

Please cite the Published Version

Visentin, Francesco  and Kaaristo, Maarja  (2024) Geographies of inland waterscapes: thinking with watery places. *Geographical Journal*, 190 (2). e12579 ISSN 0016-7398

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/geoj.12579>

Publisher: Wiley

Version: Published Version

Downloaded from: <https://e-space.mmu.ac.uk/634929/>

Usage rights:  [Creative Commons: Attribution 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

Additional Information: This is an open access article which first appeared in *Geographical Journal*, published by Wiley

Data Access Statement: Data sharing not applicable – no new data generated.

Enquiries:

If you have questions about this document, contact openresearch@mmu.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in e-space. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our Take Down policy (available from <https://www.mmu.ac.uk/library/using-the-library/policies-and-guidelines>)

SPECIAL SECTION**Geographies of Inland Waterscapes**

Geographies of inland waterscapes: Thinking with watery places

Francesco Visentin¹  | Maarja Kaaristo² 

¹Department of Languages and Literatures, Communication, Education and Society, University of Udine, Udine, Italy

²Department of Marketing, International Business and Tourism, Manchester Metropolitan University, Manchester, UK

Correspondence

Francesco Visentin, Department of Languages and Literatures, Communication, Education and Society, University of Udine, Palazzo Antonini, via Petracco 8, Udine 33100, Italy.
Email: francesco.visentin@uniud.it

Abstract

Humans and water have a complex relationship that includes various dimensions such as sociocultural, political, legal and ecological. Considering the ubiquity of water, we need a more holistic perspective to help us see water not as a static entity but rather as one in constant movement, physically and conceptually; acknowledging the interplay between water and humans is essential to understanding societal narratives deeply embedded in places. In this special section, an interdisciplinary group of scholars explore inland waters, taking a water-centric view instead of a land-centric one. The special section delves into the emerging hydro-social connections, diverse forms of expertise, governance models, collective and spontaneous actions, and resilience strategies within the context of inland water bodies, exploring how canals, rivers and wetlands are experienced and represented as places. The papers in this collection show that any form of placemaking should take responsible stewardship of water, embrace its dynamic nature, and present a realistic pathway towards sustainable solutions for present and future water challenges.

KEYWORDS

human–water relationship, inland waters, placemaking, waterscape

1 | INTRODUCTION

Water is crucial for sustaining life on the planet, appearing in various forms and states, from oceans and seas to rivers and canals, from lakes and reservoirs to groundwater and glaciers, and from fog to vapour. Water is also important in (re) creating various socio-cultural relations (Gandy, 2014; Krause & Strang, 2016; Neimanis, 2017). As Anuradha Mathur and Dilip da Cunha (2020) have noted, ‘wetness is everywhere’, and in a world where water has often been contained in favour of the earth, it is perhaps time for ‘a new imagination—a hydrologic one—that says we do not inhabit a surface but rather a ubiquitous wetness’ (2020, p. 139). As the living environments of both humans and non-humans are rapidly changing, we urgently need to respond to the challenges of the Anthropocene, one of which is reconsidering the varied human relationships with watery places.

Drawing inspiration from Kimberly Peters’ and Philip Steinberg’s insights into ‘the sea’s material and phenomenological distinctiveness [which] can facilitate the reimagining and re-enlivening of a world ever on the move’ (2015, p. 248),

This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

The information, practices and views in this article are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the Royal Geographical Society (with IBG).

© 2024 The Authors. *The Geographical Journal* published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd on behalf of Royal Geographical Society (with the Institute of British Geographers).

this special section, situated within the broader ‘watery turn’ (Visentin, 2018, p. 246), shifts the emphasis from maritime to inland waters—rivers, canals, lakes, estuaries, reservoirs and wetlands. It centres on water’s dynamism as a crucial nexus in the interplay among water, humans and place, discussing water’s role in placemaking. While the notion of dynamic and fluid places is not new, our water-centric approach introduces fresh insights for understanding, conceptualising and engaging with watery places. Embracing Stefan Helmreich’s idea of water as an influential ‘theory machine’ (2011, p. 132), the articles in this section underscore water’s pivotal role as a dynamic factor in the interrelation between people and places. They explore three themes: the temporalities of inland water, hydrological dynamics of the Anthropocene, and the legal and governance dimensions of water. This special section therefore seeks to broaden our perception of inland waters, not just as physical or material entities, but as dynamic socio-ecological systems, thereby enriching the ongoing discourse on water and its complex interplays in our lives.

