



# The Local Political Economy of Languages in a Sámi Tourism Destination Authenticity and mobility in the labeling of souvenirs

Sari Pietikäinen, Helen Kelly-Holmes

## ► To cite this version:

Sari Pietikäinen, Helen Kelly-Holmes. The Local Political Economy of Languages in a Sámi Tourism Destination Authenticity and mobility in the labeling of souvenirs. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 2011, 15 (3), pp.323. 10.1111/j.1467-9841.2011.00489.x . hal-00649464

**HAL Id: hal-00649464**

**<https://hal.science/hal-00649464>**

Submitted on 8 Dec 2011

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



**The Local Political Economy of Languages in a Sámi Tourism Destination Authenticity and mobility in the labeling of souvenirs**

|                  |                                                                                                              |
|------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Journal:         | <i>Journal of Sociolinguistics</i>                                                                           |
| Manuscript ID:   | JSLX-10-164.R1                                                                                               |
| Manuscript Type: | Article                                                                                                      |
| Keywords:        | local political economy of languages, tourism, Sámi, souvenirs, multimodal discourse, mobility, authenticity |
|                  |                                                                                                              |

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

**The Local Political Economy of Languages in a Sámi Tourism Destination. Authenticity and mobility in the labeling of souvenirs<sup>1</sup>**

**Abstract:**

In this article we use ethnographic and discourse analytic approaches to examine how the labelling of tourist souvenirs affects and is in turn affected by the local political economy of language of a tourist destination, which is also a minority language space. We begin by arguing for the importance of our particular focus of study, souvenir labels, in the process of global and local tourism, and consequently as evidence of the interplay of languages, politics and economics. We then consider the distinctive features of the local political economy of language in our particular case study, the multilingual Sámi village of Inari in Northern Finland. In a related discussion, we describe how Inari functions as a site of experiential cultural tourism, and how the purchase of souvenirs is part of the tourist experience. We then go on to describe a number of practices that we have observed in the choice and use of linguistic and visual resources for the labelling of souvenirs in Inari, the delicate balancing act that takes place in these practices between authenticity and mobility, and, how this reflects and is reflected in the local political economy of language.

Keywords: local political economy of language, Sámi, tourism, souvenirs, multimodal discourse, mobility, authenticity

Running title:  
The labeling of souvenirs

Main text word count: 8746

## Abstrakti

Tutkimme tässä artikkelissa etnografista ja diskurssianalyttistä lähestymistapoja hyödyntäen miten matkamuistot ja niiden kuvaaminen nimikelapuissa rakentuvat kielten paikallisessa poliittisessä taloudessa samalla sitä rakentaen. Tarkasteltavana oleva turistikohde on alkuperäisenä saamelaiskylänä markkinoitu Inari Pohjois-Suomessa, joka kuuluu uhanalaisten saamenkielten kotiseutualueeseen. Aluksi kuvaamme matkamuistojen tarkastelun kiinnostavuutta kielten, politiikan ja talouden tutkimuksen risteymässä. Seuraavaksi tarkastelemme Inarin kieliympäristöä ja sen nivoutumista paikalliseen poliittiseen talouteen. Tämän jälkeen kuvaamme Inarissa myynnissä olevien matkamuistojen ja niiden nimilapuissa tehtyjä kielellisiä ja visuaalisia valintoja. Matkamuistojen multimodaalisen diskurssin analyysimme kuvaa, miten niihin liittyvät käytänteet tasapainottelevat autenttisuuden ja liikkuvuuden rakentamisen välillä samalla kun ne nivoutuvat paikalliseen kielten poliittiseen talouteen.

INTRODUCTION

The ways in which languages are used in tourism are a significant component of the local political economy of languages (Gal 1989; Heller 2005) in any tourist location. This is particularly the case where tourist sites are simultaneously sites of complex multilingualism and changing socio-economic processes. Our focus in this article<sup>2</sup> is one such site, namely *Sámiland*, the traditional Sámi area in the northernmost part of Scandinavia and Russia. In Sámiland, the use of language and other semiotic resources for touristic and other economic purposes involves questions of legitimacy, authenticity and categorization (cf. Hall, Muller and Saarinen 2009; Heller 2003; Author 12010). The transition of indigenous, endangered local languages to valuable and exchangeable objects has various implications in terms of who can have legitimate access to these resources, how the profit should be circulated and who gets to decide. In this way, the sociolinguistics of tourism (cf. for example, Jaworski, Thurlow, Ylänne-McEwen and Larson 2009; Ploner 2009; Pujolar 2006) both reflect and affect the local political economy of language.

In this article we examine one aspect of the sociolinguistics of tourism and its interaction with the local political economy as revealed by the ways in which languages and other semiotic resources are used in the labeling of souvenirs in Sámiland. Our study is focused on the labeling of souvenirs for sale in a selection of outlets in the Sámi village of Inari. We take as our

starting point the understanding that these small and somewhat banal multimodal language practices in the labelling of souvenirs are actually very strategic and indicative. In discursive terms the labeling practices are both constructed and constitutive, gaining and changing identities, values and functions through dynamic social interaction (cf. Jaffe 1999; Ploner 2009). Through the ethnographic and discourse analytical examination of these little texts, and the trajectories along which they circulate, this paper attempts to contribute to the growing body of work in the sociolinguistics of tourism (Coupland, Garrett and Bishop 2005; Heller 2003; Thurlow and Jaworski 2010; Phipps 2007; Pujolar 2006) and relates to recent discussions on language and globalization (cf. Blommaert 2010; Coupland 2003, 2010; Heller 2003), especially in relating to minority languages and multilingualism.

We begin by situating souvenirs and their labels as part of the multimodality of the co-produced tourist experience (Prentice 2001). We then go on to describe the local political economy of language in Inari, and the situation of Inari as a site of cultural and nature tourism. Next, we present the particular combinations of multimodal resources that are used in the labeling and by implication the narrating of souvenirs for and by tourists. Our sociolinguistic focus is on language choice and on the selection and use of particular linguistic and visual resources for particular functions. An interesting and complex tension emerges from the data between the resources used to cue authenticity and the resources used to ensure the mobility (cf. Blommaert, Collins and Slembrouck 2005; Heller 2007) of the souvenir, and

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

we organize the presentation of our findings around this tension. In the final section, we discuss what this tension might imply for the local political economy of language in sites of tourism exchange, which are also sites of complex multilingualism.

SOUVENIR LABELS AND CONTEMPORARY CULTURAL TOURISM

Souvenirs are an important part of the multilayered and multimodal tourism space; as mentioned above, they are a way of extending and continuing the tourist experience, and as such, they form part of the overall narrative that the tourist constructs of this personal experience in a particular place (cf. Schouten 2006). They can be seen as part of the material culture of the tourist place, which in turn, as Scollon and Scollon (2003) remind us, is constructing and also constructed by circulating discourses, interaction orders and experiences of individuals in that place.

The souvenir retailer, souvenirs themselves and their labelling all act as advertisements for the place and provide an element of differentiation and authentication between ‘there’ and elsewhere, between that particular heritage and other cultures, and between locally-made and elsewhere-made. This interest in the possibilities and constraints of souvenirs to cross, mix and move temporal and spatial boundaries is related to ‘new mobility’ research (cf. for example, Sheller and Urry 2006; Urry 2007), particularly in relation to the mobility of language resources and practices between different places,

domains, genres and practices and the consequences of this mobility  
(Blommaert, Collins and Slembrouck 2005; Pennycook 2010; Author 2010).

