8

LANGUAGE AND TERRITORY

Virginie Mamadouh

A language is a dialect with an army and a navy.
אַ שפּראַך איז אַ דיאַלעקט מיט אַן אַרמיי און פֿלאָט
a shprakh iz a dialekt mit an armey un flot.

1 Introduction

This well-known aphorism captures the importance of language policy and planning for the status of a language. It was first reported (in Yiddish, hence the three versions mentioned above) in 1945 by the American linguist Max Weinreich, the founder of the Yiddish Scientific Institute in New York. It conveys very well the point that the distinction between (prestigious) languages and (undervalued) dialects is not a linguistic one but a political one, but it leaves ample room for competing interpretations (for a thorough discussion of competing attributions and interpretations, see Maxwell 2018). The army and the navy clearly refer to power relations and (the threat of) coercion, and more specifically to the state associated with the linguistic code that is acknowledged as a 'real' language. Less explicitly, they also represent the language policies of the state to enhance the status, the corpus, the (mandatory) acquisition and use of its language, and the jurisdiction in which these policies are implemented. Moreover, keeping in mind the close association between language, nation, state, and territory, the army and the navy arguably represent the core institutions able to defend the territory of a language.

The first section of this chapter explores the relation between territories and languages to advance our understanding of geographical considerations in languages and language policy and planning (LPP). The second section introduces key issues and concepts regarding the territorial character of LPP interventions. The third section deals with the evolving geographies of language and territory, and the fourth with two distinct approaches to territory in relation to languages (Laponce's territorial imperative, Raffestin's relational territory). The fifth section discusses how territorial insights are applied to LPP in two kinds of interventions: LPP for the nation-state and LPP for linguistic minorities. The final section discusses challenges for such arrangements from a territorial point of view.

2   Key issues and concepts regarding the relation between languages and territories

Contemporary conceptualisations of both language and territory are the product of modernity. "The modern person cannot merely speak; we have to speak something – a language" (Billig 1995: 31). Likewise, the modern territorial state became the default form of political organisation across the globe (Agnew 1994; Ruggie 1993; Taylor 1994, 1995). Moreover, modernity has brought about the hegemonic notion of a 'normative isomorphism' between language, nation, and state through their territory (Kamusella 2017). This isomorphism entails the coincidence of their boundaries. The normative expectation underlying this isomorphism is that the political map consists of neatly juxtaposed nation-states, and that each nation has its own language, state, and territory neatly delimitated by borders that separate it from the others. In this context, language and national identity shape territorial identification and have been invoked to legitimate territorial claims to autonomy or independence. Conversely, "Territory can be used to instill and reproduce a sense of loyalty and affiliation" (Storey 2018: 34) and to deepen linguistic and national identities.

The concept of territory is a central concept to any geographical consideration regarding languages and LPP. It is generally defined as a bounded area and refers to territoriality as political principle (the control of territory to control people, resources, and activities it contains) and to territorial strategies to exercise political power. Nevertheless, it is important to highlight that geographical approaches to territory are diverse (Murphy 2012; Elden 2013; Del Biaggio 2015; Antonsich 2017; Halvorsen 2017; Branch 2019 for a few key readings). Simply put, one can contrast more static and descriptive conceptualisations (in which territory is taken for granted as an unproblematised spatial container) to relational ones (in which territory emerges from social relations). Likewise, there are narrow definitions centred on the political jurisdiction of the state (i.e., the state territory) and broader ones where territory does not need to be formalised in legal and political institutions. Territory is not specific to national political authorities (i.e., the nation-state) but can be related to other social institutions (the lived territory practised and experienced by its inhabitants) and can be found at local, regional, national, or supranational scales.

Regarding LPP more specifically, territoriality is key to LPP instruments and interventions and to their justification. Most notably, arrangements to accommodate linguistic diversity can be territorial or non-territorial. In the first case, arrangements are implemented according to the territorial principle, meaning that they apply to all inhabitants in a specific area, while in the second case, arrangements are implemented according to the personal principle, meaning that they apply to individuals according to their membership of the target group (ascribed or self-chosen). For example, the introduction of a regional language alongside the state language in primary education can be implemented in all schools in a territory, or parents can be given the choice to enrol their children or not.

Last but not least, territory is not the only concept that can help make sense of geographical processes around languages and language policies. Considering recent development in geography and the re-conceptualisation of key geographical concepts (mostly in isolation from each other), Jessop, Brenner, and Jones (2008) argue for a more integrated approach. They distinguish four key dimensions of socio-spatial relations (territory, place, scale, and network) that are each conceived both as a principle of socio-spatial structuration and a pattern of socio-spatial relations (i.e., field structured by all principles combined). The application of this framework to LPP interventions could be particularly fruitful, but such an exercise lies far beyond the scope of this chapter. LPP interventions also affect all four types of socio-spatial relations: territory, place, scale, and network. For instance, LPP interventions directly impact place-making processes and sense of place in

the localities where they are deployed. Scale jumping (the shift to another level of government to articulate linguistic demands) can be a useful strategy to advance LPP objectives. Networks (especially those linked to the globalisation of migration and the digitalisation of society) challenge the territorial basis of many LPP arrangements. The choice of territory as the main entry for a geographical analysis remains nevertheless pertinent, because territorial arguments and territorial instruments are widely dominant in LPP.

3 Development: the evolving geographies of language and of territory

Generally, languages have not attracted much attention from geographers, even if language itself has become a key theme since the early 1990s and the influence of postmodernism and poststructuralism in (English-language) human geography and more specifically political geography (the so-called cultural turn) has been overwhelming.

