



# Negotiating Peace in Land and Maritime Border Agreements: A Register Analysis

Usman Muhammed Bello<sup>1\*</sup>, Hakeem Alohunmata<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of English, University of Abuja, 90001, Abuja, Nigeria

<sup>2</sup> Department of English, University of Abuja, 90001, Abuja, Nigeria

Received: 20.10.2025 • Accepted: 28.12.2025 • Published: 31.12.2025 • Final Version: 31.12.2025

**Abstract:** Border agreement documents are usually the end product of satisfactory negotiation between two or more parties. Thus, the written documents are technical representations of the resolutions of negotiation. They, therefore, must not only articulate these resolutions, but must do so in balanced and fair expressions. This paper examines how peace is negotiated in land and maritime border agreements through the register analysis of the documents. Being a Peace Linguistic study, the research draws insights from Halliday's register theory in establishing how peace is achieved in border agreements through careful and deliberate choice of expressions. Data is drawn from four international boundary agreements. Common register in the documents is classified and analysed with respect to its peace significance in the exercise. Findings show that register of border agreements is defined by words of positive relationship, signifying rapport enhancement or repair. In the spirit of ensuring lasting resolution, the expressions of geospatial description of the contentious areas in such documents specify the true or negotiated border lines between parties. The study concludes that an effective border agreement document is a function of a register that repairs or elevates the rapport between parties in conflict.

**Keywords:** peace linguistics, register, rapport, border agreement, negotiation

## 1. Introduction

Boundary agreements are not often given attention in linguistics, as it is the case in law (Aref Fakhry 2023; Aghemelo and Ibhasebhor 2006) and social sciences (Hussam Hussein, Meadow Poplawsky and Tanisha Mohapatra 2023). Although they are supposed to offer a settlement (or prevents a future crisis) between two or more parties, the language deployed in the construction of these agreements is central to the spirit of the documents themselves. This paper seeks to account for how peace is negotiated in border agreements via the register of the documents. This is necessary in accounting for the linguistic features of such a discourse. Data is drawn from selected international boundary agreements, classified and analyzed based on Halliday's register theory.

### 2.0 International Boundary Disputes

Disputes arising from boundary disagreements abound across the globe. Boundary disputes appear to take longer time to resolve than any other kind due to their different and sensitive nature (Kahler, 2006:10). Similarly, boundary disputes have a more probability of becoming violent or militarized than any other kind of conflict, and this is why many boundary conflicts take a violent approach (Vasquez,

<sup>1\*</sup> Corresponding Author: [udfodio4real@gmail.com](mailto:udfodio4real@gmail.com)

1993:345). Militarized disputes over maritime and land borders have also been found to produce a lot of fatalities. One thing that seems to be inevitable is that boundary disputes have the tendency to recur every now and then.

Cases of land and maritime boundary disputes can be found in all parts of the world. According to Johnson and Toft (2014:11-12), throughout the history of the world, boundaries and wars are inextricably linked. At least three out of every five wars fought have some link to boundary disagreements. Vasquez and Valeriano (2008:293) have also noted that 51 of 89 ongoing interstate conflicts around the world in 2013 are boundary-related.

Boundary disputes are not limited to a particular continent. However, some boundary disputes are mere disagreements about boundary delimitations so that they do not have political or economic implications. The ones that have economic undertone such as Nigeria-Cameroun and South Sudan-North Sudan are more sensitive in nature. In Latin America, according to *The Economist* (2000:83), there are about ten outstanding boundary disagreements, all of which are violence-free. Amongst such are Nicaragua-Colombia, and Nicaragua-Costa Rica. The maritime boundary conflict between Peru and Chile has been peacefully resolved through the machinery of international tribunals. Most of the boundary conflicts in Latin America have not led to violence.

The case is different in Africa. Due to the politics of acquisition of resources, many boundary disputes are connected to mineral resources. Notable among such cases are Uganda-Congo (DR), Angola-Congo (DR), Sudan-South Sudan, and Nigeria-Cameroun. As soon as new resources are discovered around land and maritime territories of countries that share neighbourhood, chances are that conflicts arise; each country begins to lay claim to the portion where the new resources are found. For instance, in the case of Nigeria-Cameroun land and maritime conflict, General Gowon, as early as 1975 (at which time no oil had been discovered on Bakassi land) had owned up to Cameroun's ownership of the Bakassi Peninsula through a letter he sent to Camerounian President Ahidjo (Chukwurah, 2012: 25). As soon as General Gowon's government was toppled by a military coup, the time which coincided with the discovery of oil in the Bakassi region, the Nigerian government vehemently rejected Cameroun's ownership of the peninsular. Apart from Nigeria-Cameroun and Sudan-South Sudan's boundary disputes that were violent in nature, others have not reached a violent level, and might probably have a peaceful resolution. For example, Somalia-Kenya boundary dispute has been the object of litigation at the International Court of Justice.

The Middle East had also had its fair share of land and maritime boundary conflicts. Israel-Syria, Israel-Lebanon, and Syria-Lebanon were three of such cases. Interestingly, two-third of the land and maritime boundary disputes in the Middle East have been characterised by war, making the region the one with most occurrence of violent land and maritime boundary disputes in the world (Huth, 1996: 31). The Asian continent generally has a serious problem: the heavy weights in the continent are involved in many boundary disputes. China-India, Southeast Asia-Japan, Indonesia-Timor Leste, Pakistan-Afghanistan are some of the heavy weight boundary disputes in the continent. Of all of these outstanding territorial disputes that have witnessed some form of armed conflict at some point in time, it turns out that almost all originated in unresolved border demarcations (Vasquez, 1993: 363).

From the foregoing, it becomes clear that land and territorial boundary disputes are a global phenomenon. Being that one of the cardinal roles of the United Nations is to achieve relative peace in the world, it has constantly advised nations involved in territorial disputes to approach the International Court of Justice for a peaceful resolution. However, after the pronouncement of verdict, in order to bar future occurrence of misunderstanding, written treaties or agreements are subsequently drafted and signed by the parties involved with the supervision of the United Nations.

### **3.0 Peace Linguistics: A Conceptual Overview**

The role of language in societal building is immense. Language determines not only the existence of society but also dictates the pace of its progress. It may be used for excitement, amusement,

condolence, violence as well as peace-making. The subject of language has been the focus of linguists over the years. However, due to the multiplicity of the roles, values and nature of language, the concerns of linguists are diverse. One of the recent ways in which linguistic theorizations, findings and methods have been applied to non-linguistic issues has to do with the application of linguistics to creating a peaceful co-existence of human beings amongst whom intermittent discords, crises, and misunderstanding are always inevitable. This aspect of linguistics has been given the appellation of Peace Linguistics. The concern of PL is simple to identify judging from the lexical items that make up the appellation. Hence, it is the study of the language of peace; a kind of linguistics that primarily focuses on the relationship between language and peace.

