

JOURNAL *of* NORTHERN STUDIES

Vol. 11 • No. 1 • 2017

Published by Umeå University & The Royal Skyttean Society

Umeå 2017

The *Journal of Northern Studies* is published with support from The Royal Skyttean Society and Umeå University

© The authors and *Journal of Northern Studies*
ISSN 1654-5915

Cover picture

Scandinavia Satellite and sensor: NOAA, AVHRR

Level above earth: 840 km

Image supplied by METRIA, a division of Lantmäteriet, Sweden. www.metria.se
NOAA®. ©ESA/Eurimage 2001. ©Metria Satellus 2001



Design and layout

Lotta Hortéll and Leena Hortéll, Ord & Co i Umeå AB

Fonts: Berling Nova and Futura

Paper: Munken Polar 300 gr and Munken Lynx 100 gr

Printed by

UmU-Tryckservice, Umeå University

Contents / Sommaire / Inhalt

Editors & Editorial board 5

Daniel Andersson & Lars-Erik Edlund, Language and Space in Northern Spaces
Editorial 7

Articles / Aufsätze

Guy Bordin, What Do Place-Names Tell about non-Human Beings among Canadian Inuit? 11

Julien Pongérard, Nuna. Naming the Inuit land, imagining indigenous community 37

Taarna Valtonen, Place-Name Loaning Patterns as Cultural Survival Strategies in Sami Contexts 53

Nellejet Zorgdrager, The Role of Place-Names in Olof Sirma's two Yoik Texts and their Translations 71

Reviews / Comptes rendus / Besprechungen

David Brégaint, *Vox regis. Royal Communication in High Medieval Norway*, Leiden: Brill 2016 (*Stefka G. Eriksen*) 95

Instructions to Authors

Instructions to Authors 105

TAARNA VALTONEN

Place-Name Loaning Patterns as Cultural Survival Strategies in Sami Contexts

ABSTRACT This paper discusses the place-name loaning patterns of one South Sami and one Inari Sami community that have plenty of parallel names in their area. The time span studied reaches from the end of the nineteenth century to the middle of the twentieth century. The loaning and borrowing processes are analyzed and interpreted in a thoroughly studied cultural context. The author claims that the differences in loaning reflects different strategies that aim to secure the existence of minority language and culture, and that the place-names have been used as means of manifesting one's cultural ownership to the land. The most important results based on the quality and distribution of the parallel names in the South Sami area reflects the existence of two separate name systems and a protective purist strategy toward outsiders. In the Inari Sami area the results indicate that the local Sami community has an open and pedagogical strategy towards outsiders and because of this they have shared the language-cultural code to the Finns. The author has been inspired in her study by the ideas presented in the field of ecological linguistics and cultural onomastics. This paper is based on the results of the author's doctoral dissertation.

KEYWORDS ecological linguistics, onomastics, Härjedalen, Inari Sami, place-names, Sami culture, Sami language, South Sami

Introduction

In my doctoral thesis (Valtonen 2014), I studied the place-names of four Sami communities. The time span studied extends from the end of the nineteenth century to the middle of the twentieth century. In this paper, I will discuss in detail two of the studied materials representing two Sami communities: South Sami Ruvhten sijte in Härjedalen, Sweden (formerly known as Tännäs sameby ['Tännäs Sami village']) and Inari Sami communities Čovčjävri (Fi. Syysjärvi) and Kosseennâm (Fi. Paksumaa) in Aanaar (Fi. Inari, Sw. Enare), Finland. I have also limited the scope to results concerning parallel names or name pairs, in other words to Sami place-names that have a co-existing place-name for the same referent in another language. In the case of the Inari Sami, I will not discuss North Sami parallel names, as I want to make a detailed analysis of the connection between minorities and majorities. The dynamics between local Sami populations is an interesting topic, but it deserves its own, separate article.

In my study, I was inspired by the ideas of *linguistic ecology*, a theoretical approach in which a model created in the field of natural sciences has been taken as an analogy to explain the life and death of a language and its interactions with its environment, including other languages, various social factors and ecological context. The overall idea is that language and linguistic communication cannot be examined in isolation, but must be taken as an inseparable part of its environment and social life in the broadest sense. Linguistic ecology shares common approaches with sociolinguistics, but takes in account a wider range of factors (for a more detailed description and discussion, see Haugen 1972; Haugen 2001; Mühlhäusler 1996; Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson 2007).

In my doctoral dissertation, for instance, I made reference to the nature of connections with the majority group, including its language and livelihoods, local microhistory, natural environments, livelihoods, use of landscape and traffic connections in addition to classical sociolinguistic factors, such as language domains, multilingualism, code switching, national language policy and language attitudes. My choice was guided by a need to create a more culturally oriented approach compared to traditional onomastics. I call this approach *cultural onomastics*. In doing so, I also wish to respect the epistemological principles of the Indigenous Studies that emphasizes the emic or insider view.