Geography, by definition, is about writing the space around us (from the Greek γεωγραφία—*geographia*—writing the Earth). This can be taken literally and metaphorically. Traditionally, geographers would describe the Earth and the specificities of localities on the surface of the Earth. Toponymy is therefore a traditional field of inquiry: "Naming is a prerequisite for converting space into a meaningful place. Place names are not mere signifiers but are actively involved in place-making" (Azaryahu 2017: 1). The names of places have been seen as indicators of the past evolution of the distribution of human groups in a given area, linguistic elements providing clues about the successive inhabitants. More recently, critical place name studies have shed a different light on naming practices, putting an emphasis on the strategic use of names and on the power relations these practices reveal (Berg & Vuolteenaho 2009; Rose-Redwood *et al.* 2010, 2018; Giraut & Houssay-Holzschuch 2016).

Since the cultural turn of the early 1990s, human geographers have paid even more attention to language and discourse, in the form of geographical imaginations and geopolitical representations, and to the way they have shaped the world (especially in political geography and geopolitics) including the language(s) of (lay and academic) geography. These narratives articulate what is known and what is worth knowing; they frame (acknowledged) problems and challenges, (legitimate) interests, (perceived) opportunities, and (conceivable) solutions. Critical border studies have highlighted the discursive processes of bordering, ordering, and othering (Van Houtum & Van Naerssen 2002), while studies in critical geopolitics have analysed the geographical imaginations and geopolitical representations shaping national identities and geopolitical visions and informing domestic and foreign policies, including those pertaining to languages and identities (Dijkink 1996; Paasi 1996; Ó Tuathail 1996). Since the early 2000s, other approaches, such as feminist geographies, non-representational theory, and action network theory, have displaced this (sometimes exclusionary) focus on representations (the so-called material turn foregrounding embodiment and materialities) (Dixon 2015; Müller 2015). These approaches taking objects and stuff as items reflecting meaning are also valuable avenues for research on languages and LPP as assemblages (Jones & Lewis 2019: 42–44).

By contrast, geographers have shown little interest in languages and language groups as socio-spatial phenomena. They have studied languages much less than linguists and sociolinguists have been doing geography (for that matter without much interest in geographical scholarship).[1] At the most basic level, geographers have studied the spatial distribution of languages and/or linguistic elements (geography of languages vs linguistic geography; see Breton 1976). Cultural geographers have studied languages as cultural markers, as indicators of ethnic identities and/or

of territorial identities, and as indicators of the territorial distribution of specific ethnic groups to delineate their homeland or territory (as legitimation or as alternative to the homeland or territory represented in geopolitical discourses). Language geography and linguistic geography (and even geolinguistics (Mackey 1973; Williams 1988; Williams & Van der Merwe 1996), although the latter is generally seen as a subfield of (socio)linguistics) are sometimes used as label for a specialisation within human geography around languages and linguistics aspects, but never developed into an established subdiscipline, on a par with cultural or political geography.

4 Approaches: from Laponce's territorial imperative to relational understandings of territories

The analyses of the territorial character of languages and of LPP reverberate different approaches to territories. In this section we contrast two approaches: territorial containers vs relational territories, illustrated by two key authors, Laponce and Raffestin.

In a seminal article published in 1984 in *Political Geography Quarterly*, then a recently established journal that would soon become the flagship journal of the booming subdiscipline of political geography, the Canadian political scientist Jean Laponce (1925–2016) analyses the situation of the French language in Canada, foregrounding "tensions between geography and politics" (Laponce 1984a: 91). He asserts that "The spatial dynamics of a language lead it normally […] to occupy a geographical niche that is exclusively its own: languages reject other languages" (Laponce 1984a: 91), what he calls "language's territorial imperative" (Laponce 1984a: 92). His assumption that western monism is a universal feature, i.e., the definition of a political sphere "as a nation on the basis of a single language, a single religion a single culture", has been criticised in the same journal by Pattanayak & Bayer (1987: 261) based on their experience in India, while others later contended that Laponce's 'territorial imperative' did not apply to linguistic minorities in many European states either (Mar-Molinero & Stevenson 1991).

Laponce has further developed his ideas about languages and their territories in many other publications dealing with linguistic minorities and the competition between languages (see Safran 2018 for an extensive review of his contribution to political science and more specifically to the study of languages and politics). Laponce was also one of the first political scientists "to criticize the view that democracy was not compatible with the recognition of minority languages" (Sonntag & Cardinal 2015: 10).

Laponce often framed the results of his analysis through the formulation of laws (Laponce 2003, 2006) to begin with the Law of Babel (a reiteration of the territorial imperative):

> The sons of men who were building a high tower had a well-integrated social system, they were tied by a common project, they were concentrated territorially, within a single city, and they spoke the same language. To destroy their enterprise, God breaks their language. But that is not enough. Additionally, He disperses them geographically. The implication is clear. If the sons of men had stayed in Babel, they would have eventually gone back to speaking the same tongue. … If one's goal is to maintain language distinctiveness, if one's goal is to favour multilingualism, then one should adopt Yahweh's strategy of geographical separation since, in a well-integrated social system, it is the more powerful language that leads, in its own favour, the return to Babelian unilingualism.
>
> (Laponce 2003: 58–59)

No doubt the urge to formulate laws is out of fashion in social sciences, and the associated claims to universality seem unnecessarily vain. However, Laponce's claim that a language needs a territory of its own to be effectively shielded against a larger/stronger language still has considerable appeal among language activists and many observers, even if his framing of languages as living organisms is outdated (for a critique of his anthropomorphism see Mackey's commentary in Laponce 1985). In an extreme form, Laponce (1993) compares languages to animals, at a time when geographers had already established the social specificities of human territoriality (most notably Soja 1971;[2] Gottmann 1973; Sack 1983, 1986). It is therefore important to discuss how insights from human geography can inform an analysis of the relations between languages and territories.

