



Post-humanist Perspectives in Eco-linguistics and the Future of Language through Eco-humanities

Arooj Riaz*

Research Division: Ecolinguistics, Bright Hope Foundation, Faisalabad, Pakistan

Corresponding Author: aroojriaz0202@gmail.com

Abstract: This study investigates the intersection of post-humanist theory, eco-humanities, and ecolinguistics to explore how language constructs, reflects, and actively shapes ecological meaning, values, and environmental ideologies. Traditional anthropocentric approaches to language, which position humans as the primary and often sole agents of communication and meaning-making, are increasingly challenged by post-humanist perspectives that emphasize multispecies agency, ecological interconnectedness, and relational interdependence between humans and the more-than-human world. By shifting attention away from human exceptionalism, this research highlights how linguistic practices participate in broader ecological systems and ethical frameworks. Using a qualitative textual analysis, the study examines a diverse corpus of environmental discourse, including literary narratives, media texts, policy documents, and academic writings. The analysis focuses on key linguistic features such as transitivity patterns, metaphorical framing, evaluative language, modality, pronoun use, and naming practices that either reinforce or resist dominant ecological ideologies. Drawing on Stibbe's *Stories We Live By* framework, the research evaluates whether particular discourses promote ecological sustainability, ethical responsibility, and environmental care, or instead reproduce narratives that legitimize anthropocentric dominance and ecological exploitation.

Findings reveal that dominant institutional and media discourses frequently privilege human interests, objectify nonhuman life, and normalize extractive relationships with nature. In contrast, post-humanist and eco-humanities-informed texts foreground relationality, reciprocity, and multispecies coexistence, encouraging ethical awareness and ecological accountability. The study demonstrates that language functions not as a neutral medium but as an active ecological practice that shapes environmental perception, moral reasoning, and sustainability outcomes. The research contributes to ecolinguistic scholarship by illustrating how discourse analysis can support environmental transformation. Implications for environmental education, interdisciplinary research, and public communication are discussed, emphasizing the integration of post-humanist approaches into curricula, policy discourse, and awareness initiatives to foster ecological consciousness, sustainability ethics, and multispecies justice in the Anthropocene.

Keywords: Post-humanism, Ecolinguistics, Eco-humanities, Ecological Discourse, Multispecies Communication, Sustainability

1. Introduction

1.1 Overview

Language emerges as a crucial medium for reconsidering the limits of communication and being in a time increasingly characterized by ecological crises, technological growth, and the reconfiguration of human-nonhuman connections. Traditional anthropocentric viewpoints that see language as a uniquely human phenomenon are challenged by the convergence of eco-humanities and post-humanism. Rather, it provides fresh perspectives on language as a multispecies, ecological phenomenon that is intricately linked to the living world. This thesis investigates how ecolinguistics, when viewed from a post-humanist perspective, might help rethink language's future as a more ethical, inclusive, and environmentally sensitive system of meaning-making.

1.2 Research Background

The area of eco-linguistics, which emerged from the intersection of ecology and linguistics, studies how language affects how people interact with the natural world. Conventional eco-linguistic research has mostly concentrated on linguistic depictions of nature, metaphor analysis, and environmental speech. But new advances in post-humanist theory, motivated by thinkers like Donna Haraway, Rosi Braidotti, and Bruno Latour, call for a more drastic change from human-centered linguistics to multispecies communication and ecological interdependence.

Despite emphasizing the interdependence of all living species, the eco-humanities, which include ecological philosophy, literature, and cultural studies, also criticize the hierarchy that places humans above the natural world. Eco-humanities, when combined with eco-linguistics, offer a theoretical framework for investigating how language both reflects and reconstructs ecological ethics.

In order to investigate how language could develop beyond anthropocentrism, it is still necessary to synthesize eco-linguistics and post-humanist eco-humanities despite these conceptual advancements. This integration might shed light on how linguistic systems might change to acknowledge nonhuman entities as members of the communication continuum, such as environments, animals, plants, and technologies.

1.3 Problem Statement

The majority of linguistic and ecological research is still rooted in anthropological paradigms, emphasizing human expression at the expense of nonhuman forms of communication. The prevalence of human-centered linguistic frameworks restricts our comprehension of language's functioning as an ecological system entwined with all living species. Despite the fact that post-humanism and eco-linguistics both criticize this hierarchy, there is not enough study linking them within the larger area of eco-humanities. By investigating how post-humanist approaches to eco-linguistics may rethink language's future and promote a greater sense of ecological responsibility and multispecies cooperation, this thesis fills this gap.