Souvenir labels can also be seen as part of what Thurlow and Jaworski  
(2010), building on Billing's (1995) work on banal nationalism, call 'banal  
globalisation'. They use this term to highlight how all mundane use of  
language and other semiotic resources displays, play around with and  
potentially contests global order(s) in tourism and linguistic hierarchies in  
general. As such, souvenirs and their labelling practices, while having a  
material base (cf. Jack and Phipps 2005), are indicative of larger processes and  
practices related to the local economy of language, as argued above. In our  
case, we locate the labelling practices of Inari souvenirs in a nexus of the  
shifting complexities of the local political economy, particularly because they  
aim at responding to the emerging and changing tourist encounters and market  
demands, whilst at the same time balancing with local credibility. Against  
these tensions and potentials, we observe two processes emerging in souvenir  
labelling practices: one is a combination of particular resources to construct  
authenticity for the tourist consumer; the other is a combination of particular  
resources to allow souvenir mobility across scales. We are not arguing that  
authenticity and mobility are necessarily dichotomous; nor that they are fixed,  
material properties of particular languages and products. Rather, as we shall  
see below, our data suggest that perceptions of both authenticity and mobility  
are needed for souvenirs to travel across various contexts and scales.



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

We see authenticity as discursively constructed, always situated in a particular communicative event and subject to alterations and interpretations (cf. Bruner 2001). These constructed characteristics of authenticity make it also a valuable resource in cultural tourism. We are using authenticity here in terms of consumer/tourist authenticity in experiential cultural tourism, which Waller and Lea (1999 cited in Prentice, 2001) identify as having four different, but inter-related dimensions: experience of closeness to the culture of the place; experience of the emptiness of the place, particularly of other tourists; experience of independence in the tourist experience – that is, being facilitated rather than being herded; and experience of the perception of the landscape, or the mindscape (Prentice 2001), that has already been formed by the tourist and that links intertextually to imaginings of the place. By mobility, we refer to the extent to which languages and other semiotic resources can be used to make other objects mobile across scales of places (from Inari to Japan or France), domains (from cultural politics to tourism), and practices (museum representations to individual experiences) away from their original place (Blommaert, Collins and Slembrouck 2005; Author 12010).

We extend this to encompass the biography of the souvenir label. The linguistic and multimodal choices made for the souvenir labels are the starting point for this biography which then follows a textual trajectory that starts with its initial entextualisation. Interestingly, some souvenirs are entextualised from the start as such, while others are initially entextualised as a product for local use. The souvenir and its label follow various trajectories with varying

1  
2  
3  
4 participants and participant frameworks (e.g. from producer to wholesaler;  
5  
6 wholesaler to retailer; retailer to tourist/consumer; from tourist to  
7  
8 friend/relative/work colleague etc.). Along with the text of the label, each  
9  
10 stage allows for particular resources to be used to narrate these physical  
11  
12 objects as souvenirs and to construct a link between them and the touristic  
13  
14 experience of a particular place<sup>3</sup>.  
15  
16

17  
18 While souvenirs as objects of the material world have multiple  
19  
20 meanings and modalities (cf. Davis and Marvin 2004), we focus on the  
21  
22 multimodal discourse of souvenir labels and labelling practices. We see the  
23  
24 label, the souvenir and the place of purchase as working together: the product  
25  
26 is the three-dimensional, existing object; the label is what also narrates it, and  
27  
28 plays an important role in bringing it to life as a souvenir, enabling it to be a  
29  
30 way of interacting with iconic sites and recreating the tourist experience out of  
31  
32 context. To understand the entextualisation and relocalisation processes (cf.  
33  
34 van Leeuwen 2008; Pennycook 2010), the choices and combinations of  
35  
36 particular resources and the various transitions, we first need to explore the  
37  
38 political economy of language in Inari of which these souvenir labels are born  
39  
40 and to which they contribute.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

#### 48 THE LOCAL POLITICAL ECONOMY OF LANGUAGES IN INARI 49 50 VILLAGE 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

The cultural tourism site which this article focuses on is, as mentioned earlier, the Sámi village of Inari, which is located geographically in Finnish Lapland, but simultaneously also belongs to the transnational and multilingual Sámiland of the indigenous Sámi nation<sup>4</sup>. This area, also known as *Sápmi* or North Calotte, has always been a multilingual and multicultural place undergoing changes, not only because of mobility linked to traditional livelihoods centering on reindeer herding, hunting, and fishing, but also because of cultural practices such as the seasonal move between summer and winter habitats and trade (in furs, tar and dried fish). Language hierarchies and repertoires have also been affected by the wider socio-political processes including the ‘birth’ of the Scandinavian nation states and of Russia/ the Soviet Union in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, and the consequent redrawing of national borders (the de facto splitting of Sámiland, cf Author 1 et al. 2010). Contemporary multilingualism is also related to education, media, new technology and tourism which bring global languages, particularly English, to the region. In the context of the new globalized economy, and with the new types of job opportunities it brings (for example in tourism) and the market value it creates for locality, the value, function and experiences of multilingualism and particular languages, such as indigenous Sámi languages, are also renegotiated and reinvented (Author 12010).

The historical and social trajectories of Sámi communities in the last fifty years or so have transformed Sámi languages from community

1  
2  
3  
4 languages into endangered languages known only by a few people. In the  
5  
6 contemporary Sámi context, the forces that have a particularly strong  
7  
8 impact on the language situation are linked, on the one hand, to Sámi  
9  
10 political and linguistic rights, and, on the other, to global processes such  
11  
12 as tourism, one of the increasing sources of revenue nowadays. The  
13  
14 region and its people are living through a shift from modern to post-  
15  
16 modern, from local to simultaneously global, from regional to  
17  
18 transnational. Inari village, the central focus of this article, is an example  
19  
20 of these simultaneous and at times contradictory processes and provides  
21  
22 us with a site to explore conditions and consequences of these changes in  
23  
24 the context of tourism and globalisation. This multilayeredness makes it  
25  
26 possible to construct and perform various kinds of ‘Sáminess’ in a  
27  
28 constructed touristic borderzone (cf. Bruner 2001).  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34         Similar to many other minoritized language communities (cf. e.g.  
35  
36 Lacy & Douglass 2002; Kirtsoglou and Theodossopoulos 2004; Notzke  
37  
38 1998), tourism in the Sámi context has included negotiation and  
39  
40 contestation of access, ownership and commodification with regard to  
41  
42 linguistic and cultural resources. Recent disputes have concerned, for  
43  
44 example, the use of Sámi symbols in tourist souvenirs and in the  
45  
46 decoration of hotel interiors, and use of Sámi dresses by local hosts in  
47  
48 tourist events. (see e.g. Länsman 2004; Saarinen 1999; Varanka 2001).  
49  
50  
51 Such disputes throw up many complex and interconnected issues, which  
52  
53  
54 are relevant in any consideration of how tourism, with its ‘rhetorical,  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

discourse-based character’ (Pujolar 2006: 26) can use local resources in a site like Inari to construct the tourist product. Having looked at the local political economy of language, we will now move on to look at Inari as a site of cultural tourism.

INARI AS A SITE OF EXPERIENTIAL CULTURAL TOURISM

Inari village is a very small, rural village in the far north of Finland, the Sámi domicile area. It is located at the shore of Lake Inari and for its 750 inhabitants, it provides a basic, although somewhat truncated infrastructure of services. The peripheral character of Inari is also reflected in the mixture of ways people make their living, typically through a flexible combination of some of the traditional means of living (i.e. reindeer husbandry, forestry, fishing) with the service and tourism industry. According to official Finnish statistics (Tilastokeskus, accessed 16.6.2009), 79 percent of the jobs in the region are within services, while only 11 percent are within primary industry (ie. farming, reindeer husbandry). Tourism is a significant part of the regional economy: for example, in the year 2005, tourism brought over 80 million euros to the Inari municipality and in 2007, there were 2.2 million visitors in the region that has on average 0.5 people living per m<sup>2</sup> (see Luiro, accessed 2.10.2009). About half of the visitors are international tourists, British, German, French and Russian tourists representing the biggest groups, but there are also growing markets in Southern Europe and Asia.