The point of departure I used in writing this paper is based on a theory put forth by Professor Peter Mühlhäusler (1995) that language can be used as a means to avoid conflict in contact situations. When two culturally and linguistically distinct groups meet, language is used as means of

adapting to the changing circumstances. In Mühlhäusler's article, the use of pidgins and creoles as buffering elements is a central topic, an issue that has gained little notice in Sami contexts due to the early bi- or multilingualism of Sami populations. However, the loaning and borrowing of place-names and early bi-/multilingualism are, in my opinion, connected to the same idea of initiating contact without conflict. Similarly, these reveal the linguistic strategies that Sami communities have chosen to follow in contact situations.

I will describe two different linguistic strategies used when loaning place-names. I base my remarks on the linguistic choices made when place-names have been borrowed from one language and loaned to another. The nature of the contacts that occurred during this process can be seen in the results, in other words in the borrowed place-names. It is my contention that these linguistic choices reflect the more widely used local cultural strategies employed to sustain a situation in which a minority group could peacefully co-exist with a majority group, whilst maintaining an independent minority language and culture. I further contend that the choice of the language used in and the loaning and borrowing of place-names reflect the power relationships between local groups as well as that place-names can be used as means of manifesting a cultural predominance in a given area for a given time. Furthermore, I would also like to emphasise that this paper has nothing to do with the question concerning the origin of South Sami language and culture in Härjedalen, but rather only describes and analyses the situation at the turn of the twentieth century.

Material and methods

There are several similarities as well as differences between the two studied communities and place-name systems that they maintained. Both of the groups were small reindeer herding communities, which consisted of less than 100 people during the studied period 1880–1950. In addition to the reindeer herding, fishing was also an important livelihood in Čovčjävri-Kosseennâm. The Ruvhten sįjte Sami had been living mainly by reindeer herding for centuries, where as in Northern Aanaar (Fi. Inari) the importance of this economy grew considerably during the last decades of the nineteenth century, thus causing a change in the previous migration practices. Also, in Ruvhten sįjte, reindeer herding underwent fundamental changes at the turn of the twentieth century. At the end of the studied period, paid labour, most often seasonal work outside home, grew as an important source of income due to the institution of a money-based economy (for more detailed information, see Valtonen 2014: 79–109, 139–165).

The two studied areas can be considered peripheries on a national scale since they are sparsely populated, a long way from major cities and largely inaccessible. There is, however, a very distinctive difference between the two areas: in Northern Aanaar (Inari), the mixed population of Inari and North Sami have always been a majority, with only a few Finnish settlers present before the Second World War. The North Sami population has been sharing land areas close to the border of the municipality of Ohcejohka (Fi. Utsjoki) since time immemorial, but expanded slightly toward the south due to mixed marriages in the late nineteenth century.

In contrast, there have been Scandinavian inhabitants in Härjedalen at least since the late Iron Age (Baudou 2004: 21; Bergström *et al.* 1991: 52–54; Holm 1984: 136; Zachrisson 1997: 50–52), and the South Sami have been an ethnic and linguistic minority in their homesteads for a long time. On the other hand, the Ruvhten sįjte Sami lived mainly separated from the majority population due to different livelihoods and the Swedish Crown's ethnic separation policy, which was also known as the *Lapp skall vara lapp* ['Lapp shall remain Lapp'] policy (see Lundmark 2008). The Sami, however, had contacts with Swedish households, which they visited regularly during the winter migration. On the whole, although it seems that both groups had approximately the same amount of contacts with the majority cultures during the studied period, the long history of South Sami living side by side with the Scandinavian population naturally cannot be overlooked.

Due to the long co-existence in the same area, all adult Ruvhten sįjte Sami were bilingual during the studied period. This has been the case for a long time, as evidenced in an account from 1799, which reveals that all the local Sami knew Swedish (Løøv [ed.] 1992: 53). According to Knut Bergsland (1992: 7), the South Sami have most likely been using Scandinavian languages as means of communication with outsiders since the Iron Age. Most of the adult Inari Sami in Northern Aanaar (Inari) could also speak Finnish during the studied period, but their proficiency was limited and, particularly the women, were not accustomed to speaking any language other than Sami. On the other hand, most of the adults knew also North Sami.

Neither of the Sami languages had official status during the studied period, nor was Sami used as a school language after the first year of school. The lack of official status included also maps. The situation is well described in a remark made by Professor K.B. Wiklund (1913: 11), who explained that there are also Sami place-names in Härjedalen but: "[...] av naturliga [sic!] skäl kan man ej vänta att träffa så särledes många av dem på kartorna" ['We cannot, for natural reasons, expect to find so many of them on maps']. The "natural reason" referred to by Wiklund was that as Swedish place-names existed it was only natural that the cartographers ignored the Sami names.

The otherwise overlooked Sami place-names were, however, collected for the purpose of linguistic studies (Magga 1994: 7).

In Finnish Lapland, the Finnish parallel names were considered more important. If such name did not exist, the Sami name was typically written down in Finnified form, most often partly adapted partly translated. There was however one important difference with the situation in Ruvhten sįjte: the local Sami served as guides for Finnish cartographers and could therefore explain and share their own place-name tradition and culture, whereas in Hārjedalen the guides were local Swedes (Lehtola 2012: 67, 176). Consequently, the Sami perspective is much more present on the maps of Aanaar (Inari) than those of Hārjedalen. In Aanaar, however, the cartographers did not know that there were several Sami languages and the Inari Sami place-names were often translated or adapted to North Sami, thus demonstrating a hierarchy between the Sami languages (Mattus 2004: 163).