According to Crystal, PL is “an approach which emerged in the 1990s among many linguists and language teachers in which linguistic principles, methods, findings, and applications were seen as a means of promoting peace and human rights at a global level. It emphasized the value of linguistic diversity and multilingualism” (Gomes de Matos, 2014: 415). Given the recency of PL, therefore, a robust effort is required in the development of the discipline, and this thesis is one of the efforts geared towards this goal. Crystal has placed premium on multilingualism, having realized that multilingual and multicultural societies are often characterized by intermittent conflicts. Since language, following Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, determines a user’s perception of world view, members of a multilingual society are bound to have conflicting perceptions of world view. This difference in their view of the world often results in conflicts and crises.

Scholars’ attention is now channeled to peace building across the world, and, in the acknowledgement of the role of language in achieving peace, linguists take a critical responsibility in this process. Although this was the case in the 90’s as Crystal pointed out, this linguistic activity was not sustained. The current surge of hostilities and crises around the world now makes a return to PL a *sine qua non*. Curtis notes that “if there is one thing that our bruised and battered world needs right now, it is less war and more peace, to which PL has the potential to make some major contributions” (2017:23).

PL focuses on the language quality in communication. The quality of communication depends on the linguistic abilities of individuals, their awareness of language and culture of self and others, their personal and communal backgrounds, environments, circumstances, and social status in each community. Conflicts and crises may be mitigated when language users are more careful about their choice of expressions. In other words, the quality of communication must not only be measured by its content but also by its form. Curtis asserts that:

Conflict is an inevitable aspect of life. In fact, it is a natural and necessary component of life that opens the door for further communication. If communication is successful, needs are met, current relationships strengthen and new ones are built. But if communication fails or is broken, needs fulfillment is interrupted and conflict moves towards violence. Thus, violence is the result of unfulfilled needs. (2022: 25)

Similarly, John Paul Lederach states that “Many of the skill-based mechanisms that are called upon to reduce violence are rooted in the communicative abilities to exchange ideas, find common definitions to issues, and seek ways forward toward solutions” (2016:21-22). From the given statements, a chain of related concepts are prominent. One, that the tools needed to reduce violence are directly linked with communicative abilities; in other words, they are linked with language. Next, that language is used to exchange ideas. These ideas should be a source of negotiation to “find common definitions to the issues”. In other words, finding common definitions is essential to finding common grounds which is a measure in the meaning making process. The process of common meaning-making brings into existence a working together relationship between parties in conflict. This working relationship that is more founded on communicative skills can then lead to finding solution making strategies and

resolutions to transform conflicts. In view of the above, therefore, PL has attracted a number of nomenclatures such as “non-killing linguistics”, “language of diplomacy” and “language of peace and conflict resolution”. Since PL may cover a range of linguistic levels and/or disciplines such as pragmatics, we shall narrow our focus in this research only to its lexical and grammatical aspects.

PL is being developed in order to emphasise the use of humanising language, the design of strategies to deal with differences constructively, language that fosters peace rather than language used with a different strategic agenda in mind, a focus on agreement rather than disagreement and controversy, and avoiding of pompous language which typically brings up reservations, walls, and resistance (Friedrich, 2016:98). It is the focus on ‘avoidance of pompous language, which typically brings up reservations, walls, and resistance’ that probably underlies Scott’s poser in the introduction of her research: “Is it possible to disagree without being disagreeable; can one be assertive while remaining gracious?” (2016:149). If the answer to this poser is in the affirmative, then endeavours into PL are profitable. No doubt, it is possible to maintain a position without offending the other parties, and this could largely be due to the choice of words. In fact, it is this realization that diplomats often bank upon while defending the interest of their countries. A “may-be” response to a request may actually be used when “No” is actually implied, especially when a no-response could damage the friendly relationship between the parties.

PL emphasizes the employment of positivizers. Positivizers, according to Gomes de Matos, are “nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs that convey positiveness, a positive attitude or perception” (2014:175). This suggests that there are a number of expressions that may have negative implications, and it is this awareness that PL intends to create. Friedrich and Gomes De Matos are of the opinion that:

It is easy enough to observe that languages can sadly be employed as instruments of harm; a person can, for example, hurt with the words they choose or yet segregate and exclude those who share a different linguistic background. Thus, it seems intuitive to us that we read to tip the scale in the opposite direction by reinforcing instead those humanising uses of language, which help boost respect for human dignity and social inclusion. By doing so, we may in some direct and indirect ways be advancing a nonkilling mentality. (2016:2)

As a result, PL emphasises respect for language users and the uses they make of language; respect for a healthy ecosystem of language; focus on diplomacy (negative peace), focus on building strong social institutions (positive peace); respect for individual linguistic choices; respect for language change; respect for language teacher, language learners and users with special language needs; upholding of vocabulary of peace rather than one of war; and forging of new humanizers (Friedrich and Gomes de Matos, 2016: 5-14).

It is important to note that understanding of (at least part) of the culture of fellow interactants is instrumental to peaceful communication since “being aware of various cultural orientations in the use of politeness strategies may be conducive to remaining open and compassionate toward other cultures that may prefer different linguistic and social conventions” (Ishihara, 2016: 21). In other words, positive politeness may be considered appropriate in a culture while negative politeness will be approved by another. Where interactants are, therefore, from two such opposing cultures, a middle ground must be found to achieve peaceful communication.

At times, dissidence or disagreement is a result of an individual’s personality, style or choice of expressions. Such individuals may be seen as being bereft of diplomatic spirit and, therefore, require some training/tutelage in peaceful communication. Whatever results stiff expressions can achieve could be more easily achieved by language laden with peace without making other interactants look foolish or feel angry or less valuable. However, no language can be considered (non-)peaceful in

isolation of the context of use as a particular expression considered peaceful in one context may not be so considered in another. Ishihara notes that:

In assessing the acceptability or appropriateness of certain linguistic expressions, it is crucial to consider the impact and constraints of the local context since the context influences language choices while language use itself simultaneously shapes the context as interactants negotiate meaning. (2016:23)

Accordingly, a context may require a strong/hard language especially where the language user, with higher social status than others, is expected to take a stern position on a matter over which others have shilly-shallied. The indecision, if not arrested, may likely snowball into dissociation, chaos or even violence. A fiat by a (+high) status individual could be considered peaceful in this context. Consequently, determining whether a language is peaceful or not requires that one considers three contextual elements identified by Ishihara (2016:23): social status, distance and stakes. This trichotomy of contextual elements is an adaptation of Brown and Levinson's (1987) trio of power, distance and imposition in considering the extent of politeness of an expression.

The discourse power between two or more interactants is referred to as social status while distance simply has to do with the level of familiarity between them. Stake, however, has to do with gravity or significance of the topic of discussion, its situation as well as its outcome (Ishihara, 2016: 23-24). While all the three factors are valuable in assessing the level of peacefulness of a choice of expression, stake appears to be the most significant. Ishihara poses a number of interrogatives in relation to this third factor:

... how serious is the offense that might be caused by a conflict? What stakes, from very high to very low, are likely to be involved in the matter in question? How urgently does the conflict need to be resolved? What is the significance of the topic, and how much does it matter to the listener/addressee for the speaker/writer to agree or disagree on the given topic (e.g. low stakes involved in disagreeing about someone's taste for clothing vs. high stakes involved in disagreeing about a nation's diplomatic policy)? (2016:24)

While we aver that stake is the most significant of the three factors, we do not suggest that the other factors are irrelevant. We agree with Ishihara (2016) who notes that the three factors dynamically function together.

