent theoretical foundations: different paradigms do not share the same conception of the very nature of language—they are based on different language ideologies. Indeed, depending on the epistemological history of the discipline, ideology and discourse can be contextualized either as theoretical concepts or analytical tools or both. Thus, while linguistic anthropologists may analyze language ideologies in their data consisting of discourse (language-in-action), critical discourse analysts might want to identify the discourses present in their more or less ideological data consisting of discourse (language as social practice). That is, unless they are analyzing language ideologies, for language ideology has become a token concept across paradigms. Therefore, in a Foucaultian reading, we might as well call these different disciplines or paradigms *discourses*, for they systematically form, shape, and reshape their concepts and analytical tools and apply them accordingly in their inquiry. As a result, they also find different objects.

Maingueneau (1991: 66) notes that the difficulty of defining discourse analysis is related to the spontaneous tendency to base the relationship between discourse and its analysis on the model of the relationship

1 between an empirical object and the disciplines that study it. Statements
2 such as “language is a social practice,” as a CDA theorist would say, or
3 “language is a social institution” (Cameron 1990: 93), can be seen as
4 attempts to overcome the shortcomings of monolithic notions of lan-
5 guage. However, the act of saying or writing such a statement constitutes
6 a sort of performative enactment putting language in yet another cage,
7 defining and naming it. Indeed, while such definitions express our will
8 to think of things as *processes* rather than as *beings*, the limits of our cog-
9 nition and the metalanguage that confines us seem to prevent us from
10 grasping all dimensions of language, discourse, and ideology without
11 naming, creating an entity, and essentializing.

12 The naming of paradigms, theories, and traditions in this essay is a
13 good example of such intellectual limitations. These cognitive patterns
14 make it easier for us to understand the world around us: this is why we
15 study *language ideologies* or *racist ideologies* or *racist discourses* and *feminist*
16 *discourse* or *hospital discourse* rather than just ideology or discourse—both
17 discourses and ideologies appear to be equally essentializable insofar as
18 they are named so that they form an entity. We may well think that things
19 as such do not exist, yet we almost automatically see them as entities and
20 provide them with an essence, therefore reiterating or at least echoing
21 language ideologies according to which language consists of words, and
22 sorting our concepts through theoretical grids reminiscent of Saussurean
23 linguistics and Western scientific tradition in general. This is also visible
24 in the way in which we blame entities such as linguistics, sociolinguistics,
25 the nation state, or capitalism for all kinds of calamities. And when we try
26 to establish a coherent relationship between ideology and discourse, we
27 almost automatically fall into the trap of the two-dimensional, twofold
28 scheme of idealism: intangible ideologies as conditions of existence on
29 the basis of which something is believed to exist, on the one hand, and
30 discourses through which that which exists is materialized, on the other.
31 Hence, things appear to exist only insofar as they are connected to each
32 other and they exist only if correlations in the same conceptual network
33 prove adequate.

34 Since a word or an expression is perceived as an entity expressing an
35 essence, it makes sense and is endowed with fantastic powers. This is
36 the reason why we not only name but also look for terms that are easy
37 to understand and for terms that are marketable (cf. Billig 2007: 36, 41).
38 That is, marketable according to the fashions and laws of market-
39 ing and branding that are adequate in a given place at a given time.
40 Therefore, the question “Why this now?” is quite relevant in terms of our
41 concept-forming and naming practices as well: why language ideologies,

1 commodification of language, neoliberal discourse, governmentality,
2 etc. now? Why yet another fragmentation of the discipline, on the one
3 hand, why a desired merger of disciplines resulting perhaps inevitably in
4 a hegemonic pattern of knowledge formation leading to uniformity, on
5 the other? These questions should be explored taking into account the
6 discourses and ideologies surrounding and preceding such practices as
7 well as those that they appear to be engendering.