The Sami place-names have been used only in Sami language domains, but, in the domains of the majority culture, their names have always been used. In cases where there was no such name in use, it was always possible to use an improvised translation of the Sami name. The use and survival of Sami names is therefore connected to the degree of the use of the Sami language. In many cases, the speakers of the majority languages did not even know the Sami names and the language was considered incomprehensible. Tryggve Sköld (1980: 266) also explained that, in Sweden, many Sami preferred to use Swedish place-names in order not to be identified as a Sami, which could have had negative consequences.

The studied place-name material of the Inari Sami communities of Čovčjāvri and Kosseennām consisted of 561 Inari Sami place-names, which were mainly collected by Ilmari Mattus (published in Mattus 2015), a native speaker and a member of the local Inari Sami community. However, in Ruvhten sįjte, which is nearly equivalent in size, there were only 168 South Sami place-names collected primarily during short field work periods by two Swedish linguists: Björn Collinder in 1941 and Gustav Hasselbrink in 1943. This surprisingly large difference in numbers is mainly due to the fact that, outside the summer grazing grounds of Ruvhten sįjte, there are only some, sporadic Sami place-names, and even the Sami-speaking population use the Swedish place-names. The summer grazing grounds consisted of the old tax land of Ruvhten sįjte, the *Rutfjällen skattefjäll* [‘the tax mountain of Rutfjällen’], which was separated from the land of the farmers in the land ownership consolidation (Sw. *avvittring*) of 1853, and the extension area (Sw. *utvidgningshemman*) purchased by the Swedish Crown during the 1880s and 1890s after heated debate about the land-use rights. The extension area was used by the Sami before 1853 (see Map 1). (For more

detailed information, see for instance Thomasson 1990; Thomasson 2002; Valtonen 2014.)

Since we have written evidence of the existence of the reindeer herding Sami in the area dating back several hundreds of years (see for instance Schmidt 1799 in Løøv [ed.] 1992), this cannot be interpreted in any other way than as an indication of the power relationships between Sami and the local Swedes. Unfortunately, we do not have enough evidence to show whether there has been a separate Sami place-name system in the winter grazing lands. If this was indeed the case, one would expect to find some signs of a Sami substrate or at least some influence in the Swedish place-name system. Unfortunately, the Swedish place-names have not been studied in detail, nor with the expertise of Finno-Ugrian studies. A methodological problem is that there is very little knowledge about the nature of the systematic language change in Sami place-names in Scandinavian contexts, with the exception of the politically-motivated “Norwegianisation” (see Helander 2008).

The methodology of parallel name studies or name pair studies was first established in the 1930s by an Austrian linguist, Eberhard Kranzmayer (1934, in particular). Although modern-day parallel name studies still build on his ideas, some of his basic ideas have been abandoned and new ones have been introduced in their place (for a current overview, see Petrulevich 2016). According to the method, the parallel names are divided into three types based on the connection between the two names: 1) borrowed place-names which have been borrowed as such, but substituted to fit into the phonological structure of the target language as needed. I call these “adapted place-names” (original name + borrowed name); 2) translated place-names (original name + borrowed name), and 3) independent place-names with no connection to each other (original name + new name given to the same place).

An example of the first type mentioned above is the Swedish place-name *Baltern*, which is an adaptation of the South Sami place-name *Baelhtere* [*baelhtie* ‘side of a mountain’ + suffix *-(e)re* < *vaerie* ‘mountain’ or *jaevrie* ‘lake’]. This adaptation was done by substituting incompatible Sami phonemes and morphology for those compatible with Swedish, but which did not have any real meaning. An example of the second type are the names South Sami *Vaerien/jaevrie* [‘Mountain/lake’] and Swedish *Fjäll/sjön* [‘Mountain/lake’], where each name is a translation of the other, but it is impossible to say which one is the original. In type 1, the name is borrowed as an incomprehensible word, whereas in type 2, the meaning has been borrowed. Types 1 and 2 can be further divided into subtypes, in which the specifics and/or generics may have been separately borrowed by either

adaptation or translation, as opposed to using another method for another element. For instance, the Inari Sami place-name *Huikkem/vääri* ['Shouting/mountain'] has been partially adapted, partially translated into Finnish as *Huikkima/vaara* ['Huikkima/mountain']. An example of type 3 are the independent place-names South Sami *Durrien/johke* ['Ravine/river'] and Swedish *Lill/muggen* ['Little mug'], which have a common referent.


In the years since Kranzmayer's original article, the different borrowing methods have been interpreted as signs of older and younger generations as well as an indication of the language proficiency of the borrowing group. For instance, the adaptation has been taken as an indication that the borrowing group could not understand the source language and, based on this, such names have been thought to be borrowed at an early stage of the contact. Even though this seems logical, there are several examples of modern adaptation cases in contexts where both the loaning and the borrowing group have been bilingual. This shows that there must be other factors behind the choice of borrowing method. As a result, such assumptions are proven false, with greater focus being recently placed on the choices made by the loaning and borrowing language communities as well as the sociolinguistic context. The differences or similarities in the structure and grammar of loaning and borrowing languages also play a prominent role.