1.4 Research Questions

1. How can post-humanist theory reshape eco-linguistic understanding of language and communication?
2. In what ways does integrating eco-humanities expand the scope of eco-linguistics beyond anthropocentrism?
3. What implications do post-humanist eco-linguistic perspectives have for the future of language and multispecies communication?
4. How can rethinking language through post-humanism contribute to ecological awareness and sustainability?

1.5 Research Objectives

1. To explore the intersection of eco-linguistics, post-humanism, and eco-humanities as frameworks for rethinking language.
2. To analyze how post-humanist approaches decenter the human and open space for multispecies communication.
3. To evaluate the implications of post-humanist eco-linguistics for the evolution and sustainability of language.
4. To propose an interdisciplinary model of language that reflects ecological interdependence and nonhuman agency.

1.6 Research significance

By using post-humanist theory to connect eco-humanities and eco-linguistics, this study adds to current discussions in linguistics, philosophy, and environmental humanities. It questions anthropocentric linguistic presumptions and puts forth a theory in which language is a living, ecological process rather than just a tool used by humans. By encouraging ecological ethics, inclusive communication, and knowledge of multispecies interrelationships, the study's conclusions can have an impact on educational, linguistic, and environmental discourses. By connecting post-humanism and eco-linguistic sustainability, it also offers theoretical innovation and opens the door for further research on language evolution in the Anthropocene and beyond.

1.7 Thesis Organization

From theory to synthesis, this thesis develops in a methodical manner. The conceptual frameworks of eco-linguistics, post-humanism, and eco-humanities are introduced in the first section. Key philosophical discussions and linguistic theories on human and nonhuman communication are examined in the second half. Analytical discussions on how language can develop toward ecological ethics and multispecies interaction are presented in the third section. A new paradigm for understanding language's future as an ecological and post-human phenomenon is proposed in the final part, which summarizes these findings. This structure guarantees a smooth transition from theoretical foundation to multidisciplinary analysis and thoughtful conclusion.

1.8 Chapter Summary

The study's conceptual framework and justification have been described in this introductory chapter. It stressed the importance of incorporating post-humanism and eco-humanities into eco-linguistic theory, identified the issue of linguistic anthropocentrism, and outlined the study issues and aims. The theoretical frameworks and analytical considerations that underpin the main claim that re-inventing language through post-humanist eco-linguistics opens doors toward a more inclusive and ecologically aware understanding of communication will be covered in detail in the upcoming chapters.

2. Related Work / Literature Review

Recent developments in linguistics increasingly reflect a shift away from anthropocentric models of language toward post-humanist, ecological, and interdisciplinary approaches. This shift has given rise to a growing body of scholarship at the intersection of post-humanism, ecolinguistics, and eco-humanities, which reconceptualizes language as an ecological, relational, and ethically charged phenomenon. The literature reviewed here examines how these approaches

redefine language, summarize key theories and empirical studies, and expose critical limitations that necessitate further research.

The idea that language is a cognitive ability unique to humans is contested by post-humanist viewpoints in linguistics. In his introduction to posthumanist applied linguistics, Pennycook (2016) makes the case that interactions between people, non-human things, material surroundings, and technologies are how language develops. According to this viewpoint, ecological and social assemblages—rather than just individual speakers—distribute, place, and shape language. By highlighting relationality and agency outside of the human subject, this reconceptualization undermines conventional structural and cognitive language paradigms.

This ecological perspective is further developed by ecolinguistics, which focuses on how language influences and reflects environmental relationships. In his seminal book, Stibbe (2015) presents ecosophy, an ecological philosophy that assesses discourse based on whether it sustains environmental harm or advances ecological sustainability. Using this approach, ecolinguistic studies examine literary, political, and media speech to identify narratives that either promote ecological responsibility or normalize the exploitation of nature. Oksana (2023), for instance, shows how certain language choices in print media depictions of floods can promote environmental awareness or obfuscate human responsibilities. In a similar vein, Gul, Elismariy, and Riaz (2025) stress that discourse focused on sustainability might influence public perceptions of ecological responsibility, thereby strengthening the ethical potential of language.