2 | THE ‘WATERY’ CONTEXT: RESEARCHING INLAND WATERS

Philip Steinberg and Kimberley Peters advocate for a ‘wet ontology’ to ‘reinvigorate, redirect, and reshape debates often constrained by terrestrial limits’ (2015, p. 247). This perspective prompts a reimagining of water, not as a static element but as one in constant flux; this is especially relevant given that the majority of human geography, which is primarily land-based, tends to overlook the interconnected waterscapes integral to modern individuals’ daily experiences (Anderson & Peters, 2014). The extant seminal work on wet ontologies and fluid spaces (Peters, 2016; Peters & Steinberg, 2019; Steinberg & Peters, 2015; Vannini & Taggart, 2013), however, predominantly addresses the oceanic and maritime, leaving a gap in research concerning inland waters such as rivers, canals, lakes, estuaries, lagoons, aquifers, and wetlands.

Addressing this gap is essential for a more holistic comprehension of water’s role in our contemporary world. The water levels in academic scholarship are indeed rising, with an increasing number of studies focusing on inland water in both diverse contexts and across various disciplines (e.g., Chen et al., 2013; Cosgrove & Petts, 1990; Johnston et al., 2012; Mao & Richards, 2012; Scott & Larkin, 2019; Strang, 2023; Vallerani & Visentin, 2018) as a range of topics once seen as largely terrestrial matters are now firmly on the waterfront (Daniels, 2018). In human geography, a lot of important work has been done in the framework of political ecology (Swyngedouw et al., 2002), especially through the notion of the hydrosocial cycle (Linton & Budds, 2014), focusing particularly on the political governance aspects of water as well as the waterways’ importance to planning, including its socio-ecological implications (Swyngedouw, 2015; Karpouzoglou & Vij, 2017). Extant research also deals with politics, policies, justice, inequalities and (mis)management of drinking water resources (Kaika, 2003; Sultana & Loftus, 2019; Ley & Krause, 2019; Scott & Larkin, 2019; Lavie et al., 2020), as well as the legal status (and rights) of water bodies (Charpleix, 2018; Boyd, 2017; Clark et al., 2018). Attention has also been paid to the geographies of those communities who permanently dwell on inland waters (Smith, 2007; Bowles, 2017; Roberts, 2019) or who engage with inland waters in the context of tourism and leisure (Prideaux & Cooper, 2009; Kaaristo, 2020).

Thinking about the strategies, practices and performances of living with volatile waters (Krause, 2017) has always been important; however this is now critical and in order to do so we need to pay more attention to the notion of place. While the common approach to apprehending places and spaces is often to take a terrestrial view, with land as its starting point (Anderson & Peters, 2014), it is increasingly important to take a hydro-perspectivist viewpoint—‘looking landwards from a watery heterotopia, and commenting on terrestrial life based on aquatic experience’ (Krause, 2019, p. 95) in order to better understand how water influences how we embody and think with water (Strang, 2023) as well as places. In the world ‘divided between water and land with a line that could be drawn in a map’ (da Cunha, 2019, p. xi), thinking with watery places would be an invitation to an approach to water that recognises that water and land are not distinct entities, but interconnected elements that undergo constant variations, modifications and displacements. Furthermore, water, or rather the ‘absence and presence [of water] should not be considered in absolute terms but instead as relational; as such, they are continuously blurring the boundaries of natural and cultural, embodied and representational’ (Kaaristo & Visentin, 2023, p. 99).