Results

There are plenty of parallel names in my South Sami and Inari Sami materials. However, the results give a completely different picture of the nature of the contacts. In materials on Čovčjävri-Kosseennâm, 178 Inari Sami place-names (32% of all names) have a parallel name in Finnish. In Ruvhten sįjte, 101 South Sami place-names have a parallel name in Swedish. That is as much as approximately 60% of all the names. It is impossible to arrive at an exact number, because the South Sami place-names vary a great deal due to their long informal and oral use (see Magga 1994: 8).

In addition to a much larger number of parallel names, the quality of the borrowed names also differs a great deal between the studied areas. In Ruvhten sįjte the adapted names are the most common: 51% of the South Sami place-names have an adapted parallel name in Swedish. These are followed by independent parallel names (30%) and then translated names (19%). In Aanaar (Inari), however, translated parallel names are the most common type: 69% of the Finnish parallel names are translated. These are followed by adapted parallel names (31%). Independent parallel names are a marginal phenomenon, since only less than one percent of Finnish parallel names are independent (see Table 1).

Table 1. The distribution of the parallel names in per cent in different languages divided according to the borrowing types.



Almost all the Finnish place-names have been borrowed from Inari Sami language. Only in some individual cases Finnish have been the source language. In addition to the knowledge of the cultural and historical context, the source language can be proved with a variety of linguistic evidence, such as morphological and semantic features and meaning. However, it is not always clear whether the loaning language was Inari or North Sami, because these languages are very closely related to each other and share a common history. Furthermore, the local people tend to spontaneously translate place-names from one Sami language to another, according to the language they use.

In Ruvhten sijaite however, there is no clear cultural or historical evidence that might indicate the direction of loaning. There is also evidence that suggests reverse loaning. This means that some of the place-names have been borrowed from one language to another and then back again. This type of process leaves an ambiguous trail that points to both languages and blurs interpretation. Particularly where Scandinavian names are concerned and often with great uncertainty, only the adapted names can be partly divided according to the borrowing language: approximately two-fifths of the names have been loaned from South Sami to Swedish, and three-fifths from Swedish to South Sami.

The spatial distribution of Finnish borrowed place-names in the Čovčjävri-Kosseennâm area is particular: The Finnish place-names are more prevalent close to roads (former major footpaths), and their referents are

often larger in size or are especially meaningful places in some other way. When compared with the distribution of the North Sami parallel names, the difference is evident. These are evenly distributed in the area that the North Sami share with the Inari Sami population, and have no clear correlation with the size of the referents.


This phenomenon has been previously documented in Sami contexts in Finland by Samuli Aikio (1994: 35): There has been no need to use microtoponyms with Finns because they did not use nor have been interested in the areas beyond roads and settlements. The obvious reason for this is that there were no local Finns, but only visiting public servants, who were mainly clerks and priests. The Finnish names of settlements and places nearby were needed for administrative reasons. Furthermore, on the older maps only the names of the largest places were marked in sparsely populated areas such as Northern Aanaar (Inari). The North Sami, on the other hand, had the same livelihoods and they used the same areas as the Inari Sami. It was for this reason that there has been a need for all sorts of place-names throughout the territory.

In Ruvhten sįjte, the distribution of the parallel names is more complex. The distribution of the Swedish parallel names is even: where there are Sami place-names, there are also Swedish place-names. However there is a difference between the distributions of the loaning types: there are more independent parallel names in the old tax mountain area (Sw. *skattefjäll*) on the high mountains, but at the treeline between the treeless high mountains and the forest, independent names are rare. The adapted and translated parallel names are, on the other hand, evenly distributed. The referents of independent parallel names are also more often smaller in size than in other types.

When information on the loaning language is introduced, a clear spatial tendency can be seen. In the high mountain area, in other words in the old tax mountain area, there are independent parallel names and adapted parallel names loaned from South Sami to Swedish. Below the tree line, in an area that was bought by the Crown and incorporated into the old Sami tax mountain during the 1880s and 1890s, there are mainly adapted parallel names of recent origin borrowed from Swedish to Sami (see Map 1).

Discussion

There are several issues concerning the results that need to be discussed and interpreted further. First, the number of parallel names is much higher in Ruvhten sįjte: 60% versus 30% in Čovčjävri-Kosseennám. The obvious reason for this difference is that the Swedish population has used the



Map 1. The distribution of South Sami and Swedish parallel names in Ruvhten sija. The squares symbolise adapted parallel names, triangles translated parallel names and spheres independent parallel names. The dark gray area indicates the old tax mountain (Sw. *skattefjäll*) of the Sami village as it was defined at 1853. The black border defines the area that was incorporated into the tax mountain during the 1880s and 1890s but that was used by Sami already before 1853. It includes also the area south of the tax mountain area. These borders are based on old hand drawn maps made during the land ownership consolidation (Consolidation map of Tännäs 1844–53 and 1844–53). The dotted line indicates the area used by the Ruvhten Sami village during the studied period according to Manker (1953). Drawn and © by Mikael A. Manninen and Taarna Valtonen.

same area as the Sami population, as opposed to in Northern Aanaar (Inari), where the Finnish parallel names were mainly created for the purposes of mapping and administration.