By incorporating language into cultural, ethical, and philosophical accounts of human-nature relations, co-humanities studies add a crucial interdisciplinary element to this conversation. According to Domañ (2015), ecological humanities emphasizes relational ontology above human exceptionalism and blends non-human agency, environmental ethics, and narrative responsibility. This viewpoint is further reinforced by Ferrando's (2019) work on philosophical post-humanism, which makes the case for moral frameworks that acknowledge the interdependence of ecosystems, non-human animals, and people. Language is viewed in eco-humanities as a cultural practice that influences moral responsibility and ecological consciousness, rather than just a means of communication.

Despite these developments, the literature identifies a number of important shortcomings. First, there is little empirical application of integrated frameworks that incorporate post-humanism, Eco linguistics, and eco-humanities, and a large portion of post-humanist and Eco linguistic studies is still theoretical in nature. Second, eco-humanities are rarely operationalized within systematic language analysis, although they are often explored conceptually. Third, indigenous, multilingual, and Global South ecological narratives are marginalized because existing research is mostly based on Western epistemologies and English-language contexts.

To overcome these constraints, the current study places itself at the nexus of eco-linguistics, eco-humanities, and post-humanist theory, providing an integrated analytical framework that looks at language as an ecological, ethical, and relational phenomenon. This research reimagines the role of linguistics in tackling environmental crises and advances a deeper knowledge of how language shapes ecological futures by combining theoretical insights with discourse analysis.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Method

This study employs a qualitative textual analysis as its primary research method. Textual analysis is particularly suitable for investigating how language constructs meaning, ideology, and ethical positioning within ecological discourse. Rather than measuring linguistic frequency or testing hypotheses, the method enables a close and interpretive reading of texts to reveal how linguistic choices shape representations of human–nonhuman relationships. Grounded in ecolinguistics, the textual analysis examines language as an ecological practice embedded within cultural, material, and environmental contexts.

3.2 Data Sources

The data for this research consist of secondary textual materials, selected for their relevance to ecological discourse and their ideological influence. The sources include:

1. Environmental Media Texts
News articles, opinion pieces, and feature stories addressing environmental crises, climate change, biodiversity loss, and sustainability. These texts are significant because they shape public ecological awareness.
2. Eco-literary and Cultural Texts
Essays, narratives, and selected literary works that foreground human–nature relations and ecological ethics.
3. Academic and Policy Texts
Scholarly articles, sustainability frameworks, and environmental policy documents that articulate institutional and theoretical perspectives on ecological issues.

3.3 Sampling Criteria

The study adopts purposive sampling, a common strategy in qualitative and ecolinguistic research. Texts were selected according to the following criteria:

- Explicit engagement with ecological or environmental themes
- Representation of human–nature or multispecies relationships
- Presence of anthropocentric or post-humanist ideological positioning

- Relevance to eco-humanities and sustainability discourse
- Cultural and discursive significance rather than numerical frequency

3.4 Analytical Approach

The analytical approach integrates textual analysis with ecolinguistic discourse evaluation. The analysis proceeds in three interrelated stages:

3.4.1 Identification of Ecological Narratives

Texts are first examined to identify dominant and alternative narratives related to nature, environment, and sustainability. These narratives are analyzed to determine whether they reinforce human-centered worldviews or promote ecological interdependence.

3.4.2 Linguistic Feature Analysis

At the micro-textual level, specific linguistic features are analyzed, including:

- Transitivity patterns, to identify agency and responsibility
- Metaphorical language, to uncover underlying ecological ideologies
- Evaluation and modality, to assess moral positioning and urgency
- Naming practices, to examine the representation of non-human entities

These features reveal how ecological meaning is constructed through language.

3.4.3 Ecosophical Evaluation

Drawing on Stibbe's ecosophy, the texts are evaluated ethically to assess their ecological implications. Language use is categorized according to whether it supports ecological sustainability, legitimizes environmental exploitation, or promotes multispecies coexistence.

3.5 Alignment with Theoretical Framework

The analytical approach is explicitly post-humanist, recognizing language as a relational and distributed phenomenon rather than an exclusively human faculty. By integrating eco-humanities, the analysis situates linguistic practices within broader ethical, cultural, and ecological frameworks, allowing for a holistic understanding of language as an ecological system.