It is therefore important to apprehend inland waterscapes as changing, relational, processual and unbounded places (Massey, 2004, 2005) that consist of various hydro-social connections, forms of expertise, spontaneous action and a variety of practices. Thinking with watery places would also mean understanding and analysing a ‘set of social, political and material processes by which people iteratively create and recreate the experienced geographies in which they live’ (Pierce et al., 2011, p. 54), as well as investigating their various collective and individual interactions and relationships. This means that attention needs to be paid to how the inland waters become places by focusing on for instance the notion of placemaking as a collective process whereby individuals modify (Wantzen et al., 2016), reimagine and recreate their

physical and infrastructural environs (Strydom et al., 2018), but also develop a shared understanding of place. Yet we also must not forget that it is because of water's inherent dynamism that it is so often commoditised. It is therefore necessary to explore from different angles and trajectories how water can condition and influence the political, legal, temporal, cultural and environmental approaches to places, but also to examine critically the ways places are developed, managed and governed (see for example McCann, 2002; Parker, 2008).

In human geography and related disciplines, waterscapes (Gandy, 2014; Karpouzoglou & Vij, 2017) need to be explored more in the context of the interaction between inland waters, society and the individual, studying the ways water travels in both space and time, how it is shaped and seen by a culture and society, as well as the physical and natural environment surrounding and interacting with it. Understanding the ways inland waters are experienced and represented as places has implications for the management, development, governance, policymaking as well as value (co)creation on the contemporary inland water bodies. As follows, we will discuss how canals, rivers and wetlands are experienced, narrated and represented as places and explore inland waterscapes as dynamic, multifaceted places that intersect in environmental-ecological, socio-cultural and governance-legal ways.

3 | STUDYING WITH WATERY PLACES: THIS SPECIAL SECTION

This special section explores the intersection of water, humans and place, delving into the multifaceted process of watery placemaking, and examining how water bodies are shaping human experiences of places and how they are also places in their own right. This is done by focusing on three core dimensions of watery place (making): the context of the Anthropocene, the temporality of human and water body interactions, and the legal and governance implications of such interactions.

The vulnerability of inland waters in the Anthropocene is increasingly evident in terms of both large-scale and small-scale water control, usage, management and engineering projects, further exacerbated by climate change. This is addressed by Karl Matthias Wantzen (2022), who focuses on threats to both riverine biodiversity and human water security by extensive modifications to watery landscapes (from dredging to building locks to constructing dams). He suggests that when managing watery places we should take into account a better understanding of hydrological rhythms, 'living with, not against, rivers'. The threats discussed by Wantzen become especially evident during large-scale, often repetitive, flood events, as is demonstrated by Mathew A. Varghese (2023), showing how the River Periyar in Kerala, India has been altered and modified by colonial, postcolonial and neoliberal forces, which have all profoundly altered this waterway and, in turn, also the human practices, activities and relationships taking place there. These interventions have transformed 'The temporal connectedness of socio-cultural activities to specific events of the annual water cycle has been and still is a strong determinant in some societies; however, once it is lost, it is very difficult to re-establish in modern societies' (Wantzen, 2022, p. 9).

This takes us to considering the temporal aspects of human interactions with water bodies as they can reveal intricate relationships between time and sociocultural practices. As highlighted by Mary Gearey, 'our human relationships with wetlands, across time, reveal a very particular set of engagements with waterscapes that differ from other landscapes or spaces' (2022, p. 2). Wantzen furthermore argues that the 'rhythmic pattern is universal to any kind of aquatic ecosystem; however, there are characteristic types of rhythms for each type' (2022, p. 3). The materialities and mobilities of water also play a role here: river waters are constantly (or temporarily) flowing and dynamic, creating a sense of place that is ever-changing (Wantzen, Varghese), while wetland (Gearey) or canal (Kaaristo) water is more still, fostering or stimulating different kinds of environment-human interactions.