Another clear difference is the relation between different borrowing types. The most common type of borrowing in Ruvhten sįjte is adaptation (52%), whereas in Čovčjävri-Kosseennâm it is translation (69%). In addition, the role of independent parallel names is central in Ruvhten sįjte (30%), but marginal in Northern Aanaar (Inari) (< 1%). In Čovčjävri-Kosseennâm, adapted parallel names constitute the second largest type (31%). In Ruvhten sįjte translated parallel names form the smallest type: 19%. I have compared these results with results from other areas and collected information from four other studies on parallel names, which include contacts between Scandinavian and Finno-Ugrian languages.

A major research project funded by the Academy of Finland in the 1970s and 1980s studied place-names at the border region between the Finnish and Swedish-speaking areas of Finland. The study found that the most common borrowing type in Finnish-Swedish parallel names was adaptation: on average 60% of the cases. Translation was used only in 15% of the cases, and, as the study showed, more often when the source language was Swedish. Independent parallel names were used on average in only 6% of the cases, but there were municipalities where the number was as high as 24%. Figures this high were interpreted as being an indication that two separate place-name systems and populations existed (Pitkänen 2007: 13–15; Zilliacus 1980: 340–344).

Two studies (Pedersen 1988; Söderholm 1986) conducted in several villages in North Troms, Norway, had trilingual material consisting of Sami, Kven and Norwegian place-names. In these studies, the most common borrowing type from Sami to Norwegian was adaptation (61–86%), followed by translation (21–30%). However, when a place-name was loaned from Norwegian to Sami, translation was typically the most common (44–47%), followed closely by adaptation. The fourth study was conducted by Tuula Eskeland (1994) in *Finneskogene* [‘The Finnish forests’], farther south in Norway. Her results indicate that practically all parallel names were borrowed from Finnish to Norwegian as an adaptation.

The results of Ruvhten sįjte resemble the results of the Finnish linguistic border project as well as the results by Pedersen and Söderholm. The large number of independent parallel names should be interpreted according to the Finnish results as an indication of two separate place-name systems resulting from the linguistic border between the two monolingual populations speaking either Finnish or Swedish. The larger number of translated parallel names in the materials obtained in Troms has been

explained by Pedersen and Söderholm as the result of the local population in Troms being bi- or trilingual, whereas in Finland the populations have been monolingual. According to this, the results of Ruvhten sįjte should be interpreted as a situation of two monolingual populations, which, of course, is not the case. In my opinion, the similarity should be interpreted rather as an indication of unwillingness to share and translate place-names, and, because the Swedes did not speak Sami, it would have been the members of the Sami community who were unwilling to loan their names or borrow Swedish names as translations. The results of Čovčjävri-Kosseennām seem to have a pattern of its own, which must also be explained with the help of extralinguistic factors and cultural choices.

Groups living by the linguistic border are constantly negotiating ways to exist as a separate language and culture in juxtaposition to the other. The attitudes towards other languages and cultures as well as the differences in status are demonstrated with the help of linguistic and cultural choices in different social contexts. Although these choices are often subconscious, they can sometimes be clearly conscious demonstrations. Commonly mentioned reactions are loaning and borrowing, code switching, even language change, but choices that reject cultural and linguistic change, such as purism and other forms of polarisation, also exist (Bergsland 1992; Haspelmath 2009).

In Ruvhten sįjte, the choice was *protective purism*, which was supported by the ethnic separation policy of the Swedish Crown. This is a broader phenomenon that covers the entire South Sami area and became more evident during the nineteenth century, due to the intensified conflicts with the majority groups. Knut Bergsland (1992: 14) argues that the reasons behind the survival and resistance against outside influence of the South Sami language are mainly social. Although language was used as a means of communication, its capacity to keep Scandinavians outside the group and away from its insider knowledge was more important. It served as a secret language, which was incomprehensible to others. It was also the language of the family, own community and Sami livelihoods, in other words the language that supports and protects the Sami identity and the way of life that belongs to it.

It is my contention that the phenomenon interpreted in other studies as an indication of two separate monolingual groups and a separate place-name system is actually a type of protective purism where Ruvhten sįjte is concerned. This is further supported by the distribution of parallel names in the area. The old tax mountain area has been clearly recognised as a Sami area, even by the Swedish Crown, and the exceptionally large number of independent parallel names emphasises this: the Swedish names and Swedes are disregarded. This is further supported by the fact that the Scandinavian

population on both sides of the border used to fish in the high mountain area. I see that this cultural-linguistic choice is a manifestation of cultural predominance in the area: these are our names, these are our lands.