1  
2  
3  
4 Tourism impacts on the lives of the locals in more than just an  
5  
6 economic way: it has also structured the services available in the village.  
7  
8 Despite its small size, Inari hosts two hotels with restaurants, a camping site  
9  
10 with cottages, a tourist information point, several tourist services, several  
11  
12 souvenir and handcraft shops, and the nationally and internationally  
13  
14 recognized Sámi culture and nature museum *Siida* with over 100,000 visitors  
15  
16 annually (Puolakka 2008).  
17  
18  
19

20 Inari is especially central for the Sámi community, as it is the symbolic  
21  
22 and institutional focal point for the Sámi languages with many central Sámi  
23  
24 institutions and services, such as schools, media and the Finnish Sámi  
25  
26 parliament. The village has four official languages, i.e. Northern Sámi, Inari  
27  
28 Sámi and Skolt Sámi together with the national majority language Finnish.  
29  
30 While it is nowadays rather rare to actually hear the Sámi languages spoken in  
31  
32 shops and on village roads, they are, to an extent, visible in the linguistic  
33  
34 landscape of Inari village (Author 1 et al. in print).  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 Linguistic landscapes and audioscapes are key in the multimodality of  
40  
41 the contemporary tourist experience (cf. Jaworski, Thurlow, Lawson and  
42  
43 Ylänné-McEwen 2003; Pujolar 2006). In the context of Inari tourism, the  
44  
45 visual and aural closeness of Finnish and the Sámi languages (all Finno-Ugric  
46  
47 languages, but mutually unintelligible) may for the non-Finnish speaking  
48  
49 tourist mean that the Finnish linguistic landscape and audioscape are sufficient  
50  
51 to give this feeling of being in another country and to confirm and remember  
52  
53 the visit. However, when needed, the guide or locals can point towards the  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

usage of indigenous languages in Inari, thus emphasizing the ‘indigenous’ character of the place.

    In a tourism context, Inari is branded as having two major attractions: unspoiled nature and indigenous Sámi culture. In this positioning of Inari, we can see key tropes of the marketed authenticity of experiential cultural tourism, namely ‘the promotion of naturalness’ (Prentice 2001: 17) in the case of unspoilt nature, and ‘the offer of origins’ (Prentice 2001: 9) in the indigenous Sámi culture. The village itself is described in the tourism websites (see e.g. <http://www.visitinari.fi>) and brochures as a ‘genuine’ and a ‘real’ village, where ‘the heritage of the native people has remained active and vital’. These are familiar and unchanging representations of indigenized and ethnicitized cultures in tourism (cf. Bruner 2001). We can see this as an attempt to both commodify local resources which previously did not have this market value and to differentiate this destination from other Northern destinations. In the current phase of globalization and cultural tourism, perceptions of periphery and authenticity have become valued attributes of touristic places and experiences (cf. Lacy and Douglass 2002; Shepherd 2002). This provides a good example of how authenticity and mobility are neither fixed nor dichotomous.

    To meet the other expectations of tourists, Inari, too, is full of imported goods, such as husky safaris (huskies do not belong to the natural habitat of Scandinavia), and snowmobile safaris (the snowmobile is used locally for transportation and reindeer herding). Santa Claus is also on call all year round,

1  
2  
3  
4 the Northern lights (traditionally believed to be traces of a fox waving its tail)  
5  
6 can be 'hunted' for good luck and fertility, and alongside local food (fish,  
7  
8 reindeer, mushrooms and berries) one can enjoy imported king crab or,  
9  
10 alternatively, pizza and hamburgers with Coke as anywhere else. To a certain  
11  
12 extent these goods and practices brought by tourism are now also consumed by  
13  
14 locals and they have become part of the multilayered environment of Inari.  
15  
16

17  
18 Inari is constructed for the domestic and global tourist as a place of  
19  
20 geographic and cultural escape, a gateway to places of physical beauty,  
21  
22 heritage culture, a place apart from everyday life, with its own temporal  
23  
24 dimension. Despite the complexities of the sociolinguistic, political, economic  
25  
26 and cultural situation of Inari described earlier, the souvenirs being sold to  
27  
28 tourists have to encompass a coherent narrative of the place with unique,  
29  
30 authenticating characteristics of the tourist experience there. In the following  
31  
32 section, we look at how this happens through the multimodal discourse of  
33  
34 souvenir labels.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

## 41 DATA AND METHODS

42  
43  
44  
45

46 In our research on the souvenir labelling practices in Inari, we are employing  
47  
48 multimodal discourse analysis and ethnographic analysis (cf. Hult 2009;  
49  
50 Author 2010; Scollon and Scollon 2003). The ethnographic approach helps us  
51  
52 to identify and explore the patterns and embeddedness of the souvenirs to the  
53  
54 political economy of language and the tourism experience in Inari (as outlined  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

above), and to identify the trajectory which tourists follow when buying souvenirs in Inari. Multimodal discourse analysis is crucial for examining linguistic, textual and other semiotic aspects of language practices. The data were collected systematically by our research team during four intensive field work trips in 2008-2010. The data consist of fieldwork notes, on-site observations, informal discussions with tourists and tourist service providers, photographic documentation of the key tourist attractions, key tourist souvenirs shops, souvenirs and their labels, and souvenir items

Our analysis proceeded through four interrelated steps. First, with the help of on-site observations, informal discussion and tourist guidebooks, we identified the Inari tourist trail and the typical activities the tourists engaged with. The data suggest that in Inari, with the help of tourist maps and advice from guides and the tourist information point, tourists are actively directed towards and guided along this relatively clearly marked trajectory and, based on our field work observations, tourists seem to, more or less, follow it. The most typical trail, one across the village, along the main road and shore of Lake Inari, passes the main tourist attractions and several souvenir outlets in the village. Tourists generally start from a small wooden church at one end of the village and then make their way to the village centre, making stops in the tourist information point, several tourist outlets, and, after crossing the famous *Juutua* salmon river, end up in the large, modern looking building of *Siida*, the Sámi cultural and nature museum. Even though the tourist trajectory in Inari is very short, less than one kilometre, the viewing and potential purchase of

souvenirs is a central activity of that trajectory and of the visit to Inari itself: browsing for and purchasing souvenirs make up, in our own observations, a significant amount of the time tourists spend on the trajectory.

Our second step was to identify the key souvenir shops for our analysis on souvenir labels. Based on our on-site observations, we focussed on the most popular souvenir shops where the tourists purchase souvenirs. These were the Museum Shop in *Siida*, the Sámi handcraft guild's *Duodji* shop, the largest souvenir outlet *Näkkäljärvi*, and the souvenir shop in the tourist information point.

The souvenir shops differ in their profiles and the range of souvenirs they sell, thus creating a different space and potentially different experience for souvenir browsing and purchasing. For example, the souvenir shop within the Tourist Information Point and the *Näkkäljärvi* souvenir shop with its cafeteria provide souvenirs ranging from objects made by Sámi artisans and local handicrafts people to mass produced tourist 'kitsch' with some indexing of Lapland, Sámi culture or just 'being on holiday'. In contrast, the two other souvenir shops under scrutiny are located at the centre of Sámi community practices, i.e. the Sámi *Duodji* shop sells only objects made by accredited Sámi handicrafts people and also sells Sámi language teaching materials and materials for Sámi dress making. The *Siida* museum shop similarly emphasizes Sámi artefacts, although there are also other kinds of souvenirs on sale.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

In our third step, we examined and compared the range of souvenirs available in these shops, together with making observations of the tourists purchasing souvenirs and holding informal interviews with sales personnel about souvenir selling and purchasing practices. The experiences of the team members themselves both as tourists in Inari and of purchasing souvenirs were also utilized.