An early and inspiring example is the work of Claude Raffestin (born 1936) and his relational approach to territory. He is also one of the few geographers who has offered a sustained engagement with the conceptualisation of the relation between language and territory. His seminal book *Pour une géographie du pouvoir* (Raffestin 2019 [1980]) was a particularly original publication at the time, developing an agenda for a geography of power (inspired by Foucault's conceptualisation of power) that would not be state-centric, unlike political geography had been since its conception in the late nineteenth century in Germany (Ratzel 1897). Well ahead of his time in engaging with Foucault and Lefebvre (in a way French geographers did not, certainly not before it became fashionable in the 1990s among Anglo-American geographers), Raffestin elaborated a relational geography of power (see Dell'Agnese 2013).

The book features an insightful chapter on *Langue et pouvoir* (language and power). Raffestin adopts the tetraglossic analysis proposed by Henri Gobard (1966), which makes a distinction between four functions of languages in any given cultural area: 1) a vernacular language, 2) a vehicular language, 3) a reference language, and 4) a mythical or sacred language (Raffestin 2019 [1980]: 150). The four functions may be fulfilled by different languages. This is an important move away from the hegemony of monolingualism, which Raffestin reframes here as an exceptional case in which all four functions are necessarily and normally fulfilled by the same language. In parallel to Gobard's language typology, Raffestin distinguishes 1) the territory of everyday life, 2) the territory of exchanges, 3) the territory of reference, and 4) the sacred territory (Raffestin 1995: 96). The interface between the two typologies does not imply that their respective elements necessarily correspond (Raffestin 1995: 101). Modern territorial states have typically hallowed both a specific language (and its difference from neighbouring languages) and a specific territory (and its borders from neighbouring territories). Historically, the standardisation and homogenisation of the language and the homogenisation of the territory went hand in hand (in Europe at least).

For Raffestin, all cultural phenomena can be studied as processes of production, circulation, and consumption, foregrounding human agency. Moreover, language and territory are present in each individual and collective action, meditating between human beings and their environment. But there is no essentialist relation between them: any language can be used anywhere, any territory can accommodate the use of any language. It is the inhabitants of the territory that are the users of the language and vice versa (the users of a language that dwell in a territory). Raffestin asserts that both language and territory are projections of the needs of the inhabitants (1995: 90), and both are relational. Work (as a combination of energy and information) enables the construction of these relations. Language and territory are both the product of human labour, although they are materially and temporally very different, since language can adapt much quicker to a change of needs than territory. The complementarity between them can be summarised as follows:

Language and territory thus constitute, in the field of security, complementary universes that allow the integration of time and space: *language helps to control time while the territory contributes to mastering space.* In this sense, they are instruments of culture that delineate the world: every culture is a 'machine' to produce borders, so it is a system oriented, at least in part, towards the production of security.

(Raffestin 1995: 93, my translation, my emphasis[3])

Raffestin's approach is particularly valuable for disrupting the hegemonic conceptualisation of territory as jurisdiction. His relational approach to territory highlights the existence of a wider range of diverse territories, socially produced and constructed, fulfilling different functions. Raffestin's conception of territory is much broader than the narrow sense of the jurisdiction of a national or local state, as in Laponce's territorial imperative, which is more rooted in the state-centric conception of territories common in Anglo-American scholarship (for a comparison with French language geography, see Murphy 2012; Del Biaggio 2015; Antonsich 2017; Halvorsen 2019). It would be dishonest, however, to exaggerate the differences between Laponce and Raffestin. They share an interest in the complexity of the relations between language and territory—and a concern with the state's inclination towards language domination and the obliteration of minority languages (Raffestin 1985: 338–339).

5   Applications: (state) nationalism and minority rights

Although LPP interventions may be aimed at promoting individual and collective multilingualism, language policies are generally designed for a specific language, in a specific community, and in a specific territory. However, language policies typically target one more than then others, primarily focussing on language, community, or territory. From the perspective of the geographer, the first question to ask then becomes: LPP for whom, where, or to what ends? LPP can be designed primarily:

- for a given territory T (i.e., to ameliorate the linguistic situation in T conceived as a container demarcated from other territories);
- for a given language L (to defend L against other languages);
- for a given population P (to defend their—individual and collective— rights, generally as part of other political claims for social justice and individual emancipation).

Moreover, LPP may actually be mostly intended to strengthen the state and its grip on the population and the territory it governs and represents, and language policy might even be no more than an instrument that has been contingently selected for that purpose.

In addition, four analytical moments could be distinguished to explore the geographical dimensions of LPP: 1) the linguistic situation in which language policies are imagined, developed, and implemented, 2) the linguistic grievances and claims articulated (i.e., demands for new language policies), 3) the arrangements and policies developed to accommodate demands and remove grievances (or claimers!), and 4) the intended and unintended effects of these policies (including resistance and new demands). The fourth phase is also the first phase of a new cycle (see Van der Wusten & Knippenberg 2001 for a similar cyclical model of ethnic mobilisation). In each phase, territorial considerations matter. They pertain to 1) the geographical characteristics of the linguistic group (distribution, concentration, dominance, and contiguity) and/or the linguistic characteristics of the area involved (ongoing processes of linguistic homogenisation and diversification), 2) the

role and importance of geographical arguments in the narratives invoked, 3) the (non-) territorial nature of policies proposed adopted and/or implemented, and 4) the outcome for the geographical characteristics of the linguistic group and the linguistic characteristics of the area.