The especially large number of newly adapted parallel names, which were borrowed from Swedish to Sami in the extension area of 1880–1890s in the low mountain area, shows that the same ideology has been implemented there. The bilingual Sami population could have used the Swedish names without complications, but they choose to adapt the Swedish names to follow the rules of their own language. This might have something to do with the history of this area: it was first mainly used by the Sami, but the expansion of Swedish animal husbandry and a need to enlarge grazing meadows and pastures put pressure on the situation. This led to the consolidation of 1853, in which the area in question was excluded from the Sami tax mountain. During this period, the Sami place-names in this area disappeared, but it is probable that the memory of the former ownership was kept alive.

There is also a clear indication that the situation had not been as polarised before. It is obvious that some of the adapted loans are old and some have been borrowed back and forth from one language to the other. In particular, the adapted parallel names loaned to Swedish must be taken as a sign of positive connections: the Swedes have chosen to use Sami place-names, but, because they do not understand the language and cannot pronounce its words, the names have been interpreted according to their own language. However, the small number of translated parallel names indicate that the Sami have not been very keen to share the names, since the monolingual Swedes have been unable to translate the Sami names on their own. There is also one anomaly in the distribution of parallel names: At the tree line, there are only a few independent names, which indicate that this served as a contact area. This makes sense, as the tree line was important for both Sami reindeer herders and Scandinavian animal husbandry. The two groups were consequently forced to discuss places and needed common names.

In contrast to Ruvhten sįjte, it seems that the choice made in Čovčjávri-Kosseennâm was to share the cultural-linguistic code with the majority. If one compares the situation of Northern Aanaar (Inari) with the situation in Southern Ohcejohka (Utsjoki), the neighbouring North Sami-speaking area, the difference is striking: In Ohcejohka, Finnish parallel names are almost non-existent, even though the language situation is practically identical. The difference is significant, as almost a third of the Inari Sami names in Northern Aanaar have a Finnish parallel name. Furthermore, the parallel names are mainly translations, with most of the adaptations being only partial, including elements that cannot be or are very difficult to translate into Finnish. As it was uncommon for Finns to speak Sami, one

must conclude that the place-names have been translated by the Inari Sami themselves.

Translation is most likely connected to the mapping of the area at the beginning of the twentieth century, at which time the local guides spontaneously translated place-names for the cartographers. It is possible that the Finns did not even realise that the names were translated and that there were no real Finnish names. The translation of place-names and personal names has been a common official practice in Finnish Lapland since the existence of written documents (Mattus 2004: 162–163).

Kaisu Nikula, an Inari Sami folklorist, analysed the ethnic self-identification narratives of Inari Sami people. She found that controlled multiculturalism is the single most important cultural property and strength that the people themselves mentioned. This is connected with the cultural core ideology or value of *multicultural amicability*. For instance, it is considered impolite to use a language that someone present cannot understand. Code switching was not understood as an indication of weaker status, but as an expression of strong linguistic proficiency. The Inari Sami capacity to absorb and apply influences from other languages and cultures was noted early and was often misinterpreted as being an indication of a weak and acculturative group (Lehtola 2012: 212; Nikula 2003: 164, 145).

In my opinion, the translating of parallel names is one indication of the Inari Sami's cultural ideology of multicultural amicability, not an indication of, for instance, low status or assimilation. This choice made it possible for them to control the use of place-names and to ensure that the Finns understood the cultural content and local history. Consequently, it was expected that Finns would begin to appreciate the local Inari Sami cultural heritage. The only problem with this cultural strategy is that it only works as long as the rules of the interaction created by the Inari Sami community are respected and the status of the group is held in high enough esteem.

Conclusions

In this paper, I have described two different cultural and linguistic strategies used when loaning place-names. Based on the results obtained, I have concluded that the quality and distribution of parallel names in the South Sami area reflect the existence of two separate name systems and a cultural strategy that I call *protective purism*. Its main idea is to separate the South Sami culture and language from the surrounding Scandinavian cultures and languages in order to safeguard its existence.

In the Inari Sami area of Čovčjävri and Kosseennâm, the quality of the parallel names indicate that the local Sami community opened up its linguistic-cultural code to the Finns. This strategy is based on an Inari Sami

cultural ideology of *multicultural amicability*. Its basic idea is to be open, teaching members of other linguistic and cultural groups to understand, thus establishing respect for the Inari Sami language and culture in order to safeguard its existence.

It might seem odd that two opposite approaches have been used to promote a common objective, i.e. an environment where a minority language and culture can survive. The obvious reason for the different strategies can be found in the linguistic-cultural ecosystems that surround these communities.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank the Finnish Cultural Foundation for the grants that made it possible for me to write my doctoral thesis and now continue my work as a post-doctoral researcher. I also owe a debt of gratitude to the Giellagas Institute for Saami Studies at the University of Oulu and my colleagues there for the constant support they have given me over the years.

REFERENCES

Archival Sources

- Consolidation map of Tännäs 1844–53. Akt. nr. 23-TÄN-10, Gävle: Lantmäteriet; historiskakartor.lantmateriet.se.
 Consolidation map of Tännäs 1887–98. Akt. nr. 23-TÄN-16, Gävle: Lantmäteriet; historiskakartor.lantmateriet.se.