In our final step, we moved on to examine the multimodal discourse of Inari souvenir labels. For this, we selected 32 different souvenirs and their labels, which represented the range of souvenirs and labelling practices found in our previous analytical steps. As mentioned above, we wanted to look at the particular resources used to narrate physical objects as souvenirs and to construct a link between the objects and the touristic experience of Inari. These labels were analysed according to language choice, visual trope (colour, flag, animal figure etc), indexes of production/producer (handmade, Sámi Duodji etc) and the type of souvenir (clothes, food etc). In this analysis, we also utilized our fieldnotes and on-site observations. In addition, we examined the indexing of various scales (local, national, international, global) in the linguistic and semiotic choices on the souvenirs. The scalar model proved particularly useful in helping to relate to the global economic and cultural flows manifesting in complex, overlapping and disjunctive orders and spaces (Appadurai 1990; Blommaert, Collins and Slembrouck 2005). Aiello and Thurlow (2006: 154, see also Thurlow and Aiollo 2007) suggest the concept of the semioscape as a way of tapping into the circulation of semiotic symbols

under emerging global conditions. In the next section, we discuss some examples which are illustrative of the multimodal discourse of souvenir labels in Inari.

## NARRATING SOUVENIRS IN INARI: AUTHENTICITY AND MOBILITY

### **Relative importance and functions of different languages**

The languages that appear on the labels are a key way of constructing the link to place. The languages chosen and the various functions they seem to have in the labels can be seen to represent a micro-level interplay of the global, national, regional and local layers in constructing the local political economy of language. They form a multilayered system in which use of each resource tries to open an access to the mobility and authenticity continua. In the labels that we looked at English is, perhaps not surprisingly, the primary language in which this link is made, through the use of stock phrases and buzzwords, such as ‘made in’, ‘hand-made in’ et cetera. Finnish plays a smaller role, and is almost always accompanied by English. The place names are typically in Finnish (rather than in their English version, e.g. Lapland, Northern Finland), thus constructing the link to the place, while English, linked to its function as lingua franca and as a language of marketing, serves to make the product mobile, by for instance situating a Finnish product, company or place name in relation to global navigation points (see examples below).

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

German is the next most common language to be used on labels, although it is much less significant than English or Finnish. The use of German can be seen to index the important role of Germany in trade and tourism for Finland and to the fact that German has traditionally been part of the Finnish language education and repertoire until very recently. However, in the local political economy of languages in Inari, it can be seen also to point towards the particular historical presence of German in Lapland. This is related to the presence of over 200,000 German soldiers in Lapland (doubling the number of the inhabitants in the area at the time) during World War II (specifically from 1941-1944) as a part of the alliance between Finland and Germany, which ended with the devastating ‘Lapland war’ in 1994- 1945 and consequent withdrawal of German soldiers from Finnish soil (cf. Junila 2000). In the tourism context, this has resulted in a steady flow of German tourists, some of whom have been attracted by the possibility to revisit the old war sites and by the fact that many locals, particularly those belonging to older generations, know at least some German.

Two instances of using Norwegian and Swedish relate to the neighbouring countries and mobility of people and products between them, on the one hand, and to the official status of Swedish as Finland’s other official language on the other. A number of labels also used Northern Sámi, the biggest of the Sámi languages, but Inari Sámi and Skolts Sámi, the other two local Sámi languages, are still unused resources for this purpose.

English can be seen as operating on a global scale in these souvenir labels, as the lingua franca of international tourists, indicating accessibility and mobility. German operates on a European level, indexing both the historical processes and the customizing attempts of tourism providers and souvenir producers and retailers. Norwegian and Swedish operate on a regional (Nordic) scale, and the use of Swedish also references Finland's official language policy. While these language scales work more towards making the product mobile, Finnish and Sámi work more towards localising and authenticating the product. Apart from the possibility of 'tourist language learners' taking it as their task to learn the local languages (cf. Phipps, 2007), in the international tourism context, Finnish and Sámi do not circulate that much beyond national or local scales. Rather, they seem to need the help of English for such mobility, unless they are turned into an emblem/visual, and then they might easily work as 'authentic' or 'local' enough to index originality. Author 2 (2005) has argued that 'foreign' languages can act primarily as visual and symbolic resources in advertising, and we would see here that Finnish (apart from its role for domestic tourists) and Sámi are part of the visual means for supporting and authenticating English language labels. Pujolar (2006) makes the point that national languages, particularly the big European national languages, do not always deliver clues to authenticity as they are too widely known and too 'ordinary'. In such a case, he argues that smaller languages and traditionally minoritised languages are more suited for authentication. This seems to be the case in Inari souvenir labels as not only

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

indigenous Sámi, but also Finnish is, in global terms, a ‘small’ language, with its own exotic index.

We can see an example of this in Figure 1, which depicts a vest that can be purchased in the Näkkäljärvi souvenir shop, the largest souvenir shop in Inari. The vest is a modified, “tourist version’ of a Sámi vest in that the fur inside the vest is fake fur, and the colours of the vest resemble Sámi colours (bright red, blue and yellow), but are not quite the same. These vests are sold all over Finnish skiing resorts and they are not linked to Inari in any particular way, apart from the purchase place. In Figure 1 we can see how the producer’s name and address as well as housekeeping items such as ‘phone number’ are in Finnish; however, the country is given as Finland rather than *Suomi* (the Finnish word for Finland), and the ‘wallpaper’ or background against which this information is printed is made up of a motif of snowflakes and reindeers, using a colour scheme of the Finnish national colours, blue and white.

Figure 1. Näkkäljärvi souvenir – label of a souvenir vest

**Resources for narrating authenticity**

Different tourists are looking for different kinds of narratives and indexes of what is perceived as authentic in the souvenirs they purchase for themselves and for others. Pujolar (2006) points out that many tourists are willing to sacrifice authenticity for accessibility, whereas other tourists are willing to

forego easy accessibility and go off the planned route in search of greater experience of authenticity. We can see a parallel in the souvenir purchasing practices and discourse of souvenir labels in Inari. The souvenir labels we observed range on a scale from easily accessible (for example, the use of a Finnish flag, or the term ‘made in Finland/Lapland’) to a text in Sámi language only or the Sámi flag, which, if the tourist is not guided through the tourist trajectory, thereby enabling them to ‘learn authenticity’ (Prentice, 2001), may make little sense to them. One tension as regards what is perceived and sold as ‘authentic’ in the Inari context lies between the protection of traditional Sámi handicrafts and their commodification in tourism, and this is reflected in the labelling practices of the next example. Traditional handicrafts are usually perceived to be high on the authenticity continuum and potentially they could ‘speak’ to the self-aware and reflexive tourist (cf. Grünewald 2006). We would like to argue, however, that the kind of resources used and the way they are used in the labels accompanying the products impact on the mobility of these handicrafts across scales and cultural and linguistic boundaries. Our first example of this is a label from a Sámi handicraft product, a set of beads, on sale only in the Sámi handicraft *Duodji* shop, illustrated in the next figure.

