

NARRATED SÁMI SIEIDIS

Heritage and Ownership in Ambiguous Border Zones

Stein R. Mathisen

This article analyses different individuals' actions in relation to Sámi sacrificial stones (*sieidis*) as they appear in narratives, missionary reports, and research; and relate them to discussions on heritage politics and the establishment of cultural ownership. In the long historical perspective, ownership to such cultural heritage sites can be understood both as sites of intercultural conflict leading to destruction or plunder, and as sites of ethnic revival leading to claims of repatriation and heritage status. But the sites and the narratives connected to them can also be understood as reports from a cultural border zone, where new cultural meanings are being developed all the time. Setting the stones in motion have changed their (de)localized meanings, and changing contextualizations have continued to generate new interpretations.

Keywords: agency, border zones, indigenous heritage, repatriation, sacrificial stone

Analyzed in an historical perspective, ownership of indigenous peoples' cultural heritage sites, such as for example the Sámi *sieidi* (sacrificial stone) in Northern Fenno-Scandia, can be understood within a long range of changing contexts. Some of the *sieidis* have moved from an aboriginal cultic context, to a colonial context where intercultural conflicts have led to destruction or plunder, and then to a contemporary context where an ethnic revival makes claims for repatriation and heritage status. But this process and the conceptual and material movements it entails also brings with it changing meanings and interpretations. The movement from cultic objects to objects of heritage has the potential of bringing about a change in ownership. Narratives related to the *sieidi* accompany this process and will be drawn upon in this article to elucidate changing interpretations and claims.

Contemporary and hence postcolonial narrative versions of this development are usually aligned with global discourses which argue that cultural objects removed by colonial powers should be returned to their rightful owners. This argument is given much play in literature and media, it has important ethno-political implications, and it spotlights the situation of indigenous populations throughout the world faced with the consequences of colonialism and imperialism. But at the same time, some local narratives point to an understanding of these sacred sites and objects as charged with indigenous mystery and enigma, surrounding them with secrecy and ambiguity. These narratives emphasize the importance of keeping secret the locations of the *sieidis*, and of keeping their use restricted to un-official contexts. Who can claim

ownership is a further issue problematized within these stories.

Renato Rosaldo introduced the notion of the cultural border zone, which aptly describes the sites and narratives under investigation here, as new cultural meanings develop through encounter and friction (1989). Not surprisingly, cultural conflict is a constant within such settings. This discussion makes narratives and narrators' agendas a point of departure for understanding what strategies are drawn upon to voice conflicting points of view within such cultural intersections. Ambiguous symbols, such as *sieidi*, come to communicate the multifaceted experiences of people living in this kind of cultural border zone.

Setting heritage objects in motion, by putting them on display in museums or in archives, also changes their (de)localized meanings. The changing contextualizations generate new interpretations. The change in context also implies a change in how the narrative is valued – as literature, as heritage, and as a topic of research. Following narratives and reports from different social actors in these ethnic, cultural, and national border zones, it is possible to elicit some of the many discourses that can be tied to the formation of cultural heritage as political and epistemological phenomena, in history as well as in contemporary society. Using the concepts decontextualization and recontextualization, the folklorists Richard Bauman and Charles L. Briggs (1992) pointed to the dynamics of changing contextualizations when elements from folk culture are given the status of “folklore”. Elements of communication can be taken out of a local community; they are collected and decontextualized. Then they might appear in new contexts: in the archive as a part of a national folklore collection, or in a book as a part of a folklore collection from a specific area. The communication has been recontextualized, and in this process one will often find that not only the medium, but also the meaning has changed from the initial context. In the dynamic movements of Sámi *sieidis* discussed here, it is important to identify the actors involved in such processes, their agendas and narratives, and to analyze how such changes in contexts in turn also will affect questions of value and ownership.

Northern Fenno-Scandia is an area where most people act out their lives in contexts of cultural encounter, with Sámi, Norwegian, Russian, and Kven/Finnish cultural elements as prominent parts of the mix. From an historical perspective, the area can be seen as a border zone under shifting national influences. Cultural and ethnic identities have been marginalized under changing political rule through the ages. The collection, documentation and constitution of folklore, ethnography and heritage from these politically marginalized northern areas and cultures must be understood in relation to questions of power and authority among the actors involved. But the idea in the present analysis is to get beyond questions related to the “construction” and “authenticity” of heritage. Rather it is the documentation of how heritage is actually constituted in complex cultural contexts, within political and social limitations that is of interest here. The process of constitution, I will argue, involves persons who emerge as subjective individuals with an agency, rather than as two sets of actors – mere collectors on the one hand and anonymous carriers of folklore and ancient traditional knowledge on the other. A more detailed investigation of sources can give us information about informants, who in many cases have remained anonymous in the context of museums, folklore research, as well as ethnography. Such information proves in turn rewarding for further research, making it possible to introduce new and alternative understandings of earlier acts and actors of cultural representation (cf. Kuutma 2006). Understanding some cultural representations as works involving auto-ethnographic strategies (Pratt 1992) rather than as mere products of inescapable colonial forces can also serve to empower peoples and cultures that have earlier been looked upon as passive victims of outside forces beyond their control. Such an “archaeology” surrounding the heritage constitution process in turn allows for a look at narrative agency within the process of constituting cultural property.