Despite the importance of PL in the progress of human society, it is yet to be given any serious or due attention in university syllabi or schemes on (English) linguistics though its aspects are being taught in cognate disciplines such as Peace Education, Peace Building and Applied Linguistics (Curtis, 2018: 11). In 2017, Andy Curtis became the first to develop and teach Peace Linguistics as a course when he took up the responsibility at Brigham Young University, Hawaii. It is hoped that this research will draw the attention of management of universities (as well as administrators) across the world to making up policies or courses that will enable the study of aspects of PL not only as core subject-courses for undergraduates of Linguistics and English, but also as a general subject-course for all undergraduates.

#### **4.0 Theoretical Framework**

This paper is built upon the theory of register as developed by Michael Halliday. Register is a reference to a language variety as 'determined by social context' (Bloor and Bloor, 2013: 294). It is language according to use. Registers are characterised by clusters of linguistic features which have a greater-than-random tendency to occur and their analysis is inherently qualitative in that it provides statements about frequencies/probabilities (Teichi, 2013: 417). Since every language use is tied to context, it, therefore, suggests that every instance of language use is accompanied by appropriate register. In other

words, what differentiates one genre of language use from another is the concept of register. The same event or topic may be reported in different registers depending on where it is reported, who reports it, and to whom. Social context of language use, in essence, is related to the medium of language use, its participants and physical setting. It is impossible for any language use to be devoid of these communicative factors. Every situation requires particular lexis and syntax so that the choice between *bathe*, *have a bath* and *take a bath* consists of a situational or stylistic significance (Bloor and Bloor, 2013: 130).

Bloor and Bloor (2013) note that, although the grammar contains all possibilities, stylistic norms tend to determine which of the possibilities is chosen and why. All the choices are available to the language user, but statistically there are strong preferences according to genre, situation and purpose. It is also possible that the subject-matter determines the choice of register. Considering variation of language use according to subject-matter, Quirk and Greenbaum (1973) are of the opinion that “the presumption is rather that the same speaker has a repertoire of varieties and habitually switches to the appropriate one as occasion arises. Most typically, perhaps, the switch involves nothing more than turning to the particular set of lexical items habitually used for handling the subject in question: law, cookery, engineering, football (6)”. Quirk and Greenbaum (1973) have recognized above, the possibility of register switch especially when the communication stretches over a number of subject-matters. This is often applicable in especially the novel or the newspaper which can accommodate a lot of different topics. While the different issues handled in the novel are expected to be related so that the entire discourse forms a cohesive and coherent whole, the ones handled in the newspaper may not have a coherent whole and this gives the reason for the compartmentalizations that are often found in it.

We earlier mentioned that every situation would require a particular register. It is important to note that language users adjust themselves to a particular (set of) communicative language in the appropriate register so that any “deviation from expected patterns of linguistic behaviour will bring about a reaction of disorientation and surprise” (Leech, 1969: 10).

Although register is more easily noticed in the choice of lexis, it is not restricted to lexical selection alone. It may be recognized from two planes of choice: paradigmatic and syntagmatic. A paradigmatic choice consists of lexical items: one item may replace another in context. It is this plane of choice that is reflected in these polarities: get/receive, tell/inform, go/leave, broadcast/announce and chair/seat. The context of language use would determine the appropriate lexis that suits the communicative event. Similarly, the structural organisation of lexis is also determined by context, and it is this that concerns the syntagmatic plane of choice. The difference between active and passive clauses is no more than the difference of register; the passive more amenable to formal writing style than the active. The constructions listed under our discussion of language of diplomacy are nothing more than register differences. Issues of structural differentiation are further taken up later in this review.

Halliday’s (1985) explanation of the concept of register reveals that three factors (which he termed dimensions of register) surround choice of register: field, tenor and mode. These dimensions can be employed to indicate the context of situation in which language is used. Field dimension of discourse has to do with “the total event, in which the text is functioning, together with the purposive activity of the speaker or writer; it thus includes the subject-matter as one element in it” (Halliday, 2013). It is a reference to the subject matter and it covers the topic of discussion, the participants involved, and the place and time of the communicative event. It describes the processes and activities that characterize the time of speech. It deals with the processes being talked about in the discourse. It also deals with the grammatical structures in the process and it involves the names of objects found in discourses, including their features. Field also relates to the assessment of objects or individual estimations (Halliday and Hasan, 1985: 30-31).

## 5.0 Methods

The design for this research is content analysis since there is a heavy reliance on the linguistic contents of peace agreements/documents. Register of international land and maritime border agreements are focused upon in the study. Those documents, therefore, are the sources of data for the research. The documents are downloaded from the internet where they are available. Ten land and maritime agreements are the samples used for the study. The ten conflict resolution agreements spread across four continents: Africa, America, Asia and Europe. According to the UN website, land and maritime agreements are more common in Africa and Europe than in other continents. That could have been the role played by the important players in colonialism—a practice that was common between Europe and Africa, being the beneficiary and victim respectively.

### 6.0 Register Analysis of Border Agreements

There are peculiar language choices that characterize boundary agreements. These language peculiarities cover the lexical field of the subject-matter, mode and tenor of such documents as well. The lexical field of negotiation reflects the bone of contention between parties, which may run into a spectrum of issues. That is, the field dimension of the agreement is established by the choice of expressions and combination of these expressions in line with the issue(s) being negotiated.

#### 6.1 Lexical Field of Harmony and Accord

As every negotiation is targeted towards bringing a harmonious relationship between parties, the following expressions of harmony and accord are generally productive and recurrent in all data:

**Table 1 Register of Harmony and Accord**

| S/<br>N | Agreement         | Word         | No<br>of<br>times | Article               |
|---------|-------------------|--------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| 1.      | Australian-French | Agreement    | 1                 | Article 3             |
|         | Slovenia-Croatia  |              | 6                 | Introduction/Articles |
|         | Gambia-Senegal    |              | 1                 | 7,17,19*,20,25        |
|         | Saudi-UAE         |              | 2                 | Introduction          |
|         | US-Mexico         |              | 2                 | Articles 2, 3         |
|         | <b>Total</b>      |              | <b>12</b>         | Articles 4, 5         |
| 2.      | Australian-French | Disagreement | 1                 | Article 5             |
|         | <b>Total</b>      |              | <b>1</b>          |                       |
| 3.      | Slovenia-Croatia  | Dispute      | 1                 | Article 25            |
|         | Gabon-Sao-        |              | 1                 | Article 5             |
|         | Tome/Principe     |              | 1                 | Article 8             |
|         | US-Mexico         |              | 1                 | Article 6             |
|         | Nigeria-Cameroun  |              | <b>4</b>          |                       |
|         | <b>Total</b>      |              |                   |                       |
| 4.      | Australian-French | Bonds        | 1                 | Introduction          |
|         | Saudi-UAE         |              | 1                 | Introduction          |
|         | <b>Total</b>      |              | <b>2</b>          |                       |
| 5.      | Australian-French | Friendship   | 1                 | Introduction          |
|         |                   |              | 1                 | Introduction          |