From a geographical perspective, the rich literature on LPP interventions can be divided into two main clusters: LPP interventions aimed at fostering linguistic homogenisation in a state territory, on the one hand, and LPP interventions aimed at protecting minority languages and the linguistic rights of their speakers, on the other hand. The first type focuses on territory, territoriality, and 'territorial cleansing' linked to nationalism, nation-building, and ethnonationalist movements (Penrose 2002; Tabachnik 2019; Egbert *et al.* 2016).

With *Territories, Boundaries and Consciousness,* a seminal book for critical border studies and critical geopolitics, Paasi (1996) published a rich monograph on the institutionalisation of the Finnish territory and the formation of Finnish national identity in the light of its relations with Russia/the Soviet Union and more specifically of the border adjustment after the Second World War. The roles of the Finnish language and of Finnish territory in the articulation of the geopolitical representation of Finnish national identity and Finland's geopolitical visions and foreign policies, as well as the relations between them, are analysed in detail, both in national discourses and practices and through the local experience of the displaced inhabitants of the locality of Värtsilä, which was divided by the postwar border.

The second type of studies focus on linguistic minorities and arrangements to accommodate their needs (Murphy 1988; Williams 1988, 1991; Mikesell & Murphy 1991; Cartwright 2006). Arguably, LPP arrangements are always territorial in the sense of being applied to a specific jurisdiction, but they can be organised according to different principles. Generally, as noted earlier, a distinction is made between the territorial principle and the personal principle (McRae 1975; Laponce 1980; Williams 2012). The first reifies territories (which are seen as monolingual) and creates new minorities (the users of the majority language who happen to live in the territory assigned to the minority); the second privileges individual agency but might easily run into practical difficulties when the users of the minority language are dispersed among users of other languages.

In a comparative perspective, Coakley (1993, revised and expanded in a book publication in 2003) has proposed a heuristic model to conceptualise the relation between territory and ethnic identity. It is based on two dimensions of the present distribution of the (alleged) members of a group (of course, alleged group members are not necessarily supporters of the political movement(s) claiming to speak for them): concentration (of the group in a given territory) and predominance (of the group in that territory). A group scoring high on both dimensions (that is, concentrated and predominant in a given territory) is expected to be more successful in achieving autonomy or secession, while a group scoring low on both is unlikely to do so because the situation of a large share of the group would remain unaffected while the new arrangement would create a new, large minority (since the group is not predominant in the assigned area).

For minorities that are dispersed (that is, not concentrated and not predominant anywhere), territorial solutions are unlikely. In a recent special issue of *Ethnopolitics*, Coakley (2016a: 7) more specifically addresses the case of minorities for which territorial arrangements are not viable because the territory is neither inclusive (i.e., failing to incorporate a large proportion of members), homogeneous (i.e., failing *not* to include many non-members), or compact (i.e., contiguous). This special issue features a series of case studies of non-territorial arrangements, such as special institutions for members of linguistic minorities. In his conclusion, Coakley compares these cases on five dimensions of institutional autonomy: recognition, representation, executive authority, functional autonomy, and fiscal status (Coakley 2016b: 175), concluding that autonomy is rarely

present in non-territorial arrangements and was not in Moravia (the case often held out as a model of non-territorial autonomy, Coakley 2016b: 178).

Non-territorial arrangements have recently received more attention with a renewed interest in the arrangements of the Habsburg monarchy prior to the dismantling of the multicultural empire at the end of the First World War and the theoretical work of the Austro-Marxist Renner on cultural autonomy (Nimni 1999, 2005, 2007; Sandner 2005; Coakley 2016a, 2016b; von Busekist 2019). Finally, political philosophers like Van Parijs have promoted territoriality from the point of view of social justice (Van Parijs 2011; De Schutter & Robichaud 2016 for critiques of Van Parijs), while political scientists and legal scholars discuss empirical arrangements for linguistic minorities in a comparative perspective, through the prism of state traditions (Sonntag & Cardinal 2015), legal policy options (Arraiza 2011), educational systems (Arraiza 2016), or language territorial regimes (Borisova & Sulimov 2018: 370).

From a geographical perspective, a sensitivity to scale could bring more attention to the fact that territorial arrangements reproduce similar problems at another level, creating new minorities within the minority region (consider the situation of Francophones in Flanders with the federalisation of Belgium). Non-territorial arrangements often turn out to be territorial at a different scale (see Cartwright 1996 on gradualism in local accommodation for Franco-Ontarians). Typically, in places where the personal principle applies (Brussels, Finland), non-territorial autonomy is based on a system of dual monolingualism (Dalle Mulle 2016) where monolingual individuals live in monolingual bubbles. Even when bilingualism is an everyday practice, some institutions remain monolingual bubbles. For example, From & Sahlström (2017) show the utmost importance, in the Finnish case, of monolingual schools for the users of the minority language, who are generally bilingual and fluent in the majority language to function in other social settings. This echoes the territorial imperative articulated by Laponce—albeit at a micro scale.

6   Challenges

The territorial arrangements made to accommodate linguistic diversity are not always flexible enough to accommodate new demographic and linguistic changes (particularly linked to internal and international migration). A typical example is the fixed language border in Belgium around the bilingual capital city region of Brussels that creates new tensions when French speakers and other allophones (immigrants, expats) move to suburban municipalities in Flanders (that are institutionalised as Flemish and monolingual), seriously constraining the non-territorial principle chosen for the capital city (Witte 1993; Vogl & Hüning 2010; De Keere & Elchardus 2011; Bonfiglioli 2015; Dalle Mulle 2016), while English has increasingly become a major language in Brussels (Janssens 2004, 2018; O'Donnell & Toebosch 2008; Vandenbroucke 2015, 2018).