Missionaries' Reports and Sámi Narratives

Sacrificial sites have been archeologically documented and date back millennia (see bibliography in

Sveen 2003). But the earliest written records of the Sámi's sacrificial stones were made by the Lutheran missionaries who systematically worked to christen the heathen Sámi in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Acquiring information about these stones and their location seems to have been a central part of their struggle against paganism. These written reports give the impression that the sacrificial stones were central cultic places, and as the Sámi's sacred, holy places, missionaries saw the need to destroy or profane them and through their desecration to make way for the conversion of the Sámi to the "right" religion. The stones were understood as an equivalent to the Christian churches, as cultic places for the heathen religion (Leem 1767). The sites were demonized, and represented as the devil's attempt to mislead the heathen people.

The local Sámi narratives about the sieidis (Kohl-Larsen 1971; Paulaharju 1922, 1932; Qvigstad 1926, 1928), on the other hand, did not have as their core aim to relate knowledge about any religious "system", parallel and opposed to Christianity. The narratives all have a common, uncomplicated structure and very similar plots. They generally describe actors who either use the sieidis to obtain certain goals for their personal gain – usually prosperity and good luck in reindeer herding or in fishing – or who experience misfortune because they have broken a traditional or prescribed way to behave in front of these stones. Whether the sieidis bring people luck or misfortune is to a large degree dependent on the actors' actions in the narrative.

The prescribed way of acting towards the sieidis involves keeping a promise of offerings or sacrifices. These in return will bring luck. If the promise is not kept, the sieidi will turn good luck into a loss. The sieidi is thus part of a reciprocal arrangement, which seems to have been a central relationship in the old hunting economy among the Sámi. Gifts would imply a return gift also in the interaction with the sieidis (Solem 1933: 247f). There was no ownership to land in the strict, legal sense of the term at that time. But some sources mention that descendants could inherit the *saiwoks* of an area from their parents (Solem 1933: 155). These *saiwoks* were understood

as "subterranean helpers" or a kind of helping spirits. They were associated with distant forefathers, in the sense that they were inherited among relatives, and were connected to certain hunting or pasture areas (Bergsland 1986: 74). In this way sieidis and holy mountains can be seen in relation to inherited rights to natural resources and resource areas, hence to a type of property. In the south Sámi area "Saiwo-field" (Saiwo-mountains) are also connected with "Arb-Saiwo" (inheritance Saiwos) in some of the old documents produced by the missionaries:

The more Saiwos a Sámi owns, the more well ranked he is considered to be among his people. Because Saiwos are inherited, and they can also be sold; this is why anyone who has children, divides and shares his Saiwos when he is getting old and before he dies. And as he prefers one child over the other, he will give this child better and stronger Saiwos than the others. Those marriages are considered the happiest, where someone with his wedded wife receives many Saiwos as a dowry, or can expect to inherit them from her parents. Those kinds of Saiwos are called *Arb-Saiwo* among the Sámi (Skanke 1943[1730]: 192; my translation from Danish).

In the south Sámi area, the relations between such inherited helping spirits and living people can be reconstructed historically (Bergsland 1986: 55ff). This suggests an old system where there was a relation between the guarding spirits of an area, and the group of people who used the area and its resources, and who had inherited rights to do so as long as they kept their obligations in relation to the area's guarding spirits, represented through holy mountains or sieidis. The economic importance of these old systems was continued in the Norwegian administrative language, where the terms "Arb-Saiwo" and "Saiwo-field" changed to "Skatte-field" (tax-mountains) (Bergsland 1986: 75).

In his 1917 study on the Sámi, Johan Turi (cf. Kutma 2006; Cocq 2008) also understands the offerings to the sieidis as acts of reciprocity. Offerings to the sieidi gave luck in fishing or hunting in return.