Literature

- Aikio, S. (1994). "Suoma sámi nammafuolahusas" ['On language planning of Finnish Sami names'], in *Sámi báikenamat virggálaš geavahusas Ruoŧa, Suoma ja Norgga bealde. Ávvočála Knut Bergslandii* (Sámi diedalaš áigečála 1), ed. K.R. Helander, Guovdageaidnu: Sámi allaskuvla, Sámi instituhtta; Romsa: Romssa universitehta Sámi dutkamiid guovddáš, pp. 33–39.
- Baudou, E. (2004). "Arkeologiska tolkningar av kulturhistoriska fynd i Mellannorrlands järnålder" [Archaeological interpretations of cultural historical finds of Middle Norrland's Iron Age], in *The Sámi and the Scandinavians. Aspects of 2000 Years of Contact* (Schriften zur Kulturwissenschaft Band 55), ed. J. Kusmenko, Hamburg: Verlag Dr. Kovač, pp. 17–33.
- Bergsland, K. (1992). "Language contacts between Southern Sami and Scandinavian," in *Language Contact. Theoretical and Empirical Studies* (Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs 60), ed. E.H. Jahr, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 5–15.
- Bergström, E.J., Magnusson, G. & Raihle, J. (1991). *Härjedalen. Natur och kulturhistoria* ['Härjedalen. Nature and cultural history'], Östersund: Jämtlands läns museum.
- Eskeland T. (1994). "Fra Diggasborrå til Diggasbekken. Finske stedsnavn på de norske finnskogene" ['From Diggasborrå to Diggasbekken. Finnish place-names in the

- Norwegian Finnskogene area'], diss., University of Oslo.
- Haspelmath, M. (2009). "Lexical borrowing. Concepts and issues," in *Loanwords in the World's Languages. A Comparative Handbook*, eds. M. Haspelmath & U. Tadmor, Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, pp. 35–54.
- Haugen, E. (1972). *The Ecology of Language. Essays*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Haugen, E. (2001). "The ecology of language," in *The Ecolinguistics Reader. Language, Ecology and Environment*, eds. A. Fill & P. Mühlhäusler, London: Continuum, pp. 57–66.
- Helander, K.R. (2008). *Namat dan nammii. Sámi báikenamaid dáruiduhttin Várjjaga guovlus Norgga uniovdnaáiggi loahpas* ['Names in the name of. The Norwegianization of Sami place-names in the Várjjat area at the end of the Norwegian union period'] (Dieđut 1/2008), Guovdageaidnu: Sámi Instituhtta.
- Holm, G. (1984). "Förhållandet mellan samiskt och svenskt i ortnamnen i Lappland och Jämtland-Härjedalen. En språklig jämförelse med bebyggelsehistorisk bakgrund" ['The relationship between Sami and Swedish in place-names in Lapland and Jämtland-Härjedalen. A linguistic comparison with settlement historical background'], in *Bebyggelsers og bebyggelsesnavnes alder. NORNAs niende symposium i København 25–27 oktober 1982* (NORNA-rapporter 26), ed. V. Dalberg, Uppsala: NORNA-förlaget, pp. 130–143.
- Kranzmayer, E. (1934). "Zur Ortsnamenforschung im Grenzland," *Zeitschrift für Ortsnamenforschung*, 10, pp. 105–148.
- Lehtola, V.-P. (2012). *Saamelaiset suomalaiset. Kohtaamisia 1896–1953* ['Sami Finns. Encounters 1896–1953'] (Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Toimituksia 1351/Tiede), Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Lundmark, L. (2008). *Stulet land. Svensk makt på samisk mark* ['Stolen land. Swedish power on Sami land'], Stockholm: Ordfront.
- Løov, A. (ed.) (1992). *Resa genom Hälsingland och Härjedalen år 1799. En del av Johann Wilhelm Schmidts berättelse om sin resa genom några Svenska landskap för att besöka samerna* ['A journey through Hälsingland and Härjedalen in 1799. A part of Johann Wilhelm Schmidt's account of his journey through some Swedish provinces to meet the Sami'], Trondheim: Luejie.
- Magga, O.H. (1994). "Knut Bergsland ja su bargu sámi báikenamaiguin" ['Knut Bergsland and his work with Sami place-names'], in *Sámi báikenamat virggálaš geavahusas Ruota, Suoma ja Norgga bealde. Avvočála Knut Bergslandii* (Sámi dieđalaš áigečála 1), ed. K.R. Helander, Guovdageaidnu: Sámi allaskuvla, Sámi instituhtta; Romsa: Romssa universitehta Sámi dutkamiid guovddáš, pp. 7–11.
- Manker, E. (1953). *The Nomadism of the Swedish Mountain Lapps. The Siidas and their Migratory Routes in 1945* (Acta Lapponica 7), Stockholm: Nordiska Museet.
- Mattus, I. (2004). "Paikannimistö alueen kuvaajana" ['Place-names representing the area'], in *Kaldoaivin erämaa-alueen ja Sammuttjängän-Vaijoenjängän soidensuojelualueen luonto, käyttö ja paikannimistö* (Metsähallituksen luonnonsuojelujulkaisuja. Sarja A, No. 144), eds. T. Tynys & E. Stolt, Vantaa: Metsähallitus, pp. 162–345.
- Mattus, I. (2015). *Anarâš päikkinoomah* ['Inari Sami place-names'], Aanaar: Anarâškielâ servi.
- Mühlhäusler, P. (1995). "Language ecology. Contact without conflict," in *Language Choices. Conditions, Constraints, and Consequences*, eds. M. Pütz & G. Mercator, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 3–15.
- Mühlhäusler, P. (1996). *Linguistic Ecology. Language Change and Linguistic Imperialism in the Pacific Region*, London: Routledge.
- Nikula, K. (2003). "Muistelevat inarinsaamelaiset. Empiirisen etnisyyden ja identiteettien