Two more papers in this special section provide insights into temporality by focusing on rhythm and pace. Maarja Kaaristo (2024) offers a nuanced understanding of the links between placemaking and pacemaking on the canals of the United Kingdom, highlighting how the slow pace of mobility contributes to the formation and understanding of canals as linear, watery places. She proposes considering pacemaking as a temporal dimension of placemaking, showing how the slow pace of mobility of the canal boats plays a critical role in shaping places. On the other hand, Wantzen (2022) delves into the natural rhythm of wider hydrological systems, discussing how human culture has evolved in response to and in harmony with the varying hydrological rhythms and how various technological advances have disrupted these rhythms, leading to significant cultural and ecological consequences. Looking at rhythm and pace allows us to see not only how temporality unfolds, but is also actively re/created on the waterways, which directly influences how places are formed and experienced. The slow, rhythmic pace of water-based mobility therefore crafts a unique sense of place, which is distinct from that of terrestrial urban environments.

The exploration of these temporal aspects and their effects on our interactions with water bodies also forms a foundation for understanding the interplay between water systems and the legal frameworks that govern them. Any waterscape or landscape is inevitably also a 'lawscape' for humans. In their paper, John Page and Alessandro Pelizzon (2024) explore the legal and ontological nature of water bodies, highlighting that the traditional legal distinction between natural and artificial persons is insufficient to capture the ecological and cultural nuances of the bio-social and culturally pluralistic contemporary realities. Focusing on the examples of rivers from across the globe (Aotearoa New Zealand, Colombia, India, the United States and Australia), they show how spatial re-imaginings intersect with the law and how this leads to viewing the river as an entity is emerging in jurisprudence with a potential for legal personhood. This underscores the emergence of rights of nature and provides us with an important blueprint for environmental actions in the future. However, no water body in Europe has so far acquired legal personhood and while these discussions are ongoing, we need to better connect the bottom-up initiatives driven by citizens with any top-down, policy-driven actions. This can be realised by taking seriously the need to connect local and individual aspects of the waterside communities' relationships with their watery places and spaces, and address the public issues and challenges related to inland waters which, as presented by climate emergency, are becoming more and more evident.

A practical solution is offered by Federico Venturini and Francesco Visentin (2024) who show that the community participatory processes enabled by River Contracts can potentially contribute to a fluvial sense of place. River Contracts—voluntary agreements between different parts of the societies to facilitate managing water bodies—can increase the involvement of riverine communities in the decision-making processes through collaborative negotiated planning. The signing of a River Contract is not itself proof of an effective process; what matters is the quality of participation that comprises the process. Therefore, it is important to underline that participatory events and sharing information are not sufficient in themselves to achieve the active involvement of citizens. Different modes of public engagement led to different results of the placemaking process because 'different stakeholders hold different expectations regarding their participation' (Venturini & Visentin, 2022, p. 10) due to powerful dynamics developed by the different processes. The legal and governance implications of human and nature interactions, the environmental attitudes, communities and their participation have become sites of enquiries in the Anthropocene. To better understand how these community-based initiatives would work, it is important to pay attention to the variety of personal connections with the water bodies that emerge as a sense of place and placemaking.

The varied connections with water bodies can also bring about numerous contested and sometimes conflicting stories. This includes various perceived needs of different groups as well as meanings attributed to the natural and built environment. The wider practices and motivations of different individuals and community groups can therefore differ on the waterfront, and the everyday, small-scale responses and reactions to the global challenges can sometimes be contradicting. They reflect the complicated and complex relationships, tensions, juxtapositions as well as conversations between place managers and local residents that take place in the waterscapes as is further highlighted by Gearey (2024). In her study on English wetlands, Gearey shows how fully understanding a very diverse range of recreational activities taking place in English wetlands—painting, walking, photographing, sitting and reflecting, and also wild-camping, raving, poaching or partying—is crucial for governance officials and site managers. Such knowledge is instrumental for those responsible for wetland placemaking, enabling them to create more inclusive as well as sustainable place management and development strategies. Gearey defines placemaking as a conscious, physical and deliberate act to assert agency and ownership on-site, whereas place attachment captures more of the imaginative and emotional connectivity to places. Placemaking is a dynamic and adaptive process where each encounter with a place is slightly reconfigured each time, making the particular watery places she studies (the wetlands) different every time. This distinction is important as it underscores the dynamic nature of human interactions with watery places. On the one hand, humans actively shape water landscapes through physical alterations, legal definitions and cultural practices (placemaking), while on the other hand, these waterscapes evoke deep-seated emotional and cultural connections (place attachment), in turn influencing identities and behaviours.