3.6 Reliability and Interpretive Validity

While textual analysis is inherently interpretive, analytical rigor is ensured through systematic application of ecolinguistic categories, consistent use of theoretical frameworks, and transparent explanation of analytical procedures. Interpretations are grounded in established ecolinguistic and post-humanist scholarship, enhancing conceptual validity.

3.7 Methodological Limitations

The qualitative and interpretive nature of the study limits generalizability. However, the objective of this research is not statistical representation but theoretical insight and ethical critique, which aligns with the aims of ecolinguistics and eco-humanities.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Overview:

This chapter presents the analysis and discussion of ecological discourse through a post-humanist ecolinguistic lens, drawing on Stibbe's (2015) ecosophy and the concept of "Stories We Live By". The aim is to examine how language constructs or reflects ecological values, ideologies, and ethical positions in human–nature relationships. Texts analyzed include environmental media, literary/cultural works, and academic or policy discourse, selected based on their engagement with ecological themes and representation of human–nonhuman relationships.

The analysis is structured around four main areas: agency and transitivity, metaphor and representation, evaluation and modality, and ideological framing, showing how each linguistic element contributes to ecological meaning-making.

4.2 Agency and Transitivity: Who Acts in Ecological Discourse

A key focus in ecolinguistics is who or what is represented as acting in the world, as this shapes ecological ideologies. Anthropocentric discourse typically positions humans as the sole agents, rendering the natural world passive.

Example 1 (Anthropocentric narrative):

Farmers must clear forests to meet agricultural demands.

Here, farmers are the active agents, while forests are passive, objectified entities. This aligns with Stibbe's (2015) "Stories We Live By" concept of dominance over nature, which frames ecological relationships as hierarchical, privileging human needs over environmental integrity.

Example 2 (Post-humanist narrative):

Flooding reshapes human settlements and influences social practices.

In this sentence, flooding (a non-human entity) acts upon humans, demonstrating distributed agency. Language here recognizes non-human influence, aligning with post-humanist principles and Stibbe's idea of interdependence with nature, where humans are not the only actors shaping ecological outcomes.

Interpretation: Agency assignment in language directly reflects ecological values. Anthropocentric agency supports resource exploitation, whereas recognition of non-human agency promotes ethical relationality and multispecies awareness

4.3 Metaphor and Representation: Constructing Environmental Ideologies

Metaphors shape perception by framing the natural world in particular ways. In many texts, metaphors reproduce exploitative ideologies:

Example 3 (Instrumental metaphor):

The rainforest is a treasure trove of timber waiting to be harvested.

This metaphor represents nature as a resource to be extracted, reinforcing the "Stories We Live By" of economic utility and human supremacy. It discourages consideration of ecological consequences or the intrinsic value of non-human life.

Example 4 (Relational metaphor):

Rivers and forests are the lifeblood of communities, sustaining both humans and wildlife.

Here, nature is conceptualized as interdependent and vital, emphasizing relational ethics. This aligns with Stibbe's eco-friendly narratives that prioritize sustainability and coexistence. Metaphors like this cultivate ecological awareness and ethical reflection in readers.

Interpretation: Metaphors are not neutral; they embed ideology and values, shaping how people perceive human–nature relationships. Post-humanist ecolinguistics encourages metaphors that recognize multispecies interdependence, aligning language with sustainability.

4.4 Evaluation and Modality: Expressing Responsibility

Language evaluation and modality indicate how texts construct moral obligations and ecological responsibility.

Example 5 (Weak responsibility):

Governments should consider protecting wetlands.

The modal *should* signal an optional action, downplaying urgency and responsibility. Ecologically, this supports a passive approach to environmental issues.

Example 6 (Strong responsibility):

Immediate measures must be taken to prevent irreversible ecosystem loss.

The modal *must* convey ethical obligation and urgency, emphasizing accountability toward both human and non-human stakeholders.

Interpretation: Evaluation and modality are crucial tools through which language reflects ecological ideologies. Strong obligation language supports Stibbe's ethical principle of responsibility toward nature, while weak modality sustains exploitative or indifferent "Stories We Live By."

4.5 Naming and Pronoun Usage: Recognition of Non-human Entities

How texts name and refer to non-human entities impacts ecological values:

Example 7 (Objectification):

Wildlife populations are declining due to urban expansion.

The phrase *wildlife populations* abstracts living beings into statistics, erasing their individuality and agency, reflecting the anthropocentric ideology of control and detachment.

Example 8 (Relational recognition):

Animals and ecosystems co-inhabit shared environments with humans.