|     |                             |                 |          |               |
|-----|-----------------------------|-----------------|----------|---------------|
|     | Gabon-Sao Tome and Principe |                 | 1        | Introduction  |
|     | Gambia-Senegal              |                 |          |               |
|     | <b>Total</b>                |                 | <b>3</b> |               |
| 6.  | Australian-French           | good-           | 1        | Introduction  |
|     | French-Italian              | neighbourliness | 1        | Introduction  |
|     | Gabon-Sao Tome and Principe |                 | 1        | Introduction  |
|     | Saudi-UAE                   |                 | 1        | Introduction  |
|     | US-Mexico                   |                 |          |               |
|     | <b>Total</b>                |                 | <b>5</b> |               |
| 7.  | German-Poland               | co-existence    | 1        | Introduction* |
|     | <b>Total</b>                |                 | <b>1</b> |               |
| 8.  | German-Poland               | Cooperation     | 1        | Introduction  |
|     | Slovenia-Croatia            |                 | 1        | Article 19    |
|     | Gabon-Sao Tome and Principe |                 | 1        | Introduction  |
|     | Gambia-Senegal              |                 | 1        | Introduction  |
|     | US-Mexico                   |                 | <b>5</b> |               |
|     | <b>Total</b>                |                 |          |               |
| 9.  | Australian-French           | Negotiations    | 1        | Introduction  |
|     | Slovenia-Croatia            |                 | 1        | Article 25*   |
|     | Gabon-Sao Tome and Principe |                 | 1        | Article 5     |
|     | US-Mexico                   |                 | 1        | Article 8     |
|     | <b>Total</b>                |                 | <b>4</b> |               |
| 10. | German-Poland               | Confidence      | 1        | Introduction  |
|     | Nigerian-Cameroun           |                 | 1        | Introduction  |
|     | <b>Total</b>                |                 | <b>2</b> |               |
| 11. | German-Poland               | Peace           | 1        | Introduction* |
|     | Nigerian Cameroun           |                 | 1        | Introduction  |
|     | <b>Total</b>                |                 | <b>2</b> |               |
| 12. | German-Poland               | Freedom         | 1        | Introduction  |
|     | Slovenia-Croatia            |                 | 1        | Introduction  |
|     | <b>Total</b>                |                 | <b>2</b> |               |
| 13. | German-Poland               | Stability       | 1        | Introduction  |
|     | <b>Total</b>                |                 | <b>1</b> |               |
| 14. | German-Poland               | Unification     | 1        | Introduction  |
|     | <b>Total</b>                |                 | <b>1</b> |               |
| 15. | Saudi-UAE                   | Solidarity      | 1        | Introduction  |
|     | <b>Total</b>                |                 | <b>1</b> |               |
| 16. | Saudi-UAE                   | Amity           | 1        | Introduction  |
|     | <b>Total</b>                |                 | <b>1</b> |               |



|     |                   |             |          |              |
|-----|-------------------|-------------|----------|--------------|
| 17. | Saudi-UAE         | Brotherhood | 1        | Introduction |
|     | <b>Total</b>      |             | <b>1</b> |              |
| 18. | Saudi-UAE         | Fraternity  | 1        | Introduction |
|     | <b>Total</b>      |             | <b>1</b> |              |
| 19. | Nigerian-Cameroun | well-being  | 1        | Introduction |
|     | <b>Total</b>      |             | <b>1</b> |              |
| 20. | Nigerian-Cameroun | Goodwill    | 1        | Introduction |
|     | <b>Total</b>      |             | <b>1</b> |              |

As can be seen, discourse of negotiation is clearly defined by register of harmony and accord as *agreement, solidarity, amity, brotherhood, goodwill, well-being, unification, stability, freedom, peace, confidence, cooperation, co-existence, good-neighbourliness*, and *bonds* in our data all suggest. This kind of positive words overwhelmingly outnumbers those of negative meanings such as *disagreement* and *dispute*. Even the items that are naturally negative, such as *disagreement* and *dispute*, are still deployed in the context of harmony. For instance, in Gabon-Sao Tome and Principe, the word, *dispute*, occurs in the following provision: “Any dispute concerning the interpretation or application of this Agreement shall be settled by consultation and negotiation between the Parties”. This context, thus, the negativity in the meaning of the word, *dispute*, becomes neutralized and positivized through the peace orientation in its co-text, *settle, consultation* and *negotiation*.

The register of harmony and accord imbues the spirit of confidence and peace in the parties to an agreement. They do not only have the capacity to invoke positive attitude in them, but also the tendency to prepare their psychological frame towards embracing the output of negotiation.

## 6.2 Lexical Field of Survey

There are also expressions depicting the geography or the topographical survey of the area in contention. Such expressions are inherent in land and maritime boundary. The following are the instances in our data.

**Table 2 Register of Topographical Description/Survey**

| S/<br>N | Agreement                   | Word      | No<br>of<br>times | Article                      |
|---------|-----------------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------------------|
| 1.      | Australian-French           | Island    | 1                 | Article 1                    |
|         | <b>Total</b>                |           | <b>12</b>         |                              |
| 2.      | Australian-French           | Zone      | 2                 | Articles 1, 4                |
|         | French-Italian              |           | 3                 | Introduction, Articles 2*, 4 |
|         | <b>Total</b>                |           | <b>5</b>          |                              |
| 3.      | Australian-French           | Shelf     | 2                 | Articles 1, 3                |
|         | <b>Total</b>                |           | <b>2</b>          |                              |
| 4.      | Australian-French           | Geodesics | 1                 | Article 1                    |
|         | <b>Total</b>                |           | <b>2</b>          |                              |
| 5.      | Australian-French           | Points    | 2                 | Articles 1, 2                |
|         | French-Italian              |           | 2                 | Articles 1, 3                |
|         | Slovenia-Croatia            |           | 2                 | Articles 3, 4                |
|         | Gabon-Sao Tome and Principe |           | 2                 | Articles 2*, 3               |
|         | Gambia-Senegal              |           | 2                 | Articles 1, 2*               |
|         | Saudi-UAE                   |           | 2                 | Articles 2*, 6               |
|         | <b>Total</b>                |           | <b>12</b>         |                              |