To conclude, the unifying theme of this special section is the exploration of inland waters as dynamic, multifaceted places that intersect various ecological, socio-cultural and political realms. Each paper, while distinct in its focus and methodology, contributes to a broader understanding of inland waters as places and overall, to the 'watery turn'. The papers collectively build upon each other by offering diverse yet complementary perspectives on watery places. While Wantzen delves into the ecological impacts of human activities on inland waterscapes, Gearey and Kaaristo explore the temporality of the socio-cultural significance of these spaces in their respective articles, and Varghese and Visentin and Venturini examine the political discourse surrounding their management and governance, while Page and Pellizzon study the legal implications. This allows for a more comprehensive examination of inland waterscapes as places, highlighting their complexity and their interdependencies. To sum up, the articles in this special section contribute to our broader understanding of water's influence on

our perceptions and interactions with places from a geographical viewpoint. The papers underscore water's dynamic role in our society, offering a more fluid lens than a solely terrestrial perspective, which might be less sensitive to the current context of rapid transformations and environmental shifts, particularly those driven by the climate crisis. Therefore, this approach facilitates a multi-dimensional vantage point that we hope encourages readers to also think beyond disciplinary boundaries, fostering a more nuanced and interconnected view of watery places.

4 | CONCLUSION

We need to understand the vast range and diversity of individual activities taking place on or near inland water bodies, which in turn could help the policymakers and riparian governance organisations to better manage the watery places. The various individual and collective practices discussed in this special section can enhance resilience, give people a sense of purpose and help them to better deal with the uncertainty of living in the Anthropocene. The contributors of the section, presenting empirically grounded research of inland waters across the world, are discussing them as transformational places of dwelling, discussion, work, dispute, regeneration and leisure, rooted in various practices, materialities, rhythms, tempos, embodied experiences, mobilities and everyday experiences of living with water. They discuss inland waters as socio-natural entities formed in the interrelations between environmental processes, social interactions and cultural changes. While each published paper stands on its own merit, collectively they focus on what we propose are the three key elements of watery placemaking: the hydrologies of the Anthropocene, temporalities and the governance of water. Emphasising the need to discuss the diverse activities around inland water bodies, the special section highlights their role in shaping policies and governance, underlining the transformative nature of inland waters as contested places, influenced by social, environmental and cultural interrelations. Addressing the hybrid ontologies of watery placemaking, discussing and theorising living on, by and with inland waters, the papers propose an immersive and relational approach to inland water studies with empirically grounded research, suggesting ways for exploring the changing meanings of water bodies.

Moving forward, we need to acknowledge that water is so much more than a commodity or resource for governance. This would allow for a comprehensive examination of inland waterscapes as places, highlighting their complexity and the interdependencies of their ecological, legal, social and political aspects. This themed section invites us to consider placemaking as a process that would include responsive stewardship of this dynamic element and presents an opportunity to shift from a resource-oriented perspective to a relationship-oriented approach to water.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Data sharing not applicable – no new data generated.

ORCID

Francesco Visentin  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9178-2268>