Some flexible arrangements, such as the Finnish provision to make municipalities change their language regime when the minority population[4] rises above a certain threshold (8% or 3000 speakers), or drops below another (6%, with a possible extension of ten years at the request of the Municipal Council), are better equipped to do so, without requiring a new round of political negotiations to resolve a new round of language conflict. Europeanisation and globalisation, along with the increasing role of English (and demand for English in school), nevertheless alter the balance between the two national languages in Helsinki (Kraus 2011). Both examples remind us that the territories targeted by LPP interventions are far from being closed (linguistic) systems and that they are linked to the rest of the world, through many relations (including old and new media, migration, trade, tourism, and universities).

Indeed, contemporary challenges to existing LPP go well beyond shifting relations between language groups. The deep diversity brought about by international migration but also by globalisation and digitalisation requires more complex and innovative interventions. More than ever, the still dominant normative isomorphism between language and territory is at odds with the linguistic diversity present in any area. In addition, new supranational political arrangements, such as the European Union, impact the linguistic situation in their member states (Wise 2006, 2007).

LPP instruments are also likely to travel across borders as 'best practices' and influence social mobilisation, political debates, and policy decisions. Therefore, the purpose of this chapter is not only to highlight the relations between language and territory and the territorial dimensions of LPP. It is to problematise the taken-for-granted territorial imperative, to help to uncover other geographical imaginations and geopolitical representations of the relation between language and territory and other practices of plural configurations of languages and socio-spatial forms, and to develop a geographic sensitivity to specific local situations. This should be a warning against the uninformed policy transfer (De Jong *et al.* 2002) of 'best practices' when it comes to language policy and planning.

Notes

1   A review of the work of linguists and sociolinguists on spatial aspects is beyond the scope of this chapter. Spatial metaphors have been widely used in (socio-)linguistics ranging from proximity and distance between languages, centre and periphery, monocentrism and pluricentrism, territory and border, linguistic domains and linguistic landscapes. For recent overviews see Auer and Schmidt 2010 (especially Johnstone's chapter) and Auzanneau and Trimeille 2017.
2   A direct critique of Robert Ardrey's bookseller *The Territorial Imperative: A Personal Inquiry Into the Animal Origins of Property and Nations* (1966). Laponce uses the expression 'territorial imperative' but does not explicitly refer to this book.
3   "Langue et territoire constituent donc, en matière de sécurité, des univers complémentaires qui permettent l'intégration du temps et de l'espace: la langue contribue à maitriser le temps tandis que le territoire contribue à maitriser l'espace. En ce sens, ils sont bien des instruments de culture qui découpent le monde: toute culture étant une 'machine' à fabriquer des limites, elle est donc un système orienté, en partie du moins, vers la production de sécurité".
4   Swedish and, since 1991, Sámi.

Further reading

Brunn, Stan D. and Roland Kehrein (eds.) (2019) *Handbook of the Changing World Language Map*. Cham: Springer. An interdisciplinary collection bringing together a wide array of essays pertaining to geography and linguistics.

Jones, Rhys and Huw Lewis (2019) *New Geographies of Language: Language, Culture and Politics in Wales*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. A recent plea for a greater integration of language policy with contemporary geographical research, with empirical discussions of the Welsh language

Laponce, Jean A. (1984) *Langue et territoire*. Quebec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, and (1987) *Languages and Their Territories*. Toronto: Toronto University Press. A multidisciplinary discussion of language and territory, dealing more specifically with bilingualism and with the state.

Laponce, Jean (2006) *Loi de Babel et autres régularités des rapports entre langue et politique*. Quebec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval. A summary of the six main laws Laponce formulated about changing relations between languages and politics, including the Law of Babel and the Law of Lyautey (which is equivalent to the saying about the army and the navy discussed at the beginning of this chapter).

Paasi, Anssi (1996) *Territories, Boundaries and Consciousness; The Changing Geographies of the Finnish-Russian Border*, Belhaven Studies in Political Geography. Chichester: John Wiley. A seminal work on spatial socialisation and social spatialisation based on an empirically rich account of the evolution of

Finnish national identity, and paying particular attention to the role of the national language and the state border with Russia.

Raffestin, Claude (2019 [1980]). *Pour une géographie du pouvoir*. Lyon: ENS Éditions. A systematic introduction to a geography of power, paying particular attention to the mediating role of language.

References

Agnew, John (1994) "The territorial trap: the geographical assumptions of international relations theory", *Review of International Political Economy*, vol. 1 (1), 53–80, https://doi.org/10.1080/09692299408434268

Antonsich, Marco (2017) "Territory and territoriality", in Richardson, Douglas, Noel Castree, Michael F. Goodchild, Audrey Kobayashi, Weidong Liu, and Richard A. Marston (eds.) *The International Encyclopedia of Geography: People, the Earth, Environment, and Technology*, 1–9. Hoboken: Wiley, https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118786352.wbieg0022

Arraiza, José-Maria (2011) "Blueprints for Babel: legal policy options for minority and indigenous languages", *European Public Law*, vol. 17 (1), 111–138.

Arraiza, José-Maria (2016) "Language diversity speaking to autonomy: exploring the relations between autonomy and minority language education", *Revista de Llengua i Dret/Journal of Language and Law*, vol. 66, 105–123, http://dx.doi.org/10.2436/rld.i66.2016.2840

Auer, Peter and Jürgen Erich Schmidt (eds.) (2010) *Language and Space: Theories and Methods, an International Handbook of Linguistic Variation, Volume 1: Theories and Methods*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Auzanneau, Maoz and Cyril Trimaille (2017) "L'odyssée de l'espace en sociolinguistique", *Language et société*, vol. 2017/2 (1601–61), 349–367, https://doi.org/10.3917/ls.160.0349

Azaryahu, Maoz (2017) "Toponymy", in Richardson, Douglas, Noel Castree, Michael F. Goodchild, Audrey Kobayashi, Weidong Liu, & Richard A. Marston (eds.) *The International Encyclopedia of Geography: People, the Earth, Environment, and Technology*, 1–3. Hoboken: Wiley, https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118786352.wbieg0042

Berg, Lawrence D. and Jani Vuolteenaho (eds.) (2009) *Critical Toponymies: The Contested Politics of Place Naming*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Billig, Michael (1995) *Banal Nationalism*. London: Sage.