Figure 2: Duodji souvenir – label of a piece of jewellery

This piece of jewellery is an authenticated Duodji product: Duodji is a northern Sámi word and means an act, activity or product, but it is mostly used



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

to refer to Sámi handicrafts made of traditional Sámi materials, by traditional Sámi methods and by Sámi people (cf. Kulonen, Seurujärvi-Kari and Pulkkinen 2005; Lehtola 1997). The Sámi Duodji is a protected brand, supported and supervised by the Sámi craft guild to guarantee the Sámi authenticity of the product by guaranteeing that it is made by a Sámi person using traditional Sámi ways and materials. Only products which fulfil all these criteria are sold in Duodji shop. The shop itself is very small, basically two small rooms, and clearly marked as a Sámi shop with usage of Sámi flag, Sámi colours, Northern Sámi signs, the playing of Sámi music in the background etc. In a tourism context, Duodji represents ‘indigenous handicrafts’ that reflect and respond to tourism present in the local environment in an attempt to market and sell these local items to a larger market (cf. Grünwald, 2006).

The label here simply contains the name of the product (which means a pearl), in Northern Sámi and Finnish, a bar code, a product number and a price. The language choice and the hierarchical ordering of languages on this label represent a micro-instance of the language policy that seems to be operating for Duodji souvenirs. The Duodji lables are all either monolingual Northern Sámi labels or bilingual Northern Sámi and Finnish, indexing the products first and foremost as Sámi products, but also facilitating multilingual practices, apparent both within the Sámi community itself and in the surrounding environment. As noted above, the use of other Sámi languages in the labels or products themselves is very rare, indicating the dominant position of Northern Sámi as the main Sámi language.

1  
2  
3  
4 The number on the product which is given on the label (see Figure 2)  
5  
6 is also a way for Duodji personnel to identify the maker of the product (needed  
7  
8 for later payment). Interestingly, in terms of selling their products, these  
9  
10 handicrafts makers have chosen not to mark or 'brand' their products by using  
11  
12 their name and individual identity, relying instead on the strength of the  
13  
14 Duodji brand.  
15  
16

17  
18 In this particular example, the product number and the utilization of  
19  
20 Northern Sámi and Finnish as particular local resources do not seem to us to  
21  
22 afford international mobility for the souvenir and easy recontextualisation out of  
23  
24 the context of Inari: the narrating of the product is left entirely to the tourist,  
25  
26 and an example from our own experience illustrates this well. One of our team  
27  
28 members purchased one of the cheapest items in this shop, a pair of woollen  
29  
30 socks knitted in the traditional Sámi way and by a Duodji craftperson, which  
31  
32 cost the considerable sum of 40 euros (as a souvenir to bring back home  
33  
34 outside of Finland as a gift). The label was very similar to our example above.  
35  
36 The recipient of the socks was less than impressed by the present, shocked at  
37  
38 the cost, and at a loss as to why anyone would pay so much for woollen socks,  
39  
40 seeing them as nothing special. This illustrates that ways in which many  
41  
42 Duodji souvenirs are perhaps at the extremely high end of a notional  
43  
44 authenticity continuum, but at the low end of a mobility continuum. The  
45  
46 narrative that supports the products needs to be created for the tourist in order  
47  
48 for it to be mobile enough to work outside of their local or production context  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

or place of purchase, particularly where the souvenir is a gift rather than a remembrance for the tourist themselves.

    This also reminds us that the meaning of a souvenir does not derive only from the utilisation of indexicality to a particular place, but gains meaning also through the act of purchase and giving. As Jaffe (1999) shows with her study on greeting cards, the meaning of an object is always also relational and therefore has an interpersonal nature apart from any ideational and identifying characteristics (cf. also Thurlow and Jaworski 2010). Kopytoff (1986: 65) reminds us that commodities are not only materially produced as things but they also need to be culturally marked as being a certain kind of thing. Furthermore, the meaning of a thing, like a souvenir, varies in time and space and between individual social actors. In our next example, the linguistic and semiotic choices on the label fulfil at least some of this narrative function.

**Making authenticity mobile**

As our last example showed, even with the authenticating nature of the Duodji brand label, many of the Duodji souvenirs still need significant narrative work and other supporting resources in order to become mobile outside of the local/indigenous scale. One response to this is an emerging labelling practice in Duodji souvenirs whereby local resources are combined with other linguistic, discursive and visual resources to add mobility without compromising appeals to authenticity. As mentioned earlier, one dimension

1  
2  
3  
4 identified by tourists as indicating greater authenticity of experience was the  
5  
6 directness of the link to the culture, to 'real' people and a corresponding lack  
7  
8 of tourists, an exclusivity of the touristic experience (not in terms of luxury,  
9  
10 but in terms of not sharing it with a mass market). One way in which this is  
11  
12 narrated in another type of Sámi Duodji label is by the inclusion of a signature  
13  
14 and a number on the label. It is interesting to note that there are no more  
15  
16 textual or visual clues on this label than on the previous one discussed above.  
17  
18  
19 However, the use of the signature and the product number enhance the  
20  
21 potential for mobility, since the signature of the craftsman creates a link to  
22  
23 the 'real' experience, a real person, and the numbering of the item cues  
24  
25 exclusivity, signalling to the tourist that these are not mass-produced goods.  
26  
27  
28 The use of signatures and numbering are global ways of constructing  
29  
30 authenticity, which contribute to the mobility of the Sámi Duodji souvenirs  
31  
32 and help with the recontextualisation of the souvenir texts beyond the local  
33  
34 contexts.  
35  
36  
37

38  
39 However, some Duodji products are beginning to utilize even more  
40  
41 obviously global resources in a more explicit way to enhance mobility of local  
42  
43 resources on a global scale. As Thurlow and Aiello (2007) argue, globally  
44  
45 available and globally recognized visual resources, such as maps and booklet  
46  
47 formats, have potential for meaning beyond one scale and context and are  
48  
49 therefore often chosen by local producers to gain mobility. In the next  
50  
51 example, the product, a bookmark in the Sámi national colours, has a label  
52  
53 which is in the form of a mini-booklet, consisting of four pages. On the front  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

page of the booklet there is the name of the manufacturer, *Ságat*. The producer is a recognised Sámi fabric designer, who has also worked for leading Finnish fabric companies. When we open the booklet, we find a map and text in Northern Sámi, as we can see in Figure 3:

Figure 3. Duodji souvenir – the booklet label

In this label, the map of Europe can be seen as a global resource, although it is mixed with local resources by the fact that it utilizes the Sámi national colours. The names of the countries on the map are in English, again giving accessibility and mobility, and the visual includes the Arctic Circle, an icon and a metonym for this tourist place, and one that is globally distributed. The Arctic Circle also cues authenticity in that it alludes to ‘naturalness’ and emptiness (see discussion above). The map can be seen as an attempt to make an explicit link to Sámiland, not just Lapland or Finland, and thus serves as a place-branding technique, by ‘situating’ Sámiland and clearly delineating it as a separate place. Finland is there, but it is backgrounded. This choice shows some of the complexities regarding different and to an extent competing perspectives on the Northern territory: the label ‘Sámiland’ foregrounds the symbolic and political construction of transnational Sámiland which developed as a part of the Sámi political movement particularly in the latter half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (Lehtola 1997) and to which many Sámi people ascribe., This has

the effect of downplaying the nation-state perspective to the region,  
represented as Finland and its province Lapland.

On the opposite page of the label we see text in Northern Sámi “*Mu njeallje jagiáiggi – ivnnit mátterván hemiiddán eatnamiin*” (The four seasons-colours from the land of my forefathers). We would argue that Northern Sámi functions here as part of the visual of the label for the majority of tourists. It provides another cue for authenticity, the mobility having been taking care of by strategic deployment of the map (cf. Aiello and Thurlow 2006). Here we can see at least two processes taking place simultaneously. One is a process which makes the Northern Sámi language an emblem, a visual element indexing both the place and the uniqueness/authenticity of that place. Regardless of whether the tourist recognizes this as a Sámi language (or takes it as Finnish), the text serves this function. The second process is that Northern Sámi is becoming a language used in marketing and branding, expanding the domains in which Sámi languages are usually used, indexing for people with Sámi resources a new (added) value and function (cf. Author 12010), and this has inevitable consequences for the local political economy of language. The mobility of the narrative is further supported by the inclusion of parallel translations of the text into English, German and Japanese on subsequent pages of the booklet.