|     |                              |              |           |                               |
|-----|------------------------------|--------------|-----------|-------------------------------|
| 6.  | Australian-French            | co-ordinates | 2         | Articles 1, 2                 |
|     | French-Italian               |              | 3         | Introduction, Articles 1, 2   |
|     | Slovenia-Croatia             |              | 1         | Article 6                     |
|     | Guinea-Sao Tome and Principe |              | 2         | Articles 2*, 3                |
|     | Gambia-Senegal               |              | 1         | Article 2                     |
|     | US-Mexico                    |              | 1         | Article 1                     |
|     | <b>Total</b>                 |              | <b>10</b> |                               |
| 7.  | Australian-French            | Order        | 1         | Article 1                     |
|     | Nigeria-Cameroun             |              | 1         | Annex 1 (2)                   |
|     | <b>Total</b>                 |              | <b>1</b>  |                               |
| 8.  | Australian-French            | Line         | 4         | Articles 1, 2, 3, 4           |
|     | French-Italian               |              | 1         | Article 1*                    |
|     | Slovenia-Croatia             |              | 6         | Article 2, 3, 9*, 11, 12, 13* |
|     | Guinea-Sao Tome and Principe |              | 1         | Article 2, 4                  |
|     | Gabonese-Sao Tome            |              | 2         | Introduction, Article 3       |
|     | Saudi-UAE                    |              | 1         | Article 2                     |
|     | US-Mexico                    |              | 1         | Introduction                  |
|     | <b>Total</b>                 |              | <b>16</b> |                               |
| 9.  | Australian-French            | Territory    | 1         | Article 3                     |
|     | Saudi-UAE                    |              | 1         | Introduction                  |
|     | <b>Total</b>                 |              | <b>2</b>  |                               |
| 10. | German-Poland                | Frontiers    | 3         | Introduction, Articles 1, 2   |
|     | Gambia-Senegal               |              | 1         | Article 2*                    |
|     | <b>Total</b>                 |              | <b>4</b>  |                               |
| 11. | Slovenia-Croatia             | Air          | 1         | Article 1                     |
|     | Guinea-Sao Tome              |              | 1         | Article 4                     |
|     | <b>Total</b>                 |              | <b>2</b>  |                               |
| 12. | Guinea-Sao Tome              | Space        | 1         | Article 4                     |
|     | Slovenia-Croatia             |              | 1         | Article 1                     |
|     | <b>Total</b>                 |              | <b>2</b>  |                               |
| 13. | Slovenia-Croatia             | Subsoil      | 2         | Articles 2, 3                 |
|     | Gabon-Sao Tome               |              | 1         | Article 4                     |
|     | <b>Total</b>                 |              | <b>1</b>  |                               |
| 14. | Slovenia-Croatia             | structures   | 1         | Article 2                     |
|     | <b>Total</b>                 |              | <b>1</b>  |                               |
| 15. | Slovenia-Croatia             | Width        | 1         | Article 4                     |
|     | <b>Total</b>                 |              | <b>1</b>  |                               |
| 16. | Slovenia-Croatia             | Parts        | 1         | Article 6                     |
|     | <b>Total</b>                 |              | <b>1</b>  |                               |
| 17. | Slovenia-Croatia             | Sea          | 3         | Articles 3*, 4*, 5            |
|     | US-Mexico                    |              | 1         | Introduction                  |
|     | <b>Total</b>                 |              | <b>1</b>  |                               |
| 18. | Slovenia-Croatia             | distance     | 2         | Articles 3, 4                 |
|     | US-Mexico                    |              | 2         | Introduction, Article 1       |
|     | <b>Total</b>                 |              | <b>1</b>  |                               |
| 19. | Slovenia-Croatia             | entities     | 1         | Article 7                     |
|     | <b>Total</b>                 |              | <b>1</b>  |                               |
| 20. | Slovenia-Croatia             | property     | 2         | Articles 7*, 15*              |
|     | <b>Total</b>                 |              | <b>1</b>  |                               |
| 21. | Slovenia-Croatia             | markers      | 4         | Articles 9*, 10*, 12, 18      |
|     | <b>Total</b>                 |              | <b>4</b>  |                               |
| 22. | Slovenia-Croatia             | roads        | 1         | Article 9                     |
|     | <b>Total</b>                 |              | <b>1</b>  |                               |
| 23. | Slovenia-Croatia             | channels     | 3         | Articles 9*, 11, 20           |
|     | <b>Total</b>                 |              | <b>3</b>  |                               |
| 24. | Slovenia-Croatia             | watercourses | 2         | Articles 9*, 11               |
|     | <b>Total</b>                 |              | <b>1</b>  |                               |

|     |                  |              |          |                 |
|-----|------------------|--------------|----------|-----------------|
| 25. | Slovenia-Croatia | terrain      | 1        | Article 9       |
|     | <b>Total</b>     |              | <b>1</b> |                 |
| 26. | Saudi-UAE        | hydrocarbons | 2        | Articles 3*, 4  |
|     | <b>Total</b>     |              | <b>2</b> |                 |
| 27. | Saudi-UAE        | field        | 2        | Articles 3*, 4* |
|     | <b>Total</b>     |              | <b>2</b> |                 |
| 28. | Slovenia-Croatia | tourism      | 1        | Article 19      |
|     | <b>Total</b>     |              | <b>1</b> |                 |
| 29. | Slovenia-Croatia | period       | 1        | Article 19      |
|     | <b>Total</b>     |              | <b>1</b> |                 |
| 30. | Slovenia-Croatia | entry        | 1        | Article 19      |
|     | US-Mexico        |              | 1        | Article 4       |
|     | <b>Total</b>     |              | <b>2</b> |                 |
| 31. | Slovenia-Croatia | benefits     | 1        | Article 20      |
|     | <b>Total</b>     |              | <b>1</b> |                 |
| 32. | Slovenia-Croatia | residence    | 1        | Article 20      |
|     | <b>Total</b>     |              | <b>1</b> |                 |
| 33. | Slovenia-Croatia | settlement   | 1        | Article 20      |
|     | <b>Total</b>     |              | <b>1</b> |                 |
| 34. | Slovenia-Croatia | right        | 1        | Article 20      |
|     | US-Mexico        |              | 1        | Article 3       |
|     | <b>Total</b>     |              | <b>2</b> |                 |
| 35. | Slovenia-Croatia | citizenship  | 1        | Article 20      |
|     | <b>Total</b>     |              | <b>1</b> |                 |
| 36. | Slovenia-Croatia | goods        | 1        | Article 20      |
|     | <b>Total</b>     |              | <b>1</b> |                 |
| 37. | Slovenia-Croatia | charges      | 1        | Article 20      |
|     | <b>Total</b>     |              | <b>1</b> |                 |

The above expressions capture not only the boundary nature such as *zone* and *island*, but also the contents of the area such as *entities*, *property*, *water* and *hydrocarbons*. In order for a negotiation to be watertight, there are expressions that point to some accuracy of description or survey. Such expressions include *distance*, *geodesics*, *width*, *points*, *line*, and *coordinates*. The need for this set of expressions is informed by the parties' intention to determine which parts or aspects of the boundary belong to whom, and this calls for some form of measurement and allocation. In measuring the parts of the boundary and allocating them accordingly, there must be expressions that will point to aspects of measurement as indicated above. This gives (or at least, appears to) some form of exactitude to the division of boundary between parties. This exactitude of measure is reflected in the latitude and longitude points of the land and maritime space in question as the following shows:

| Point                       | Latitude S     | Longitude E   |
|-----------------------------|----------------|---------------|
| R 1                         | 15° 44' 07"    | 158° 45' 39"  |
| R 2                         | 16° 25' 28"    | 158° 22' 49"  |
| R 3                         | 16° 34' 51"    | 158° 16' 26"  |
| R 4                         | 17° 30' 28"    | 157° 38' 31"  |
| R 5                         | 17° 54' 40"    | 157° 21' 59"  |
| R 6                         | 18° 32' 25"    | 156° 56' 44"  |
| (Australia-French-Article1) |                |               |
|                             | Longitude E    | Latitude N    |
| Point 1                     | 008° 48' 49,2" | 41° 15' 31,2" |

|         |                |               |
|---------|----------------|---------------|
| Point 2 | 009° 08' 09,1" | 41° 19' 09,0" |
| Point 3 | 009° 16' 15,0" | 41° 17' 34,2" |
| Point 4 | 009° 19' 03,0" | 41° 20' 13,8" |
| Point 5 | 009° 27' 03,6" | 41° 24' 27,0" |