Bonfiglioli, Clothilde (2015) "La course de vélo du Gordel autour de Bruxelles-Capitale: matérialisation d'une frontière communautaire?", *Belgeo*, vol. 2015 (2), 1–22, https://doi.org/10.4000/belgeo.16508.

Borisova, Nadezhda and Konstantin Sulimov (2018) "Language territorial regimes in multilingual ethnic territorial autonomies", *Nationalities Papers*, vol. 46 (3), 358–373, https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2017.1351938

Branch, Jordan (2017) "Territory as an institution: spatial ideas, practices and technologies", *Territory, Politics, Governance,* vol. 5 (2), 131–144, https://doi.org/10.1080/21622671.2016.1265464

Breton, Roland J.-L. (1976) *Géographie des langues*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.

Cardinal, Linda and Selma K. Sonntag (eds.) (2015) *State Traditions and Language Regimes*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Cartwright, Don (2006) "Geolinguistic analysis in language policy", in Ricento, Thomas (ed.) *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method*, 194–209. Malden: Blackwell.

Cartwright, Don (1996) "The expansion of French language rights in Ontario, 1968–1993: the uses of territoriality in a policy of gradualism", *The Canadian Geographer*, vol. 40 (3), 238–257, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-0064.1996.tb00451.x

Coakley, John (1993) "Introduction: the territorial management of ethnic conflict", *Regional Politics and Policy*, vol. 3 (1), 1–22, https://doi.org/10.1080/13597569308420856

Coakley, John (ed.) (2003) *The Territorial Management of Ethnic Conflict*. London: Frank Cass.

Coakley, John (2016a) "Introduction: dispersed minorities and non-territorial autonomy", *Ethnopolitics*, vol. 15 (1), 1–23, https://doi.org/10.1080/17449057.2015.1101842

Coakley, John (2016b) "Conclusion: patterns of non-territorial autonomy", *Ethnopolitics*, vol. 15 (1), 166–185, https://doi.org/10.1080/17449057.2015.1101840

Dalle Mulle, Emmanuel (2016) "Belgium and the Brussels Question: the role of non-territorial autonomy", *Ethnopolitics*, vol. 15 (1), 105–124, https://doi.org/10.1080/17449057.2015.1101839

De Jong, Martin, Konstantinos Lalenis, and Virginie Mamadouh (eds.) (2002) *The Theory and Practice of Institutional Transplantation; Experiences with the Transfer of Policy Institutions*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

De Keere, Kobe and Mark Elchardus (2011) "Narrating linguistic conflict: a storytelling analysis of the language conflict in Belgium", *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, vol. 32 (3), 221–234, https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2011.563857

De Schutter, Helder and David Robichaud (eds.) (2016) *Linguistic Justice: Van Parijs and His Critics*. London: Routledge.

Del Biaggio, Cristina (2015) "Territory beyond the anglophone tradition", in Agnew, John, Virginie Mamadouh, Anna Secor, and Joannne Sharp (eds.) *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Political Geography*, 35–47. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell.

Dell'Agnese, Elena (2013) "The political challenge of relational territory", in Featherstone, David and Joe Painter (eds.) *Spatial Politics: Essays for Doreen Massey*, 115–132. Chichester/Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.

Dijkink, Gertjan (1996) *National Identity and Geopolitical Visions, Maps of Pride and Pain*. London: Routledge.

Dixon, Deborah (2015) *Feminist Geopolitics: Material States* London: Routledge.

Egbert, Stephen L., Nathaniel R. Pickett, Nicole Reiz, William Price, Austen Thelen, and Vincent Artman (2016) "Territorial cleansing: a geopolitical approach to understanding mass violence", *Territory, Politics, Governance*, vol. 4 (3), 297–318, https://doi.org/10.1080/21622671.2015.1036911

Elden, Stuart (2013) *The Birth of Territory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

From, Tuuli and Frijthof Sahlström (2017) "Shared places, separate spaces: constructing cultural spaces through two national languages in Finland", *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, vol. 61 (40), 465–478, https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2016.1147074

Giraut, Frédéric and Myriam Houssay-Holzschuch (2016) "Place naming as *dispositif*: toward a theoretical framework", *Geopolitics*, vol. 21 (1), 1–21, https://doi.org/10.1080/14650045.2015.1134493

Gobard, Henri (1966) *L'aliénation linguistique: Analyse tétraglossique*. Paris: Flammarion.

Gottmann, Jean (1973) *The Significance of Territory*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.

Halvorsen, Sam (2019) "Decolonising territory: dialogues with Latin American knowledges and grassroots strategies", *Progress in Human Geography*, vol. 43 (5), 790–814, https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0309132518777623

Janssens, Rudi (2004) "The other languages of Brussels", *The Low Countries: Arts and Society in Flanders and The Netherlands: A Yearbook*, vol. 12, 277–279.

Janssens, Rudi (2018) *Meertaligheid als opdracht. Een analyse van de Brusselse taalsituatie op basis van taalbarometer 4*. Brussels: ASP.