### **Making mobility authentic**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

While many of the Duodji souvenirs have to work to become mobile beyond local and indigenous circuits, they have relatively guaranteed access to what is taken as authentically Sámi. For the many other Inari souvenirs, such as the vest in the first example, the situation is almost the opposite. These souvenirs may be made by locals (not necessarily by Sámi people), or imported from other parts of Finland and beyond, and consequently they do not have unproblematic access to Sámi traditions and associated indexes of authenticity. Therefore, they may have to draw on other linguistic and semiotic resources to construct their authenticity. At the same time, this means that in their souvenir production, they are not confined by the Sámi traditions and policies (as for example in the Duodji brand), and are therefore ‘free’ to make the most of a range of diverse resources from various local and global scales in order to maximise mobility while constructing authenticity. We observe several strategies of how this is done in Inari souvenir labelling practices.

As mentioned earlier, the initial entextualising of the label appears significant here, since not all of the Duodji products are (or have traditionally been) entextualised as souvenirs from the beginning; instead they were (and still are primarily) produced for the Sámi community. This is in contrast to the next example, a label from a hat purchasable in Näkkäljärvi souvenir shop (the largest outlet), which has been entextualised and so intentionally narrated as a souvenir from the start. An explicit narrative is created for the product, linking it directly to Lapland as a place. Lapland is a resource that is not just locally, but also globally available, and it could be argued that it is metonymic

of not just Finland, but the other Nordic countries as well. Furthermore, in contrast to 'Sámiland' or 'Sápmi', the name 'Lapland' does not have the connotation of indigenous culture and traditions, hence using 'Lapland resources' for marketing and economic purposes is far simpler politically than utilizing Sámi resources. Not surprisingly, in labels using Lapland resources, nature is foregrounded as a key attribute, with the associated tropes of purity and otherworldliness used to cue authenticity. The English text reads as follows:

Wild Lapland Products Oy was established in the 1960s. The original idea was to develop products inspired by the history of Lapland and its beautiful, pure nature and to awaken the product user's interest in Lapland. These original principles have been followed when developing the product. We hope these warm thoughts also reach you with this product.

The English text appears in a multi-lingual label, which utilizes national and international resources - with Finnish and Swedish versions ahead of the English version - but not Sámi language resources. The different language versions are indicated by the respective national flags, although of course Swedish is an official language of Finland, and so is both a national and international resource. The English version is indicated by the British flag, which positions English as an international rather than global resource, when it



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

is in fact much more likely to function as the latter for the majority of tourists. The kind of local-national-global dynamics and contradictions, exemplified here in the usage of flags, can be found across tourism discourse and practices, which are deploying the dialectics of familiar and exotic, authentic and banal, real and fantasized (Favero 2007; Sheller and Urry 2005). As with the Duodji label discussed above, the narrative for the souvenir is constructed multimodally: the booklet form of the label serves to reinforce and support the idea of a founding narrative for the brand to accompany and make the product mobile across places. Through these choices of linguistic and visual resources, the souvenir is made mobile and is easily recontextualised across a range of trajectories. The narrative also functions as a guarantee for the authenticity of the product as a ‘genuine’ product from Lapland and its ‘pure’ nature, and as the outcome of thoughtful and longstanding development.

**Breaking down dichotomies**

Yet another process that we observe in Inari souvenir labelling practices is a playful and creative use of linguistic and other semiotic resources to ensure mobility whilst at the same time retaining a ring of the ‘real thing’ in the tourism context. To adapt to the new political economy of tourism and to profit from it, discursive resources such as new genres, humour, irony and play with languages are a way to gain access to local resources. without crises of legitimacy, and to speak to tourists across different scales (cf. Author 1 2010).

1  
2  
3  
4 The above example shows that while English may give accessibility and  
5  
6 mobility, on its own it may not be a sufficient cue for place or authenticity – it  
7  
8 may be too ordinary, too mobile, with no link to the locality (cf, Pujolar 2006).  
9  
10  
11 So, while we find instrumental use of English on souvenir labels in Inari, it  
12  
13 rarely appears on its own without visual means to support the place /  
14  
15 authenticity link.  
16  
17

18 In Figure 4, we can see an example of a ceramic bought in the Siida  
19  
20 Museum shop. The language of the label is primarily English, the brand  
21  
22 *Dragonía* being a unique piece of language play designed to create a  
23  
24 differentiated product (cf. Moore 2003). It is also a case of language mixing  
25  
26 and creativity: the English word ‘dragon’ is fused with a Finnish suffix – ‘ia’,  
27  
28 meaning the place or the house of the Dragon. The person’s Finnish name and  
29  
30 their title ‘ceramicist’ work as indexes of authenticity (see above). Again, as in  
31  
32 the Duodji example above, the signature links to the ‘real’ person, the ‘real’  
33  
34 culture, and the inclusion of the internationalism ‘ceramicist’ links to the fact  
35  
36 that they are a ‘real’ craftsman. The discursive link to place is explicitly  
37  
38 made through the use of the adjective ‘Finnish’ along with the other standard,  
39  
40 well-known and often used trope of authenticity, ‘handmade’ (cf. Prentice  
41  
42 2001), which ensures its rhetorical appeal travels well across scales  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 While the use of English here narrates the product into a souvenir and  
50  
51 guarantees its mobility, the visual, indexing the art of ‘primitive’ cave-type or  
52  
53 Shamanic drawings, offers an additional authenticating support to the  
54  
55 souvenir, providing a valuable narrative resource. The figure seems to be a  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

fox, which has a well-established role in traditional local folklore, indexing in a subtle way the place. The global meaning potential of a fox may relate to its mythological role in many cultures as an animal between times and places, dusk and dawn, associated with magic and cunning. The image of a fox is thus both local and global. Taken together, these visual and language practices deploy rustic imagery, which simultaneously indexes both the local and global.

Figure 4. Siida museum shop souvenir – ceramics

Having looked at these different practices, we would now like to discuss their implications for the local political economy of language in Inari and beyond in terms of the sociolinguistics of tourism and of globalisation.

DISCUSSION

Souvenir labels, as the examples above show, illustrate the challenge in all tourism discourses and practices of having to balance delicately between the construction of mobility and the construction of authenticity in choosing and deploying multimodal local and global resources. There is a need to construct authenticity and to differentiate the place, its culture and its language – and of course its souvenir products. In terms of the souvenir labels we examined, the ‘right’ degree of ‘authenticity’ accompanied by resources for mobility seems to make a perfect match, although the judgment of what is the ‘right’

1  
2  
3  
4 composition is of course always locally made and varies between tourists. It is  
5  
6 co-constructed by the tourist and producer/provider and subject to  
7  
8 renegotiation and reconstruction as the souvenir text travels along differing  
9  
10 trajectories and participant frameworks. A product that is not differentiated  
11  
12 enough is not attractive/worth buying, but if this goes too far, then the souvenir  
13  
14 may not be mobile enough, may not work out of its context or may need too  
15  
16 much explanation – the ultimate ‘real’ souvenir, it can be argued, may be a  
17  
18 banal, everyday object.  
19  
20  
21