(French-Italian-Article1)

|    |              |             |
|----|--------------|-------------|
|    | Longitude    | Latitude    |
| C1 | 45°30'42,7", | 13°22'25,9" |
| C2 | 45°30'42,7"  | 13°18'15,5" |
| T5 | 45°27'12,0"  | 13°12'54,0" |
| T6 | 45°25'00,0"  | 13°13'42,9" |

(Slovenia-Croatia-Article4)

|           |             |             |
|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| Point No. | Latitude    | Longitude   |
| 1         | 1°29'04"S   | 7°16'30"E   |
| 2         | 0°47'15.8"S | 6°11'30.7"E |
| 3         | 0°12'54"S   | 5°19'23"E   |
| 4         | 0°41'45.3"N | 3°37'03.2"E |

(Guinea-Sao Tome and Principe-Article2)

This kind of measurement typifies all the land and maritime agreement treaties used for this study except the ones that have already been adjudicated upon (before a written agreement) by the ICJ such as Nigeria-Cameroun, or the one which is a reconfirmation of an earlier agreement such as German-Poland. In either case, it is possible that the exact measurement already exists somewhere, such as in the judgement of the ICJ or an earlier agreement, and therefore, reference to the points in the agreements is unnecessary.

### 6.3 Lexical Field of Boundary Resolution

There are purposive lexical items, those that specify the precise business or intendment of the agreement i.e. boundary resolution process. Some of such expressions are presented in the table below.

**Table 3 Register of Boundary Resolution Processes**

| S/<br>N | Agreement         | Word           | No<br>of<br>times | Article                |
|---------|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|------------------------|
| 1.      | Australian-French | Delimitation   | 1                 | Article 1              |
|         | German-Poland     |                | 1                 | Article 1              |
|         | <b>Total</b>      |                | <b>2</b>          |                        |
| 2.      | French-Italian    | Delineation    | 1                 | Article 1              |
|         | German-Poland     |                | 1                 | Article 1              |
|         | Slovenia-Croatia  |                | 1                 | Article 9              |
|         | <b>Total</b>      |                | <b>1</b>          |                        |
| 3.      | Slovenia-Croatia  | Demarcation    | 1                 | Article 9              |
|         | French-Italian    |                | 1                 | Article 1              |
|         | German-Poland     |                | 1                 | Article 1              |
|         | <b>Total</b>      |                | <b>3</b>          |                        |
| 4.      | Australian-French | Interpretation | 1                 | Article 5              |
|         | Slovenia-Croatia  |                | 1                 | Article 25             |
|         | Gabonese-Sao Tome |                | 1                 | Article 5              |
|         | Nigeria-Cameroun  |                | 1                 | Article 6              |
|         | US-Mexico         |                | 2                 | Articles 6, 8          |
|         | <b>Total</b>      |                | <b>6</b>          |                        |
| 5.      | Slovenia-Croatia  | Maintenance    | 4                 | Articles 1, 14, 15, 17 |

|     |                   |                |          |                               |
|-----|-------------------|----------------|----------|-------------------------------|
|     | <b>Total</b>      |                | <b>4</b> |                               |
| 6.  | Slovenia-Croatia  | protection     | 3        | Introduction, Articles 18, 19 |
|     | <b>Total</b>      |                | <b>3</b> |                               |
| 7.  | Slovenia-Croatia  | Determination  | 1        | Article 1                     |
|     | <b>Total</b>      |                | <b>1</b> |                               |
| 8.  | Slovenia-Croatia  | Restoration    | 5        | Articles 1, 10, 14, 15, 17    |
|     | <b>Total</b>      |                | <b>5</b> |                               |
| 9.  | Nigeria-Cameroun  | Administration | 1        | Annex 1 (2)*                  |
|     | <b>Total</b>      |                | <b>1</b> |                               |
| 10. | US-Mexico         | implementation | 1        | Article 6                     |
|     | Nigerian-Cameroun |                | 2        | Articles 1, 6*                |
|     | <b>Total</b>      |                | <b>3</b> |                               |
| 11. | Nigerian Cameroun | Consolidation  | 1        | Introduction                  |
|     | <b>Total</b>      |                | <b>2</b> |                               |
| 12. | Slovenia-Croatia  | Ratification   | 1        | Article 30                    |
|     | <b>Total</b>      |                | <b>1</b> |                               |
| 13. | Slovenia-Croatia  | Exchange       | 1        | Article 7*                    |
|     | US-Mexico         |                | 2        | Articles 4, 9                 |
|     | <b>Total</b>      |                | <b>3</b> |                               |

The above items show that there are different dimensions to boundary agreement. Generally, all the dimensions revolve around *delimitation* or *demarkation*. But this activity (of *delimitation* or *demarkation*) may invariably require that an existing, old or new boundary be interpreted (*interpretation*), implemented (*implementation*), protected (*protection*), or maintained (*maintenance*). Dispute over boundary agreement is often a subject of litigation, and this informs the existence of the word, *arbitration*, as part of register of negotiation over boundary. In order to bar some likely future disagreement over what constitutes the appropriate boundary, negotiation or agreement on the new boundary is subjected to *ratification*. These words generally denote steps, action or observances towards, or necessary for, peace and conflict resolution.

#### 6.4 Tenor of Border Agreements

In terms of the tenor of negotiation or border agreement register, we find that parties in a negotiation usually occupy formal positions or status, even when they are familiar with each other. In other words, no matter the bond or close social relationship existing between parties, once it comes to a matter of negotiation, they automatically adorn a formal social garment. The following register points to the formality of the relationship between parties of negotiation as seen in the sampled international land and maritime treaties as the following table shows.