Maarja Kaaristo  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2803-0418>

REFERENCES

- Anderson, J. & Peters, K. (2014) *Water worlds: Human geographies of the ocean*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Bowles, B.O.L. (2017) Gongoozled: Freedom, surveillance and the public/private divide on the waterways of south East England. *Etnofoor*, 29(1), 63–79.
- Boyd, D.R. (2017) *The rights of nature: A legal revolution that could save the world*. Toronto, ON: ECW Press.
- Charpleix, L. (2018) The Whanganui River as Te Awa Tupua: Place-based law in a legally pluralistic society. *The Geographical Journal*, 184(1), 19–30. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/geoj.12238>
- Chen, C., MacLeod, J. & Neimanis, A. (Eds.). (2013) *Thinking with water*. Montreal, QC & Kingston, ON: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Clark, C., Emmanouil, N., Page, J. & Pelizzon, A. (2018) Can you hear the Rivers sing: Legal personhood, ontology, and the nitty-gritty of governance. *Ecology Law Quarterly*, 45, 787–844.
- Cosgrove, D. & Petts, G. (Eds.). (1990) *Water, engineering and landscape: Water control and the landscape transformation of the modern period*. London, New York: Bellhaven Press.
- da Cunha, D. (2019) *The invention of Rivers. Alexander's eye and Ganga's descent*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Daniels, S. (2018) Liquid landscape: Southam, constable, and the art of the pond. *British Art Studies*, (10). Available from: <https://doi.org/10.17658/issn.2058-5462/issue-10/sdaniels>
- Gandy, M. (2014) *The fabric of space: Water, modernity, and the urban imagination*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Gearey, M. (2024) Place-making in waterscapes: Wetlands as palimpsest spaces of recreation. *The Geographical Journal*, 190(2), e12477. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/geoj.12477>
- Helmreich, S. (2011) Nature/culture/seawater. *American Anthropologist*, 113(1), 132–144.
- Johnston, B.R., Hiwasaki, L., Klaver, J.J., Ramos Castillo, A. & Strang, V. (Eds.). (2012) *Water, cultural diversity & global environmental change: emerging trends, sustainable futures?*. Jakarta, Indonesia & Dordrecht, the Netherlands: UNESCO & Springer.
- Kaaristo, M. (2020) Rhythm and pace. In: Salazar, N. & Amit, V. (Eds.), *Pacing mobilities: Timing, intensity, tempo and duration of human movements*. New York, NY: Berghahn.
- Kaaristo, M. (2024) Pacemaking and placemaking on the UK canals. *The Geographical Journal*, 190(2), e12525. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/geoj.12525>
- Kaaristo, M. & Visentin, F. (2023) Absence as an affordance: Thinking with(out) water on the inland waterways. *Cultural Geographies*, 30(1), 87–102. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/14744740221100838>
- Kaika, M. (2003) The water framework directive: A new directive for a changing social, political and economic European framework. *European Planning Studies*, 11(3), 299–316. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09654310303640>
- Karpouzoglou, T. & Vij, S. (2017) Waterscape: A perspective for understanding the contested geography of water. *WIREs. Watermark*, 4(3). Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1002/wat2.1210>
- Krause, F. (2017) Towards an amphibious anthropology of delta life. *Human Ecology*, 45(3), 403–408. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10745-017-9902-9>
- Krause, F. (2019) Hydro-perspectivism: Terrestrial life from a watery angle. *Anthropological Notebooks*, 25(2), 93–101.
- Krause, F. & Strang, V. (2016) Thinking relationships through water. *Society & Natural Resources*, 29(6), 633–638. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920.2016.1151714>
- Lavie, E., Crombé, L. & Marshall, A. (2020) Reconceptualising the drinking waterscape through a grounded perspective. *The Geographical Journal*, 186(2), 224–236. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/geoj.12343>
- Ley, L. & Krause, F. (2019) Ethnographic conversations with Wittfogel's ghost: An introduction. *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Spaces*, 37(7), 1151–1160. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/23996544198736>
- Linton, J. & Budds, J. (2014) The hydrosocial cycle: Defining and mobilizing a relational-dialectical approach to water. *Geoforum*, 57, 170–180. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2013.10.008>
- Mao, F. & Richards, K. (2012) Irreversible river water quality and the concept of the reference condition. *Area*, 44(4), 423–431. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-4762.2012.01124.x>
- Massey, D. (2004) Geographies of responsibility. *Geografiska Annaler*, 86, 5–18. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0435-3684.2004.00150.x>
- Massey, D. (2005) *For space*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mathur, A. & da Cunha, D. (2020) Wetness is everywhere: Why do we see water somewhere? *Journal of Architectural Education*, 74(1), 139–140. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10464883.2020.1693843>
- McCann, E.J. (2002) The cultural politics of local economic development: Meaning-making, place-making, and the urban policy process. *Geoforum*, 33(3), 385–398.
- Neimanis, A. (2017) *Bodies of water: Posthuman feminist phenomenology*. London, UK: Bloomsbury.
- Page, J. & Pelizzon, A. (2024) Of rivers, law and justice in the Anthropocene. *The Geographical Journal*, 190(2), e12442. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/geoj.12442>
- Parker, C. (2008) Extended editorial: Place – The final frontier. *Journal of Place Management and Development*, 1(1), 5–14. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1108/17538330810865309>
- Peters, K. (2016) *Water worlds: Human geographies of the ocean*. Abingdon, UK and New York City, NY: Routledge.
- Peters, K. & Steinberg, P. (2019) The ocean in excess: Towards a more-than-wet ontology. *Dialogues. Human Geography*, 9(3), 293–307. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/2043820619872886>
- Pierce, J., Martin, D.G. & Murphy, J.T. (2011) Relational place-making: The networked politics of place. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 36(1), 54–70. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-5661.2010.00411.x>
- Prideaux, B. & Cooper, M. (Eds.). (2009) *River tourism*. Wallingford, UK & Cambridge, MA: CABI.
- Roberts, L. (2019) Taking up space: Community, belonging and gender among itinerant boat-dwellers on London's waterways. *Anthropological Notebooks*, 25(2), 57–70.
- Scott, M. & Larkin, A. (2019) Geography and the water–energy–food nexus: Introduction. *The Geographical Journal*, 185(4), 373–376. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/geoj.12331>
- Smith, D.P. (2007) The 'buoyancy' of 'other' geographies of gentrification: Going 'back-to-the water' and the commodification of marginality. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 98(1), 53–67. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9663.2007.00376.x>
- Steinberg, P. & Peters, K. (2015) Wet ontologies, fluid spaces: Giving depth to volume through oceanic thinking, environment and planning D. *Society and Space*, 33(2), 247–264. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1068/d14148p>
- Strang, V. (2023) *Water beings: From nature worship to the environmental crisis*. London, UK: Reaktion Books.
- Strydom, W., Puren, K. & Drewes, E. (2018) Exploring theoretical trends in placemaking: Towards new perspectives in spatial planning. *Journal of Place Management and Development*, 11(2), 165–180. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1108/JPM11-2017-0113>
- Sultana, F. & Loftus, A. (Eds.). (2019) *Water politics: Governance, justice and the right to water*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Swyngedouw, E. (2015) *Liquid power: Contested hydro-modernities in twentieth-century Spain*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Swyngedouw, E., Kaika, M. & Castro, E. (2002) Urban water: A political-ecology perspective. *Built Environment*, 29(2), 124–137.