22         The labels discussed and analysed above represent the complexity of  
23  
24 the local political economy of language in Inari and the difficulties of  
25  
26 categorising particular languages in relation to each other and in relation to  
27  
28 wider economic and political issues. For example, Sámi languages seem to be  
29  
30 powerful resources for authenticating souvenirs, something which, on the one  
31  
32 hand, reinforces their strong local solidarity role, and, on the other, opens up a  
33  
34 status role resulting from the possibilities offered by this commodification and  
35  
36 the global valuing of local authenticity in tourism. However, the use of only  
37  
38 one of the Sámi languages, the largest one in terms of speakers, namely  
39  
40 Northern Sámi, reinforces an internal linguistic hierarchy, which tends to  
41  
42 downplay and ignore internal multilingualism in the Sámi community,  
43  
44 particularly when using the languages beyond the local context.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51         English seems to be the ultimate resource for mobility, but it is not  
52  
53 enough on its own and does not seem to offer a sufficiently authenticating  
54  
55 narrative to accompany the souvenir of a local experience or encounter. So,  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

while Sámi languages alone are no enough, changes in the local political economy and the dynamics of local-global relations, mean that neither too is English. Finnish, the language of the nation state and of (recent) domination, from the Sámi point of view, plays a lesser authenticating role. A number of ‘supercentral’ (De Swaan 2001) lingua francae of the current era are also present, and, while they may seem to be randomly selected, each of these choices of languages, as we saw in the case of German, tells a story about local, national and global language regimes, historical, contemporary, and future.

Souvenir labels of course are only one part of the sociolinguistics of tourism in Inari and elsewhere, but nonetheless they are one small piece of evidence of actual linguistic and visual choices made from available resources which reflect and in turn create the local political economy of language. We argue that the tension, evidenced in our ethnographic and discourse analytic study, between resources utilized for authentication and resources utilized for mobility in multimodal souvenir discourse tells us something about this local political economy of language. It would seem that the more ‘authentic’ the product, in the sense that it utilizes resources traditionally operating on a local scale, the greater the need for a supporting narrative, which is provided either by a guide, a guidebook or an encounter which the tourist has during their visit (e.g. buying a souvenir which reminds them of the colours they encountered at Inari), or through the multimodal discourse of the label. Thus, either the label

1  
2  
3  
4 talks for itself and supports the product, or the tourists themselves must do  
5  
6 this.  
7

8           This reflects the necessity for multilingualism in peripheral minority  
9  
10 language spaces such as Inari, where mobility continues to be afforded through  
11  
12 other languages. As Author 2 (2005) has argued, token use of a minoritised  
13  
14 language in a status domain such as advertising (and in this case tourism) can  
15  
16 be a double-edged sword. On the one hand, the use of the language in this  
17  
18 prestigious and modern domain can challenge the position of the language in  
19  
20 existing regimes and hierarchies. On the other, the token usage and the need  
21  
22 for supporting resources from other, more dominant languages, can simply  
23  
24 reinforce a marginal position for the language.  
25  
26  
27  
28

29           Under the conditions of ‘the new economy’, and with its shift towards  
30  
31 the production of services rather than goods, cultural tourism in peripheral  
32  
33 areas like Inari is facing several new opportunities and challenges. The broader  
34  
35 change underlying these questions can be seen as a change from a discourse of  
36  
37 political rights to a discourse of economic development. As regards languages,  
38  
39 this means expanding our understanding of what language is and does,  
40  
41 particularly moving from perceiving language as a marker of ethnolinguistic  
42  
43 identity to perceiving it also an economically interesting skill or a commodity  
44  
45 (Heller 2005). While this is nothing new for world languages, lingua francas  
46  
47 and large national languages, in a minority language context, these changes  
48  
49 and shifts may create new opportunities for minoritized languages. Of course,  
50  
51 these changes, related to authenticity and originality as in the Sámi case,  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

simultaneously raise important and tricky questions of ownership, boundaries of commodification and the basis for identity politics.

A final clue about the local political economy of language offered by the discourse of souvenir labels is in terms of the changing nature of multilingualism in an area such as Inari and Sámiland in general as a result of being part of the global tourist route. Multilingualism for touristic purposes seems able to make a fairly easy transition towards heteroglossic and ‘truncated’ practices without becoming entangled with issues of identity, local cultural politics or issues of representation and legitimacy. Using a little bit of a particular language on a label does not need to indicate any kind of fluency or competence or ownership. Indeed, the pragmatic or commercial imperative may sometimes be used to override such concerns. However, the use of such languages may impact on local (and global) notions about fluency, competence and ownership, which in turn may feed back into debates about representation, legitimacy and identity. Similarly, for the tourist, the appearance of particular languages (their language or not), may or may not affect their own particular practices and ideologies. This is the reflexive nature of the local political economy of language and its intertwining with new economic processes.

**REFERENCES**

- Aiello, Giorgia and Crispin Thurlow. 2006. Symbolic capitals: Visual discourse and intercultural exchange in the European Capital of Culture scheme. *Language and Intercultural Communication* 6 (2): 148–162.
- Appadurai, Arjun. 1990. Disjuncture and difference in the global cultural economy. *Theory, Culture and Society* 7: 295–310.
- Billig, Michael. 1995. *Banal Nationalism*. London, U.K.: Sage Publications.
- Blommaert, Jan. 2010. *The Sociolinguistics of Globalization*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University press.
- Blommaert, Jan, James Collins and Stef Slembrouck. 2005. Spaces of multilingualism. *Language & Communication* 25: 197–216.
- Bruner, Edward M. 2001. The Maasai and the Lion King: Authenticity, nationalism, and globalization in African tourism. *American Ethnologist* 28 (4): 881–908.



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Coupland, Nikolas. 2003. Introduction: Sociolinguistics and globalisation,  
*Journal of Sociolinguistics* 7 (4): 465–472.

Coupland, Nikolas (ed.) 2010. *Handbook of Language and Globalization*.  
Cambridge, Mass: Blackwell Publishers.

Coupland, Nikolas, Garrett Peter and Hywel Bishop. 2005. Wales  
Underground: Discursive frames and authenticities in Welsh mining  
heritage tourism events. In Adam Jaworski and Annette Pritchard (eds)  
*Discourse, Communication and Tourism*. Clevedon, U.K.: Channel View  
Publications. 199–222.

Davis, Robert C. and Garry R. Marvin. 2004. Taking it all home. In *Venice,  
the Tourist Maze: A Cultural Critique of the World's Most Touristed  
City*. Berkeley: University of California Press. 261–292.

De Swaan, Abram. 2001. *Words of the World: The Global Language System*.  
Cambridge UK and Malden MA: Polity/Blackwell.

Favero, Paolo. 2007. What a wonderful world! On the touristic ways of seeing the knowledge and the politics of the culture industries of otherness.

*Tourist Studies* 7(1): 51–81.

Gal, Susan. 1989. Language and political economy. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 18: 345-367.

Grünewald, Rodrigo de Azeredo. 2006. Pataxo tourist arts and cultural authenticity. In Melanie Smith and Mike Robinson (eds.) *Cultural Tourism in a Changing World: Politics, Participation and (Re)presentation*. Bristol, U.K.: Channel View Publications. 203-214.

Hall, C. Michael, Dieter Muller and Jarkko Saarinen. 2009. *Nordic Tourism Issues and Cases*. Bristol, U.K.: Channel View Publications.

Heller, Monica. 2003. Globalization, the new economy, and the commodification of language and identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 7(4): 473–492.

Heller, Monica. 2005. Language, skill and authenticity in the globalized new economy. Paper presented at Noves SL. Revista de Sociolingüística. Retrieved from <http://www.gencat.cat/llengua/noves> (home page), accessed August 10, 2009.

Heller, Monica (ed.) 2007. *Bilingualism: A Social Approach*. Hampshire,  
U.K.: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hult, Francis M. 2009. Language ecology and linguistic landscape analysis in  
Elana Shohamy and Durk Gorter (eds.) *Linguistic Landscape:  
Expanding the Scenery*. London, U.K.: Routledge. 88–104.