**Table 3 Register of Formal Relationship**

| S/<br>N | Agreement         | Word          | No<br>of<br>times | Article                      |
|---------|-------------------|---------------|-------------------|------------------------------|
| 1.      | Australian-French | Countries     | 1                 | Introduction                 |
|         | French-Italian    |               | 2                 | Introduction/Article 2       |
|         | Saudi-UAE         |               | 1                 | Article 6                    |
|         | <b>Total</b>      |               | <b>12</b>         |                              |
| 2.      | Australian-French | Delegations   | 1                 | Introduction                 |
|         | <b>Total</b>      |               | <b>1</b>          |                              |
| 3.      | Slovenia-Croatia  | in accordance | 5                 | Articles, 7, 9, 10, 13, 25   |
|         | Australian-French |               | 3                 | Articles 3, 4, 5             |
|         | German-Poland     |               | 1                 | Introduction                 |
|         | Gabonese-Sao Tome |               | 1                 | Introduction                 |
|         | US-Mexico         |               | 3                 | Introduction, Articles 4*, 5 |
|         | Nigeria-Cameroun  |               | 2                 | Articles 1, 2                |

|     |                   |              |           |                 |
|-----|-------------------|--------------|-----------|-----------------|
|     | <b>Total</b>      |              | <b>15</b> |                 |
| 4.  | Australian-French | Jurisdiction | 1         | Article 4       |
|     | <b>Total</b>      |              | <b>1</b>  |                 |
| 5.  | German-Poland     | Nations      | 1         | Introduction    |
|     | Gambia-Senegal    |              | 1         | Introduction    |
|     | <b>Total</b>      |              | <b>2</b>  |                 |
| 6.  | Slovenia-Croatia  | Obligations  | 2         | Article 7*, 15* |
|     | <b>Total</b>      |              | <b>5</b>  |                 |
| 7.  | Slovenia-Croatia  | Holders      | 1         | Article 7*, 15* |
|     | <b>Total</b>      |              |           |                 |
| 8.  | Slovenia-Croatia  | Manner       | 2         | Article 8, 12   |
|     | <b>Total</b>      |              | <b>2</b>  |                 |
| 9.  | Slovenia-Croatia  | Period       | 1         | Article 8       |
|     | <b>Total</b>      |              | <b>4</b>  |                 |
| 10. | Slovenia-Croatia  | Date         | 2         | Articles 8, 19  |
|     | US-Mexico         |              | 2         | Articles 4*, 9  |
|     | <b>Total</b>      |              | <b>4</b>  |                 |
| 11. | Slovenia-Croatia  | provision    | 1         | Article 9       |
|     | <b>Total</b>      |              | <b>2</b>  |                 |
| 12. | Slovenia-Croatia  | Condition    | 1         | Article 10      |
|     | <b>Total</b>      |              | <b>2</b>  |                 |
| 13. | Slovenia-Croatia  | Maintain     | 1         | Article 10      |
|     | Gambia-Senegal    |              | 1         | Introduction    |
|     | <b>Total</b>      |              | <b>2</b>  |                 |
| 14. | Slovenia-Croatia  | Restore      | 1         | Article 10      |
|     | <b>Total</b>      |              | <b>1</b>  |                 |
| 15. | Slovenia-Croatia  | Ensure       | 2         | Articles 14, 18 |
|     | Saudi-UAE         |              | 1         | Article 5       |
|     | <b>Total</b>      |              | <b>3</b>  |                 |
| 16. | Slovenia-Croatia  | Adhere       | 2         | Articles 14, 18 |
|     | Saudi-UAE         |              | 1         | Article 5       |
|     | <b>Total</b>      |              | <b>3</b>  |                 |
| 17. | Slovenia-Croatia  | Allow        | 1         | Article 15      |
|     | <b>Total</b>      |              | <b>1</b>  |                 |
| 18. | Slovenia-Croatia  | Conclude     | 1         | Article 19      |
|     | <b>Total</b>      |              | <b>1</b>  |                 |
| 19. | Slovenia-Croatia  | Guarantee    | 1         | Article 19      |
|     | Nigeria-Cameroun  |              | 1         | Article 3       |
|     | <b>Total</b>      |              | <b>2</b>  |                 |
| 20. | Slovenia-Croatia  | Notify       | 1         | Article 21      |
|     | <b>Total</b>      |              | <b>1</b>  |                 |
| 21. | Gabonese-Sao Tome | Refrain      | 1         | Article 4       |
|     | <b>Total</b>      |              | <b>1</b>  |                 |

Since, in the case of land and maritime agreement, parties are almost always countries, states, or entities that have sovereignty or constitutional backing, it is incumbent upon them to handle boundary matters in the most formal (if not legalistic) way. It is this fact that necessitates expressions like *countries*, *nations*, *delegations*, and *holders*, all of which refer to parties to negotiation in one way or the other with some kind of formality. In addition to this, the formal relationship between parties is made more explicit by the legal orientation of expressions such as *(in) accordance*, *condition*, *jurisdiction* and *obligation*. These items are suggestive of important subject to which participants need to be formally disposed. This is the reason for also having expressions like *ensure*, *refrain*, *adhere*, *allow*, *guarantee*,

*conclude*, and *notify*. These are verbs that either give instructions or warning, but which all have legal force, implication or orientation as the following contextual instances show:

- i. Each party shall *refrain* from making any *claims* or *exercising sovereignty* (Gabonese-Sao Tome/Article 4)
- ii. ...a Party shall *ensure* that *entities* it *authorizes* to *undertake* activities within the Area shall *observe* the *terms* of the *Treaty* (US-Mexico, Article 5)
- iii. Cameroon, after the transfer of authority to it by Nigeria, *guarantees* to Nigerian nationals living in the Bakassi Peninsula the exercise of the fundamental rights and freedoms enshrined in international human rights law and in other relevant provisions of international law (Nigerian-Cameroun, Article 3)

These articles spell out what claims are acceptable or not acceptable by parties with respect to the contents of agreement, and it is not difficult to identify the tone of formality in the expression. The expressions, *refrain*, *ensure*, *observe*, *authorize*, *undertake* and *guarantee* in addition with their context, confer the formal status on *each party* to the agreement.

### 6.5 Mode of Border Agreement

With regard to mode, every formal, legal or quasi-legal negotiation is achieved first, through spoken and subsequently written forms. Since negotiation, particularly between nations or states, is essentially a formal activity, its end products are always documented. But this written document is almost always preceded by oral negotiation, and evidence of orality is often established in the written form. This is true of all the documents used in this research. For instance, all of them prominently feature this expression: (the parties) *have agreed as follows*... . It is only logical that the agreements would have been orally concluded in principle before their documentation. It is at that time that concessions would have been made and agreed upon. The written agreement is simply a reflection of the oral concurrence, but the written one requires an endorsement from the parties as well as parliamentary backing in order to give it a life, so that reference can always be made to it. This shows why the written agreement contains expressions such as *willingness* and *claims* in order to indicate that the agreement is not done under any duress; and it is not an accident that the expression, "... *have agreed as follows*..." appears at the introductory section of all the documents used for this study.

Thus, register of negotiation is defined by words of positive relationship such as *solidarity*, *fraternity*, *well-being*, *bonds*, *peace*, *friendship* and *brotherhood*. Words of geospatial description that are agreeable to the parties also form aspects of register of boundary negotiation/agreement. Instances of such include *coordinates*, *line*, *marker*, *distance*, *width* and *point*. Finally, we can find a lot survey words defining the area of dispute as agreed by the parties. Examples are *measurement*, *maintenance*, *restoration*, *delineation* and *demarkation*.