- Vallerani, F. & Visentin, F. (Eds.). (2018) *Waterways and the cultural landscape*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Vannini, P. & Taggart, J. (2013) Doing islandness: A non-representational approach to an Island's sense of place. *Cultural Geographies*, 20(2), 225–242. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1474474011428098>
- Varghese, M.A. (2023) Unintentional designs in ecology: The case of river Periyar in Kerala. *The Geographical Journal*, 1–14. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/geoj.12527>
- Venturini, F. & Visentin, F. (2024) River contracts in north-east Italy: Water management or participatory processes? *The Geographical Journal*, 190(2), e12473. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/geoj.12473>
- Visentin, F. (2018) Liquid conclusion: Towards a humanistic hydrology. In: Vallerani, F. & Visentin, F. (Eds.) (Eds.) *Waterways and the cultural landscape*. London, UK: Routledge, pp. 244–256.
- Wantzen, K.M. (2022) River culture: How socio-ecological linkages to the rhythm of the waters develop, how they are lost, and how they can be regained. *The Geographical Journal*, 00, 1–16. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/geoj.12476>
- Wantzen, K.M., Ballouche, A., Longuet, I., Bao, I., Bocoum, H., Cisse, L. et al. (2016) River culture: An eco-social approach to mitigate the biological and cultural diversity crisis in riverscapes. *Ecohydrology & Hydrobiology*, 16(1), 7–18. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecohyd.2015.12.003>

How to cite this article: Visentin, F. & Kaaristo, M. (2024) Geographies of inland waterscapes: Thinking with watery places. *The Geographical Journal*, 190, e12579. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/geoj.12579>