8 “The eye that knows and decides” is also an eye that governs (Foucault
9 1973: 89). A discourse analysis of the reasons why theories and concepts
10 emanate from certain positions and locations (Germany, France, the
11 United Kingdom, the United States, rather than, say Spain, India, Brazil,
12 or Nigeria) is in order. In addition, an inquiry of the ways in which each
13 local eye justifies itself as an eye that perceives the truth that other eyes
14 do not see and manages to present itself as the ultimate analyzer of truth
15 carrying positive connotations of progress would be helpful in order to
16 understand the contingent nature of the truth that we seek. In short, we
17 may want to ask ourselves what the regularities are that allow a concept
18 to be part of a network, and perhaps continue to look for other ways of
19 conceptualizing *being*.

References

- 22 Angermüller, Johannes. 2005. “Le poststructuralisme expliqué au Français ...”
23 A propos de la réception des tendances françaises de l’analyse du discours en
24 Allemagne. Paper presented at the Franco-German colloquium *L’Analyse du*
25 *discours en France et en Allemagne: Tendances actuelles en sciences du langage et*
26 *sciences sociales*. Université de Paris XII, June 30–July 2, 2005.
- 27 Ariel, Mira. 2009. Discourse, grammar, discourse. *Discourse Studies*. 11-1: 5–36.
- 28 Billig, Michael. 2007. Critical discourse analysis and the rhetoric of critique.
29 In Gilbert Weiss and Ruth Wodak, eds. *Critical Discourse Analysis: Theory and*
30 *Interdisciplinarity*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. 25–46.
- 31 Blommaert, Jan. 2005. *Discourse: A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge
32 University Press.
- 33 Cameron, Deborah. 1990. Demythologizing sociolinguistics: Why language does
34 not reflect society. In John E. Joseph and Talbot J. Taylor, eds. *Ideologies of*
35 *Language*. New York: Routledge. 79–93.
- 36 De Beaugrande, Robert. 1999. Discourse studies and ideology: On “liberalism” and
37 “liberalisation” in three large corpora of English. *Discourse Studies*. 1-3: 259–95.
- 38 *Dictionnaire historique de la langue française*. 1992. Alain Rey, ed. Paris: Dictionnaires
39 Le Robert.
- 40 Eagleton, Terry. 1991. *Ideology: An Introduction*. London: Verso.
- 41 Fairclough, Norman. 1988. *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
- . 1992. *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity.
- . 1995. *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. New York:
Longman.

- 1 ———. 2002. Language in new capitalism. *Discourse & Society*. 13-2: 163–6.
- 2 Foucault, Michel. 1972. *The Archeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*.
- 3 A. M. Sheridan Smith, trans. New York: Pantheon Books.
- 4 ———. 1973. *The Birth of the Clinic: An Archeology of Medical Perception*. A. M.
- 5 Sheridan Smith, trans. New York: Routledge.
- 6 ———. 1980. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977*.
- 7 Colin Gordon, ed. New York: Pantheon.
- 8 Gal, Susan and Kathryn A. Woolard. 1995. Constructing languages and publics:
- 9 Authority and representation. *Pragmatics*. 5-2: 129–38.
- 10 Gershon, Ilana. 2010. Media ideologies: An introduction. *Journal of Linguistic*
- 11 *Anthropology*. 20-2: 283–93.
- 12 Gumperz, John J. and Jenny Gumperz-Cook. 2008. Studying language, culture,
- 13 and society: Sociolinguistics or linguistic anthropology? *Journal of Sociolinguistics*.
- 14 12-4: 532–45.
- 15 Harris, Zellig S. 1952. Discourse analysis. *Language: Journal of the Linguistic Society*
- 16 *of America*. 28-1: 1–30.
- 17 Heller, Monica. 2008. Language and the nation-state: Challenges to sociolinguistic
- 18 theory and practice. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*. 12-4: 504–24.
- 19 Heller, Monica and Alexandre Duchêne. 2007. Discourses of endangerment:
- 20 Sociolinguistics, globalization and social order. In Monica Heller and Alexandre
- 21 Duchêne, eds. *Discourses of Endangerment: Ideology and Interest in the Defense of*
- 22 *Languages*. New York: Continuum. 1–13.
- 23 Hodge, Robert and Gunther Kress. 1993. *Language as Ideology*. 2nd edn. London:
- 24 Routledge.
- 25 Hymes, Dell. 2000. The emergence of sociolinguistics: A response to Samarin.
- 26 *Journal of Sociolinguistics*. 4-2: 312–15.
- 27 Kroskrity, Paul V. 2000. Regimenting languages: Language ideological perspec-
- 28 tives. In Paul V. Kroskrity, ed. *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Politics, and*
- 29 *Identities*. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
- 30 ———. 2009. Narrative reproductions: Ideologies of storytelling, authoritative
- 31 words, and generic regimentation in the village of Tewa. *Journal of Linguistic*
- 32 *Anthropology*. 19-1: 40–56.
- 33 Krzyżanowski, Michał. 2011. Ethnography and critical discourse analysis: Towards
- 34 a problem-oriented research dialogue. *Critical Discourse Studies*. 8-4: 231–8.
- 35 Labov, William. 1972. *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia
- 36 Press.
- 37 ———. 1979. Locating the frontier between social and psychological factors in
- 38 linguistic variation. In Charles J. Fillmore, Daniel Kempler, and William S.-Y.
- 39 Wang, eds. *Individual Differences in Language Behavior*. New York: Academic
- 40 Press. 327–39.
- 41 Laclau, Ernesto and Chantal Mouffe. 1985. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. London: Verso.
- Lakoff, Robin Tolmach. 2000. *The Language War*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Maingueneau, Dominique. 1991. *L'analyse du discours: introduction aux études de l'archive*. Paris: Hachette Université.
- . 2005. L'analyse du discours et ses frontières. *Marges linguistiques*. 9: 64–75.
- Mannheim, Karl. 1936. *Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge*. Louis Wirth and Edward Shils, trans. London: Routledge.