kirjon tarkastelua elämäkerronnan kautta” [‘Commemorating Inari Sami. An examination of experienced ethnicity and spectrum of identities with the help of biographical narration’], MA thesis., University of Helsinki.

- Pedersen, A.-K. (1988). “Stadnamnlån. Fonologi og ortografi i lydlig lånte stadnamn med eit oversyn over fonologien i norsk på Skibotn og i Kvenangsbotn” [‘Place-name loans. Phonology and orthography in adapted place-name loans with an overview of the phonology of Norwegian in Skibotn and in Kvenangsbotn’], MA thesis., University of Tromsø.
- Petrulevich, A. (2016). *Ortnamnsanpassning som process. En undersökning av vendiska ortnamn och ortnamnsvarianter i Knýtlinga saga* [‘Place-name adaptation as a process. An investigation of Wendish place-names and place-name variants in Knýtlinga Saga’] (Namn och samhälle 28), Uppsala: Uppsala University.
- Pitkänen, R.L. (2007). “Finnish-Swedish contacts in Finnish nomenclature,” in *Borrowing of Place Names in the Uralian Languages* (Onomastica Uralica 4), eds. R.L. Pitkänen & J. Saarikivi, Helsinki: Onomastica Uralistica-research program, pp. 9–26.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. & Phillipson, R. (2007). “Language ecology,” in *Handbook of Pragmatics*, eds. J.-O. Östman & J. Verschueren, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 1–24.
- Sköld, T. (1980). “Ortnamn och kodväxling” [‘Place-names and code switching’], in *Ortnamn och språkkontakt. Handlingar från NORNA:s sjätte symposium i Uppsala 5–7 maj 1978* (NORNA-rapporter 17), eds. T. Andersson, E. Bryllå & A. Rosvik, Uppsala: Nordiska samarbetskommittén för namnforskning, pp. 266–276.
- Söderholm, E. 1986: “Mönstre innen et flerspråklig stedsnavnsystem” [‘Patterns in a multilingual place-name system’], *Namn og Nemne*, 3, pp. 7–17.
- Thomasson, L. (1990). “Samerna” [‘The Sami’], in *Jämtlands och Härjedalens historia. Femte delen 1880–1980*, ed. M. Rolén, Östersund: Jämtlands läns museum, pp. 703–820.
- Thomasson, L. (2002). *Ur Jämtlandssamernas nutidshistoria. En mer än hundraårig kulturkamp* [‘About the Jämtland Sami’s recent history. More than hundred years of cultural struggle’] (Bokserie Gaaltije 1), Östersund: Gaaltije.
- Valtonen, T. (2014). *Mielen laaksot – Mielen vuemieh – Miela vuomit – Mielä vyemeh – Miöl vue’m. Neljän saamen kielen paikannimien rakenne, sanasto ja rinnakkaisnimet vähemmistö-enemmistö-suhteiden kuvastajina* [‘Valleys of the mind. Place-names in four Sami languages as mirrors of minority-majority relations. Construction, vocabulary, and parallel names’] (Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Toimituksia 271), Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Wiklund, K.B. (1913). “Några jämtländska och norska sjönamn av lapskt ursprung” [‘Some Jämtlandic and Norwegian lake names of Sami origin’], *Namn och bygd*, 1913, pp. 11–17.
- Zachrisson, I. (1997). “Fångstmarker och fjäll” [‘Hunting grounds and mountain areas’], in *Möten i gränsland. Samer och germaner i Mellanskandinavien* (Monographs, Statens historiska museum 4), ed. I. Zachrisson, Stockholm: Statens historiska museum, pp. 46–52.
- Zilliacus, K. (1980). “Ortnamnföråden vid språkgränsen i Finland. Presentation av ett forskningsprojekt” [‘The place-names at the linguistic border in Finland. A presentation of a research project’], in *Ortnamn och språkkontakt. Handlingar från NORNA:s sjätte symposium i Uppsala 5–7 maj 1978* (NORNA-rapporter 17), eds. T. Andersson, E. Bryllå & A. Rosvik, Uppsala: Nordiska samarbetskommittén för namnforskning, pp. 317–349.

AUTHOR

Taarna Valtonen is a post-doctoral researcher and teacher at the Giellagas Institute for Saami Studies at the University of Oulu, Finland. She is a culturally oriented linguist specialised in Sami languages, onomastics, lexicology, contact linguistics and linguistic ecology as well as micro- and ethnohistory.

taarna.valtonen@oulu.fi