

Annika Pasanen

Sámi allaskuvla / Sámi University of Applied Sciences

## Crossing Ideologies in Discourses on Sámi Language Development

Sámi languages are a group of Indigenous languages currently undergoing active processes of strengthening and revitalization. Positive developments have occurred at varying rates in different countries, regions, and communities that speak different Sámi languages. In Finland, three Sámi languages are spoken: Inari Sámi, North Sámi, and Skolt Sámi. All of these languages have been actively revitalized and developed for decades (Aikio-Puoskari 2016).

For the smaller Sámi languages, Inari and Skolt Sámi, intergenerational language transmission was interrupted under post-war circumstances, and revitalization has involved both the renewal of the language itself and the key factors that support language vitality. The language has gradually gained a foothold in educational settings, administration, public services, and within families (Pasanen 2015; Juutinen 2023). In contrast, North Sámi has always had L1 speakers across all generations in Finland, but assimilation has influenced the language's vitality to varying degrees in different areas (Aikio 1988; Rasmussen 2013). In some areas, there is a need to re-establish the entire speech community, while in others, the focus is more on strengthening Sámi language rights and expanding existing language domains.

This diverse situation and the varying needs of the Sámi have given rise to different, and at times conflicting, discourses on how Sámi languages should be developed. These discourses can be seen as reflecting the phenomenon of ideological clarification (Dauenhauer & Dauenhaur 1998; Roché 2019), social processes that clarify the goals, responsibilities, and priorities of language development.

In this paper, I analyze the ideologies and ideological clarifications linked to the development of Sámi languages. The data for this study consists of online news texts from Yle Sápmi, the Sámi branch of Finland's national broadcasting company Yle. I focus on news from the period 2013–2023 and analyze them by highlighting discourses on how Sámi languages are currently being developed and how they should be developed. Key questions include: What does revitalization mean, and what is its goal? Who should or should not be involved? Who is responsible for the language? What should be prioritized?

My analysis highlights common themes in revitalization discourses, such as a strong personal commitment to the Sámi language and its intergenerational transmission. However, differences between the Sámi languages are also evident in the data. While expanding the speech community is viewed as the key goal for revitalizing Inari Sámi, the focus in North Sámi development is on addressing the needs of L1 speakers.

The example of the Sámi languages has inspired several other Indigenous and minority communities in their efforts for language revitalization. Understanding the ideological foundations of revitalization is crucial in the current situation, where the vast majority of the world's languages, including Uralic languages, are at risk of disappearing.

#### References:

- Aikio, M. 1988. *Saamelaiset kielenvaihdon kierteessä: kielisosiologinen tutkimus viiden saamelaiskylän kielenvaihdosta 1910–1980*. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Toimituksia 479. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Aikio-Puoskari, U. 2016. *Gullos sámegiella! Saamen kielten elvyttämisen parhaita käytäntöjä ja kansallisen politiikan linjauksia Suomessa, Ruotsissa ja Norjassa*. Inari: Sámediggi.
- Dauenhauer, N. M. & R. Dauenhauer. 1998. Technical, emotional, and ideological issues in reversing language shift. Examples from Southeast Alaska. In *Endangered languages. Current issues and future prospects*, edited by Lenore A Grenoble and Lindsay J. Whaley: 57–98. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Juutinen, M. 2023. *Koltansaamen kielikontaktit. Vähemmistökieli muuttuvassa kieliympäristössä*. Acta Universitatis Ouluensis, B Humaniora 209. Oulu: Oulun yliopisto.
- Pasanen, A. 2015. *Kuávsui já peeivičuová. 'Sarastus ja päivänvalo'.* Inarinsaamen kielen revitalisaatio. Uralica Helsingiensia 9. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura & Helsingin yliopisto.
- Rasmussen, T. 2013. *Go ealáška, de lea váttis dápmat. Davvisámegiela etnolingvistalaš ceavzinnávccaid guorahallan guovtti gránnjágielddas Deanus ja Ohcejogas 2000-logu álggus*. Romsa: Norgga Árkatalaš Universitehtta.
- Roche, G. 2019. Does ideological clarification help language maintenance? Exploring the revitalization paradox through the case of Manegacha, a Tibetan minority language. *Anthropological Linguistics* 61.1 (2019):114–134.