- 1 Mazière, Francine. 2005. *L'analyse du discours*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- 2 Pennycook, Alastair. 1998. The right to language: Towards a situated ethics of
- 3 language possibilities. *Language Sciences*. 20-1: 73–87.
- 4 Romaine, Suzanne. 1994. *Language in Society: An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*.
- 5 Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 6 Saussure, Ferdinand de. 1959. *Course in General Linguistics*. Wade Baskin, trans.
- 7 New York: Philosophical Library.
- 8 ———. 1983. *Course in General Linguistics*. Roy Harris, trans. London: Duckworth.
- 9 Sawyer, R. Keith. 2002. A discourse on discourse: An archeological history of an
- 10 intellectual concept. *Cultural Studies*. 16-3: 433–56.
- 11 Schiffrin, Deborah. 1994. *Approaches to Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- 12 Silverstein, Michael. 1979. Language structure and linguistic ideology. In
- 13 Paul R. Cline, William F. Hanks, and Carol L. Hoftbauer, eds. *The Elements:*
- 14 *A Parasession on Linguistic Units and Levels*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- 15 193–247.
- 16 Simpson, Paul. 1993. *Language, Ideology, and Point of View*. London: Routledge.
- 17 Thompson, John B. 1984. *Studies in the Theory of Ideology*. Cambridge: Polity.
- 18 *Trésor de la langue française informatisé*. Web. Accessed May 16, 2013.
- 19 van Dijk, Teun A. 2006. Ideology and discourse analysis. *Journal of Political*
- 20 *Ideologies*. 11-2: 115–40.
- 21 Wodak, Ruth. 2001. The discourse-historical approach. In Ruth Wodak and
- 22 Michael Meyer, eds. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage. 63–94.
- 23 ———. 2007. Language and ideology—Language in ideology. *Journal of Language*
- 24 *and Politics*. 6-1: 1–5.
- 25 Wodak, Ruth, Rudolf de Cillia, Martin Reisigl, and Karin Liebhart. 1999. *The*
- 26 *Discursive Construction of National Identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University
- 27 Press.
- 28 Woolard, Kathryn A. 1998. Introduction: Language ideology as a field of inquiry.
- 29 In Bambi B. Schieffelin, Kathryn A. Woolard, and Paul V. Kroskrity, eds. *Language*
- 30 *Ideologies: Practice and Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press. 3–47.
- 31
- 32
- 33
- 34
- 35
- 36
- 37
- 38
- 39
- 40
- 41