Jack, Gavin and Alison Phipps. 2005. *Tourism and Intercultural Exchange:  
Why Tourism Matters*. Clevedon, Tonawanda, N.Y. and North York,  
Ontario: Channel View Publications.

Jaffe, Alexandra. 1999. *Ideologies in Action: Language Politics on Corsica*.  
Berlin, Germany and New York, N.Y.: Mouton de Gruyter.

Jaworski, Adam and Crispin Thurlow (eds) 2010. *Semiotic Landscapes:  
Language, Image, Space*. London: Continuum.

Jaworski, Adam, Crispin Thurlow, Sarah Lawson and Virpi Ylänne-McEwen.  
2003. The uses and representations of local languages in tourist  
destinations: A view from British TV holiday programmes. *Language  
Awareness 12 (1)*: 5-28.

Jaworski, Adam, Crispin Thurlow, Virpi Ylänn-McEwen and Sarah Lawson.

2009. *Language, Tourism and Globalisation. The Sociolinguistics of  
Fleeting Relationships*. London, U.K.: Routledge.

Junila, Marianne. 2000. *Kotirintaman aseveljeyttä*. väitöskirja. Helsinki,  
Finland: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Author 2,

Kirtsoglou, Elisabeth and Dimitrios Theodossopoulos. 2004. 'They are taking  
our culture away': Tourism and culture commodification in the Garifuna  
Community of Roatan: *Critique of Anthropology* 24: 135-157.

Kopytoff, Igor. 1986. The cultural biography of things: Commoditization as  
process. In Arjan Appadurai (ed.) *The Social Life of Things:  
Commodities in Cultural Perspective*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge  
University Press. 64–91.

Kulonen, Ulla-Maija, Irja Seurujärvi-Kari and Risto Pulkkinen (eds.) 2005.  
*The Sámi: A Cultural Encyclopaedia*. Helsinki, Finland: Suomalaisen  
Kirjallisuuden Seura.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Lacy, Julie A. and William A. Douglass. 2002. Beyond authenticity: The meanings and uses of cultural tourism. *Tourist Studies* 2: 5-21.

Lefebvre, Henri. 1991. *The Production of Space*. Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell.

Lehtola, Veli-Pekka. 1997. *Saamelaiset: Historia, yhteiskunta, taide*. Jyväskylä, Finland: Gummerus.

Luiro, Satu. *Lapin matkailustrategia 2007-2010*. Retrieved from [www.lapinliitto.fi](http://www.lapinliitto.fi). Accessed October 2, 2009.

Länsman, Anni-Siiri. 2004. *Väärtisuhteet Lapin matkailussa: Kulttuurianalyysi suomalaisten ja saamelaisten kohtaamisesta*. Inari, Finland: Kustannus Puntsi.

Moore, Robert E. 2003. From genericide to viral marketing: On ‘brand’. *Language & Communication* 23: 331–357.

Notzke, Claudia. 1999. Indigenous tourism development in the arctic. *Annals of Tourism Research*: 55–77.

Pennycook, Alastair. 2010. *Language as a Local Practice*. London, U.K.: Routledge.

Phipps, Alison. 2007. *Learning the Arts of Linguistic Survival: Languaging, Tourism, Life*. Clevedon, U.K.: Channel View Publications.

Author 1

Author 1

Author 1

Ploner, Josef. 2009. Narrating regional identity in tourism – sketches from the Austrian Danube valley. *Language and Intercultural Communication* 9(1), pp. 2-14.

Prentice, Richard. 2001. Experiential cultural tourism: Museums and the marketing of the new romanticism of evoked authenticity. *Museum Management and Curatorship* 19 (1): 5-26.

Pujolar, Joan. 2006. *Language, Culture and Tourism: Perspectives in Barcelona and Catalonia*. Barcelona, Spain: Turisme de Barcelona.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Puolakka, Eeva. 2008. *Siidan asiakastutkimus 2007-2008*. Published in series  
Metsähallituksen luonnonsuojelujulkaisuja, B 110. Finland:  
Metsähallitus.

Saarinen, Jarkko. 1999. Representations of indigeneity: Sámi culture in the  
discourses of tourism. In James N. Brown and Patricia M. Sant (eds.)  
*Indigeneity: Constructions and Re/Presentations*. New York, N.Y.:  
Nova Science Publishers. 231–249.

Schouten, Frans. 2006. The process of authenticating souvenirs. In Melanie  
Smith and Mike Robinson (eds.) *Cultural Tourism in a Changing World:  
Politics, Participation and (Re)presentation*. Bristol, U.K.: Channel  
View Publications. 191-202.

Scollon, Ron and Suzie Wong Scollon. 2003. *Discourse in Place: Language in  
the Material World*. London, U.K.: Routledge.

Sheller, Mimi and John Urry. 2006. The new mobilities paradigm.  
*Environment and Planning A* 38 (2): 207-226.

Shepherd, Robert. 2002. Commodification, culture and tourism. *Tourist  
Studies* 2: 183-201.

Shohamy, Elana and Durk Gorter (eds.) 2008. *Linguistic Landscapes:*

*Expanding the Scenery*. London, U.K.: Routledge.

Thurlow, Crispin and Giorgia Aiello. 2007. National pride, global capital: A

social semiotic analysis of transnational visual branding in the airline

industry. *Visual Communication* 6 (3): 305-344.

Thurlow, Crispin and Adam Jaworski. 2010. *Tourism Discourse: Language*

*and Global Mobility*. Basingstoke, U.K. and New York, N.Y.: Palgrave-

MacMillan.

Tilastokeskus. N.d. Inari – Enare. Retrieved from

<http://www.stat.fi/tup/kunnat/kuntatiedot/148.html>. Accessed June 16,

2009.

Urry, John. 2007. *Mobilities*. Cambridge, U.K.: Polity.

van Leeuwen, Teun. 2008. *Discourse as practice*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford

University Press.

Varanka, Piia. 2001. Lappi matkailun näyttämöllä: Saamelaiskulttuuri ja

luonto matkailun kulisseina. Published in series Lapin yliopiston



yhteiskuntatieteellisiä julkaisuja. B. Tutkimusraportteja ja selvityksiä.  
35. Rovaniemi, Finland: Lapin yliopisto.



Figure 1. Näkkäläjärvi souvenir – label of a souvenir vest

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



Figure 2: Duodji souvenir – label of a piece of jewellery





Figure 3. Duodji souvenir – the booklet label



Figure 4. Siida museum shop souvenir – ceramics

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> We would like to thank the reviewers and the editors of this journal for extremely valuable comments on the earlier versions of this article. We also wish to thank X X for her help in the ethnographic work in the research reported here.

<sup>2</sup> The impetus for our analysis of souvenir labelling practices arose from our larger research project called X.X , focussing on multilingualism in minority language communities under emerging global conditions, particularly in Sámiland. (see Y.Y. ). The project is funded by the Academy of Finland.

<sup>2</sup> This relates to our understanding of space as a complex and dynamic social construction (Lefebvre 1991), which is produced and experienced in human interaction. The dynamics between language, multimodal practices and (public) space are a growing focus of research notably within the transdisciplinary fields of linguistic landscape and goasemiotics (Jaworski and Thurlow 2010; Shohamy and Gorter 2009).

<sup>4</sup> Today it is estimated that, of approximately 60,000 to 80,000 Sámi people, half speak one of the nine Sámi languages. The most dominant language is Northern Sámi, with approximately 30,000 speakers throughout Sámiland, whereas other Sámi languages have only very few speakers in a very local language community, with as few as 250 to 400 speakers each (Kulonen, Seurujärvi-Kari and Pulkkinen, 2005).

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

---