This phrasing recognizes coexistence and non-human agency, emphasizing relational ethics, a key component of post-humanist ecolinguistics. It aligns with Stibbe's call for narratives that challenge human supremacy.

4.6 Silence and Absence in Ecological Discourse

Ecolinguistic analysis also considers what is not said, as silences reflect ideology. For instance, many climate reports focus on human mitigation efforts without acknowledging non-human suffering or agency. This omission aligns with the dominant exploitative "Stories We Live By", where ecological responsibility is human-centric and non-human voices are absent.

4.7 Integrative Discussion: Language as Ecological Practice

The textual analysis demonstrates that linguistic choices construct and reflect ecological values and ideologies:

1. Agency assignment shows whether humans dominate or coexist with nature.
2. Metaphors frame nature as a resource, victim, or relational partner.
3. Modality and evaluation reveal ethical responsibility toward ecosystems.
4. Naming and pronoun use signal recognition or erasure of non-human life.

According to Stibbe (2015), dominant discourses in society often reproduce unsustainable “Stories We Live By”, promoting human superiority and environmental exploitation. The post-humanist and eco-humanities-informed texts analyzed here, however, demonstrate alternative ecological narratives, emphasizing multispecies interdependence, ethical responsibility, and sustainability.

Interpretation, Language is not neutral; it actively shapes how humans perceive, relate to, and act upon the environment. Post-humanist ecolinguistic analysis reveals that transforming discourse—through metaphors, agency, and evaluation—can foster ecological awareness and promote sustainable, multispecies futures

5. Conclusion

5.1 Summary of Main Findings

This study examined the intersection of post-humanist theory, eco-humanities, and ecolinguistics to explore how language constructs, reflects, and shapes ecological meaning, values, and ideologies. Through textual and discourse analysis, several key findings emerged:

1. **Agency and Responsibility:**
Language often positions humans as the primary agents in ecological discourse, reflecting anthropocentric ideologies. Post-humanist texts, however, recognize non-human agency, portraying humans as participants within broader ecological systems rather than as dominant controllers.
2. **Metaphors and Ideologies:**
Metaphorical representations of nature reveal underlying ecological ideologies. Resource-centered metaphors perpetuate exploitative narratives, while relational and life-centered metaphors encourage ethical consideration, interdependence, and sustainability.
3. **Evaluation and Ethical Framing:**
Modal verbs and evaluative language shape perceptions of ecological responsibility. Texts employing strong obligation and ethical framing promote multispecies accountability and sustainable practices.
4. **Naming and Inclusion of Non-human Entities:**
The way non-human entities are named or referred to affects their perceived moral and ecological status. Anthropocentric discourse often objectifies nature, whereas post-humanist language recognizes coexistence and multispecies relationships.
5. **Ideological Gaps and Silences:**
Many discourses omit non-human perspectives, reflecting dominant human-centered “Stories We Live By” (Stibbe, 2015). Post-humanist approaches highlight the need to amplify marginalized ecological voices, including animals, plants, and ecosystems.

Overall, the findings suggest that language is an active ecological force, shaping how humans understand, interact with, and ethically respond to the natural world. Post-humanist ecolinguistics provides a framework for transforming discourse toward sustainability, interdependence, and multispecies awareness.

5.2 Implications

The study has significant theoretical, educational, and practical implications:

1. **Theoretical Contribution:**
By integrating post-humanist theory and eco-humanities, this research extends traditional ecolinguistics beyond anthropocentric limits. It demonstrates that language can be studied as a multispecies ecological practice, reshaping how scholars understand communication, ethics, and sustainability.
2. **Educational Implications:**
Findings emphasize the need to incorporate ecological literacy and post-humanist perspectives in education. Teaching students to recognize linguistic patterns that perpetuate anthropocentrism can foster environmental awareness, ethical reflection, and responsibility toward ecosystems.
3. **Practical Applications:**
Media, policy-making, and environmental advocacy can benefit from awareness of linguistic framing. Promoting discourse that recognizes non-human agency and relational metaphors can strengthen public engagement with sustainability and ecological ethics.