### 7.0 Discussion and Conclusion

We have examined the register features of border agreement, and our analysis has shown that register of border agreements tilts towards achieving peace between parties to agreement. This is evidently captured in the field of expressions as the register of harmony and accord demonstrates. The lexical field is populated by numerous expressions of positive attitude and friendship as reflected by words such as *solidarity*, *brotherhood*, *goodwill*, *well-being*, *unification*, *stability*, and *freedom*. Indeed, positive expressions constitute the basis of agreement as parties have already decided against discord, conflict and disagreement, by mere opting for resolution process. This is necessitated by expressions like *peace*, *confidence*, *coexistence* and *cooperation*. These positive expressions are meant to institute, establish or strengthen the diplomatic relationship between parties. This is why the lexical expressions in the discourse are overwhelmingly positive. Where there are negative expressions, they are conditioned to facilitate diplomacy by positively contextualizing them.

Furthermore, the field of expression also covers land and maritime survey by providing topographical details or description of the area in contention. This is informed by the parties' intention to determine which parts or aspects of the boundary belong to whom, and this calls for some form of measurement and allocation. This allows for exactitude of boundary division between parties, which is reflected in the latitude and longitude points of the land and maritime space in question.

The tenor of border agreement register places the parties in a negotiation in formal position or status, regardless of the bond or close socio-political relationship existing between them. Expressions such as *countries, nations, delegations, holders, (in) accordance, condition, jurisdiction, obligation, ensure, refrain, adhere, allow, guarantee, conclude, and notify*, establish the formality of such a discourse. The formal relationship between parties is made more explicit by the legal orientation of some of such expressions.

Our analysis also revealed that the mode of border agreement is first through spoken and subsequently written forms. Negotiation between parties to agreement is essentially a formal activity, whose end products are almost always documented. Evidence of preliminary orality is often established in the written form.

It is, therefore, evidenced that peace negotiation in border agreements is a function of formal positive expressions that advance conflict resolution and diplomacy between parties. The success or failure of negotiation process is a function of the deployed register. Every peaceful conflict resolution is built upon register of positive expressions that convey harmony, accord and diplomacy.

#### References

- Aghemelo, A. & Ibhasebhor, S. (2006) "Colonialism as a Source of Boundary Dispute and Conflict among African States: The World Court Judgement on the Bakassi Peninsula and its Implications for Nigeria." *Journal of Social Sciences*. Vol. 13(3): Pp. 177-181.
- Bloor, T. & Bloor, M. (2013). *The Functional Analysis of English: A Hallidayan Approach*. 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition. Routledge.
- Chukwurah, O. (2012). *Nigerian and the Bakassi Peninsula Question: Revindication and Not Cession to Cameroon*. Law Resources and Allied Matters Service, 2012.
- Curtis, A. *The New Peace Linguistics and The Role of Language in Conflict*. Information Age Publishing, 2022.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Introducing and Defining Peace Linguistics". *The Word*. Vol. 27(3). 2018. Pp. 11-13.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Back from the Battlefield: Resurrecting Peace Linguistics". *TESL Reporter*. 2017. Vol. 50(1), 20-34. [http://tesol.byuh.edu/sites/tesol.byuh.edu/files/TESOLReporter50-1\\_article2.pdf](http://tesol.byuh.edu/sites/tesol.byuh.edu/files/TESOLReporter50-1_article2.pdf)
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Whatever Happened to Peace (Linguistics)?" *The English Connection*. Autumn 2017. Vol. 21 (3). 23-24.
- Crystal, D. (1999). *The Penguin Dictionary of Language*. London: Penguin Books. Pp. 254-255.
- Freidrich, P. (2016). "World Englishes and Peace Linguistics: Their Contribution to English for Diplomatic Purposes". *English for Diplomatic Purposes*. Patricia Friedrich (ed.). Multilingual Matters.
- Freidrich, P. & Gomes de Matos, F. (2016). "Toward a Nonkilling Linguistics". *English for Diplomatic Purposes*. Patricia Friedrich (ed.). Multilingual Matters.
- Gomes De Matos, F. (2014). "Peace Linguistics for Language Teachers". *DELTA*. Vol. 30(2). Pp. 415-424.
- Fakhry, A. (2023). "Legal Aspects of the Lebanon-Israel Maritime Boundary Agreement." Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung e. V. Rule of Law Programme MENA.
- Halliday, M. (2013). "Meaning as Choice". *Systemic Functional Linguistics: Exploring Choices*. Lisa Fontaine, Tom Bartlett and Gerard O'Grady (eds.). New York: Cambridge. Pp. 15-36.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1985). "Context of Situation". *Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in Social-Semiotic Perspective*. Michael Halliday and Ruqaiya Hassan (eds.). Victoria: Deakin University. Pp. 3-12.



- Hussein, H., Poplawsky, M. & Mohapatra, T. (2023). "The Political Context of Change in Transboundary Freshwater Agreements." *Environmental Science & Policy*. Vol. 149.
- Huth, P. K. (1996). *Standing Your Ground: Territorial Disputes and International Conflict*. University of Michigan Press.
- Ishihara, N. (2016). "Softening or Intensifying Your Language in Oppositional Talk: Disagreeing Agreeably or Defiantly." *English for Diplomatic Purposes*. Patricia Friedrich (ed.). Multilingual Matters.
- Johnson, D. D. P. & Toft, M. D. (2014). "Grounds for War: The Evolution of Territorial Conflict." *International Security*. Vol. 38 (3). Pp. 7-38.
- Kahler, M. (2006). Territoriality and Conflict in an Era of Globalization. In M. Kahler & B. F. Walter (Eds.), Cambridge University Press. Pp. 1–22.
- Leckie-Tarry, H. (1995). *Language and Context: A Functional Linguistic Theory of Register*. London: Biddles Ltd.
- Leech, G. (1969). *A Linguistic Guide to English Poetry*. London: Longman.
- Lederach, J. P. (2003). *Little Book of Conflict Transformation*. Good Books.
- Montgomery, M. (1996). *An Introduction to Language and Society*. 2nd Edition London: Routledge.
- Quirk, R. & Greenbaum, S. (1973). *A University Grammar of English*. Longman Group Ltd.
- Scott, Biljana. (2016). "Force and Grace". *English for Diplomatic Purposes*. Patricia Friedrich (ed.). Multilingual Matters.
- Teichi, Elke. (2013). "Choices in Analysing Choice: Methods and Techniques for Register Analysis". *Systemic Functional Linguistics: Exploring Choices*. Lisa Fontaine, Tom Bartlett and Gerard O'Grady (eds.). New York: Cambridge. Pp. 417-431.
- The Economist. (2000, August 17). "The Costs of Petty Nationalism: Latin America's Borders." *The Economist* Pp. 33–34.
- Vasquez, J. A. (1993). *The War Puzzle*. Cambridge University Press.
- Vasquez, J. A., & Valeriano, B. (2008). "Territory as a Source of Conflict and a Road to Peace." In J. Bercovitch, V. Kremenyuk, & I. W. Zartman (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Conflict Resolution*. SAGE Publications. Pp. 193–209.