Jessop, Bob, Neil Brenner, and Martin Jones (2008) "Theorizing sociospatial relations", *Environment & Planning D: Society & Space*, vol. 26 (3), 389–401, https://doi.org/10.1068%2Fd9107

Jones, Rhys and Huw Lewis (2019) *New Geographies of Language: Language, Culture and Politics in Wales*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kamusella, Tomasz (2017) "The rise and dynamics of the normative isomorphism of language, nation, and state in Central Europe", *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, vol. 35 (1/4), 351–381.

Kraus, Peter A. (2011) "The multilingual city: the cases of Helsinki and Barcelona", *Nordic Journal of Migration Research*, vol. 1 (1), 25–36, http://doi.org/10.2478/v10202-011-0004-2

Laponce, Jean A. (1980) "Le comportement spatial des groupes linguistiques: solutions personnelles et solutions territoriales aux problèmes de minorités", *International Political Science Review / Revue internationale de science politique*, vol. 1 (4), 478–494, https://doi.org/10.1177%2F019251218000100404

Laponce, Jean A. (1984a) "The French language in Canada: tensions between geography and politics", *Political Geography Quarterly*, vol. 3 (2), 91–104, https://doi.org/10.1016/0260-9827(84)90001-6

Laponce, Jean A. (1984b) *Langue et territoire*. Quebec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval.

Laponce, Jean. A. (1985) "The multilingual mind and multilingual societies: in search of neuropsychological explanations of the spatial behavior of ethno-linguistic groups (with commentaries)", *Politics and the Life Sciences*, vol. 4 (1), 3–30.

Laponce, Jean (1987) *Languages and Their Territories*. Toronto: Toronto University Press.

Laponce, Jean (1992) "Language and politics", in Hawkesworth, Mary and Maurice Kogan (eds.) *Encyclopedia of Government and Politics*, 587–602. London: Routledge.

Laponce, Jean A. (1993) "Do languages behave like animals?", *International Journal of Sociology of Languages*, vol. 103 (1), 19–30, https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.1993.103.19

Laponce, Jean (2003) "Babel and the market: geostrategy for minority languages", in Maurais, Jacques and Michael A. Morris (eds.) *Languages in a Globalising World*, 58–63. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Laponce, Jean (2006) *Loi de Babel et autres régularités des rapports entre langue et politique*. Quebec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval.

Mackey, William F. (1973) *Three Concepts for Geolinguistics.* Quebec: C.I.R.B.

Mackey, William F. (1988) "Geolinguistics: its scope and principles", in Williams, Colin H. (ed.) *Language in Geographic Context*, 20–46. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Mar-Molinero, Clare and Patrick Stevenson (1991) "Language, geography and politics: the "territorial imperative" debate in the European context", *Language Problems & Language Planning*, vol. 15 (2), 162–176, https://doi.org/10.1075/lplp.15.2.03mar

Maxwell, Alexander (2018) "When theory is a joke: the Weinreich witticism in linguistics", *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft*, vol. 28 (2), 263–292.

McRae, Kenneth D. (1975) "The principle of territoriality and the principle of personality in multilingual states", *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, vol. 4, 33–54.

Mikesell, Marvin W. and Alexander B. Murphy (1991) "A framework for comparative study of minority-group aspirations", *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, vol. 81 (4), 581–604, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8306.1991.tb01710.x

Müller, Martin (2015) "More-than-representational political geographies", in Agnew, John, Virginie Mamadouh, Anna Secor, and Joanne Sharp (eds.) (2015) *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Political Geography*, 407–423. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118725771.ch30

Murphy, Alexander B. (1988) *The Regional Dynamics of Language Differentiation in Belgium: A Study in Cultural-Political Geography.* Chicago: University of Chicago.

Murphy, Alexander B. (2012) "Entente territorial: Sack and Raffestin on territoriality", *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, vol. 30 (1), 159–172, https://doi.org/10.1068%2Fd4911

Nimni, Ephraim (1999) "National multiculturalism in late imperial Austria as a critique of contemporary liberalism: the case of Bauer and Renner", *Journal of Political Ideologies*, vol. 4 (3), 289–314, https://doi.org/10.1080/13569319908420800

Nimni, Ephraim (ed.) (2005) *National Cultural Autonomy and Its Contemporary Critics*. London: Routledge.

Nimni, Ephraim (2007) "National-cultural autonomy as alternative to minority territorial nationalism", *Ethnopolitics*, vol. 6 (3), 345–364, https://doi.org/10.1080/17449050701487363

Ó Tuathail, Gearóid (1996) *Critical Geopolitics, The Politics of Writing Global Space*. London: Routledge.

O'Donnell, Paul and Annemarie Toebosch (2008) "Multilingualism in Brussels: 'I'd rather speak English'", *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, vol. 29 (2), 154–169, https://doi.org/10.2167/jmmd564.0

Paasi, Anssi (1996) *Territories, Boundaries and Consciousness: The Changing Geographies of the Finnish-Russian Border*, Belhaven Studies in Political Geography. Chichester: John Wiley.

Pattanayak, D. P. and J. M. Bayer (1987) "Laponce's 'The French language in Canada: tensions between geography and politics': A rejoinder", *Political Geography Quarterly*, vol. 6 (3), 261–263, https://doi.org/10.1016/S0260-9827(87)80004-6

Penrose, Jan (2002) "Nations, states and homelands: territory and territoriality in nationalist thought", *Nations and Nationalism*, vol. 8 (3), 277–297, https://doi.org/10.1111/1469-8219.00051

Raffestin, Claude (1985) "Laponce, Jean A. (1984) *Langue et territoire*. Québec, Presses de l'Université Laval, 265 p.", *Cahiers de géographie du Québec*, vol. 29 (77), 338–339

Raffestin, Claude (1995) "Langue et territoire. Autour de la géographie culturelle", in Walty, Samuel and Bruno Werlen (eds.) *Kulturen und Raum: theoretische Ansätze und empirische Kulturforschung in Indonesien: Festschrift für Professor Albert Leemann*, 87–104. Zurich: Rüegger.