5.3 Recommendations and Future Directions

Based on the findings, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. Curriculum Integration:
Introduce post-humanist ecolinguistics into language, literature, and environmental studies curricula to develop ecological literacy and critical awareness of human-centered discourse.
2. Media and Policy Awareness:
Encourage media outlets, policymakers, and educators to use inclusive and relational language that acknowledges non-human agency and promotes multispecies sustainability.
3. Cross-Cultural and Indigenous Research:
Future research should explore non-Western, multilingual, and indigenous ecological narratives, as these perspectives often embody relational and post-humanist understandings of language and the environment.
4. Empirical Ecolinguistic Studies:
Combine textual and discourse analysis with empirical methods such as interviews, participatory observation, or computational linguistic tools to assess the impact of ecological discourse on public perception and behavior.
5. Interdisciplinary Collaboration:
Encourage collaboration between linguists, ecologists, environmental philosophers, and educators to design holistic models of language, sustainability, and multispecies ethics.

5.4 Final Conclusion

This study demonstrates that language is not a passive reflection of human thought but an active ecological force that shapes values, ideologies, and multispecies relationships. By applying post-humanist perspectives and eco-humanities insights, ecolinguistics can move beyond anthropocentric frameworks and contribute to ethical, sustainable, and relational understandings of language.

In sum, rethinking language through a post-humanist ecolinguistic lens is essential for fostering ecological awareness, promoting multispecies justice, and cultivating sustainable futures in both scholarship and society.

References

- Demuro, E., Pavesi, M., & Zanoni, A. (2023). Can nonhumans speak? Linguaging and worlds in posthumanist applied linguistics. *Linguistic Frontiers*, 6(2), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.2478/lf-2023-0015>
- Domańska, E. (2015). Ecological humanities. *Teksty Drugie*, 1, 13–32. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/286267300_Ecological_Humanities
- Ferrando, F. (2019). *Philosophical posthumanism*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Gul, W., Elismariy, W. A., & Riaz, B. (2025). Eco-linguistics and sustainability: Language as a tool for environmental responsibility. *Advance Social Science Archive Journal*, 36(1), 1–12. <https://assajournal.com/index.php/36/article/view/671>
- Ha, C. (2023). The year's work in ecolinguistics 2022. *Journal of World Languages*, 9(3), 377–395. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jwl-2023-0022>
- Oksana, P. (2023). Eco-linguistic analysis of flood representations in print media. *Pakistan Languages and Humanities Review*, 7(3), 215–230. <https://ojs.plhr.org.pk/journal/article/view/840>
- Pennycook, A. (2016). Posthumanist applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(4), 445–461. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amw016>
- Stibbe, A. (2015). *Ecolinguistics: Language, ecology and the stories we live by*. Routledge.
- Ferrando, F. (2019). *Philosophical posthumanism: Foundations, concepts and critique*. Bloomsbury Academic. [Bookswagon](https://www.bloomsbury.com/9781350100000/Philosophical-posthumanism-Ferrando)
- Haraway, D. J. (2016). *Staying with the trouble: Making kin in the Chthulucene*. Duke University Press. [Wikipedia](https://www.dukeupress.edu/staying-with-the-trouble)

- Hayles, N. K. (1999). *How we became posthuman: Virtual bodies in cybernetics, literature, and informatics*. University of Chicago Press. [Wikipedia](#)
- Latour, B. (2004). *Politics of nature: How to bring the sciences into democracy* (C. Porter, Trans.). Harvard University Press. [Wikipedia](#)
- Latour, B. (1993). *We have never been modern* (C. Porter, Trans.). Harvard University Press. [Wikipedia](#)
- Stibbe, A. (2021). *Ecolinguistics: Language, ecology and the stories we live by* (2nd ed.). Routledge. [Routledge](#)
- DeLoughrey, E., Didur, J., & Carrigan, A. (Eds.). (2015). *Global ecologies and the environmental humanities: Postcolonial approaches*. Routledge. [Routledge](#)
- Herbrechter, S., Callus, I., Rossini, M., de Bruin-Molé, M., & Müller, C. J. (Eds.). (2022). *Palgrave handbook of critical posthumanism*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Tsing, A. L. (2015). *The mushroom at the end of the world: On the possibility of life in capitalist ruins*. Princeton University Press.
- Pennycook, A. (2018). *Posthumanist applied linguistics*. Routledge

Selected Journal Articles

- Pennycook, A. (2018). Posthumanist applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(4), 445–461. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amw016>
- Peluso, M. (2025). Towards an ecocritical and sustainable foreign language education through picture books. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics*.