Raffestin, Claude (2012) "Space, territory, and territoriality", *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, vol. 30 (1), 121–141, https://doi.org/10.1068%2Fd21311

Raffestin, Claude (2019 [1980]) *Pour une géographie du pouvoir*. Lyon: ENS Éditions.

Ratzel, Friederich (1897) *Politische Geographie*. Munich/Leipzig: R. Oldenbourg.

Reuchamps, Min, Dimokritos Kavadias, and Kris Deschouwer (2014) "Drawing Belgium: using mental maps to measure territorial conflict", *Territory, Politics, Governance*, vol. 2 (1), 30–51, https://doi.org/10.1080/21622671.2013.814549

Rose-Redwood, Reuben, Derek H. Alderman, and Maoz Azaryahu (2010) "Geographies of toponymic inscription: new directions in critical place-names studies", *Progress in Human Geography*, vol. 34 (4), 453–470, https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0309132509351042

Rose-Redwood, Reuben, Derek Alderman, and Maoz Azaryahu (eds.) (2018) *The Political Life of Urban Streetscapes: Naming, Politics and Place*. London/New York: Routledge.

Ruggie, John G. (1993) "Territoriality and beyond: problematizing modernity in international relations", *International Organization*, vol. 47 (2), 139–174, https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818300004732

Sack, Robert D. (1983) "Human territoriality: a theory", *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, vol. 73, 55–74, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8306.1983.tb01396.x

Sack, Robert D. (1986) *Human Territoriality: Its Theory and History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Safran, William (2018) "The contributions of Jean A. Laponce to political science", *International Political Science Review*, vol. 39 (5), 690–701, https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0192512118805358

Sandner, Günther (2005) "Nations without nationalism: the Austro-Marxist discourse on multiculturalism", *Journal of Language and Politics*, vol. 4 (2), 273–291, https://doi.org/10.1075/jlp.4.2.06san

Soja, Edward W. (1971) *The Political Organization of Space*. Washington, DC: Association of American Geographers, Commission on College Geography.

Sonntag, Selma K. and Linda Cardinal (2015) "State traditions and language regimes: a historical institutionalism approach to language policy", *European and Regional Studies*, vol. 8, 5–21, https://doi.org/10.1515/auseur-2015-0010

Storey, David (2018) "Territory and territoriality", in Paasi, Anssi, John Harrison, and Martin Jones (eds.) *Handbook on the Geographies of Regions and Territories*, 34–43. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Tabachnik, Maxim (2019) "Untangling liberal democracy from territoriality: from ethnic/civic to ethnic/territorial nationalism" *Nations and Nationalism*, vol. 25 (1), 191–207, https://doi.org/10.1111/nana.12428

Taylor, Peter. J. (1994) "The state as container: territoriality in the modern world-system", *Progress in Human Geography*, vol. 18 (2), 151–162, https://doi.org/10.1177%2F030913259401800202

Taylor, Peter. J. (1995) "Beyond containers: internationality, interstateness, interterritoriality", *Progress in Human Geography*, vol. 19 (1), 1–15, https://doi.org/10.1177%2F030913259501900101

Van der Wusten, Herman and Hans Knippenberg (2001) "The ethnic dimension in 20th century European politics: a recursive model", in Dijkink, Gertjan and Hans Knippenberg (eds.) *The Territorial Factor, Political Geography in a Globalising World*, 273–291. Amsterdam: Vossius Pers UvA.

Van Houtum, Henk and Ton van Naerssen (2002) "Bordering, ordering and othering", *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, vol. 93 (2), 125–136, https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9663.00189

Van Parijs, Philippe (2011) *Linguistic Justice for Europe and for the World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Vandenbroucke, Mieke (2015) "Language visibility, functionality and meaning across various TimeSpace scales in Brussels' multilingual landscapes", *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, vol. 36 (2), 163–181, https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2014.909442

Vandenbroucke, Mieke (2018) "Multilingualism, urban change and gentrification in the landscape of a Brussels neighbourhood", *Multilingua*, vol. 37 (1), 25–52, https://doi.org/10.1515/multi-2015-0103

Vogl, Ulrike and Matthias Hüning (2010) "One nation, one language? The case of Belgium" *Dutch Crossing*, vol. 34 (3), 228–247, https://doi.org/10.1179/030965610X12820418688570

Von Busekist, Astrid (2019) "After Empire: Karl Renner's Danubian model of pluralism", *Nations and Nationalism*, vol. 25 (2), 544–563, https://doi.org/10.1111/nana.12464

Williams, Colin H. (ed.) (1988) *Language in Geographic Context*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Williams, Colin H. (ed.) (1991) *Linguistic Minorities, Society and Territory*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Williams, Colin H. (2012) "Language policy, territorialism and regional autonomy", in Spolsky, Bernard (ed.) *The Cambridge Handbook of Language Policy*, 174–202. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Williams, Colin H. and Izak van der Merwe (1996) "Mapping the multilingual city: a research agenda for urban geolinguistics", *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, vol. 17 (1), 49–66, https://doi.org/10.1080/01434639608666259

Wise, Michael (2006) "Defending national linguistic territories in the European Single Market: towards more transnational geolinguistic analysis", *Area*, vol. 38 (2), 204–212, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-4762.2006.00683.x

Wise, Michael (2007) "Putting principles of linguistic rights into practice: geographical perspectives on a contemporary European problem", *Geoforum* vol. 38, 171–189, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2006.07.010

Witte, Els (ed.) (1993) *De Brusselse Rand*. Brussels: VUB Press.