However, according to Turi's opinion, such offerings for luck could also be made to the church or to poor people – and some poor people were considered more potent than others (Turi 1917: 108f). It was possible to make a promise of an offering and see how it affected your luck. If you were lucky, it was important to keep the promise (Turi 1917: 109). This is also the case in the narratives connected to fishing sieidis. One was to promise the sieidi some of the fat from the fish caught so as to ensure a good catch. If the promise was not kept, the catch would be lost. Ellen Utsi from Kautokeino¹ told this example typical of such narratives concerning reindeer to Qvigstad:

Issaš Ovla (...) went to a stone called *Onnegeaðgi* [literally: “stone of luck”] and said: “If two wild reindeer oxes now come along, I will shoot them and give one of them to the stone so that my reindeer luck will continue.” As he had said this, two reindeer oxes came from two different quarters. They started poking, and their antlers got stuck in each other, and the man thought: those two will never pry themselves loose. He picked up his gun and started aiming, and then he thought: I won't give the stone anything, when I shoot these reindeer. But then the reindeer pried themselves loose of one another before he managed to shoot, and they ran away and disappeared (Qvigstad 1928: 514f; my translation from Norwegian).

The missionaries' reports constructed a Sámi religion that was antithetical to Christian religion. By demonizing Sámi beliefs and religious practices, missionaries also constructed legitimate grounds for their own proselytizing activities. While the written reports were primarily intended for the missionaries' churches and should be understood within that context, the missionaries' activities had consequences within the local contexts where the Sámi lived their everyday life. The condemnation and even criminalization of the old sieidi practices had an impact on the social and economic organization of the old Sámi society, and not only on their beliefs. This in turn influenced the way people un-

derstood social obligations, ownership of resources, and the (re)distribution of values among the inhabitants of an area.

Laestadianism and Sámi Cultural Conflicts

The border between Finland and Norway was closed in 1852. This caused problems for many reindeer herders, who could no longer keep their reindeer on the winter pastures in Finland. The closing of the border also introduced new relations between groups of people through migration. Some of the followers of the Laestadian religious movement² started an uprising against the local Norwegian authorities, later called the Kautokeino rebellion of 1852 (Zorgdrager 1997). In the course of this incident, the local merchant and the *lensmann* (sheriff) were killed, and the local clergyman was beaten along with many other inhabitants who did not follow the rebels. The rebellious Sámi group felt that only they represented true Christianity, and the local authorities' sale of liquor to the Sámi was seen as the work of the devil. The authorities punished the rebels with death sentences for the leaders and long prison sentences for the participants.

These turbulent times set their mark on the community of Kautokeino, but the rebellion also influenced the overall Norwegian understanding of the Sámi and their culture. When Christianity and above all Laestadianism gained hold among the Sámi, some of the old beliefs and customs (like *juoigat*, the Sámi way of singing) were connected with paganism, and repudiated. Yet the supernatural powers that had been associated with the old sieidis did not vanish completely. People relied strongly on nature and its resources, and found it wise to have good relations with, or at the very least show respect also to, the old powers that governed nature. Some would give the offerings due when they passed the sieidis on their spring or autumn migration with the reindeer, just to secure good luck. There were many narratives of what could happen if those old stones were not honored properly or if they were mocked. Some narratives illustrate the dilemma the Sámi faced – honoring the old customs of the forefathers or following the rules preached in the church and in

the Laestadian congregations, risking either ill fortune or eternal damnation.

One such narrative is about the legendary rich reindeer owner Aslak Mathisen Logje (1795–1887). Every year on his way to the summer pastures he made a sacrifice of butter and brandy by a certain stone, and it was told that this was the reason for his great reindeer luck; he was said to have owned more than 5,000 reindeer (Kohl-Larsen 1971: 41ff; see also Turi 1917: 159). But Aslak Logje was also a pious Christian:

Every morning outside his tent he said his morning prayers with his head uncovered in awe, and he never missed a sermon whenever it was possible for him to attend (...) He never stole a reindeer, neither did he tolerate that any of his servants did (Smith 1938: 387; my translation from Norwegian).

This rich reindeer owner is supposed to be the model for the noble character Laagje in Jens A. Friis³ popular novel *Lajla* (Friis 1881). Friis described Laagje as the free and noble Sámi living a life in total harmony with nature as well as with the Christian faith and church. Yet while oral narratives show up the contradictions in Aslak's religious practices, the novelist creates a second character, the more primitive and wild servant Jaampa, who worships the sieidis. Instead of the ambiguous and multivocal description found in oral narratives, Friis constitutes his literary character according to Christian religious standards, representing only the "good" forces, and thus constructs a univocal narrative.

The first Sámi to give an account of the sieidis is Lars Jakobsen Hætta (1834–1897), a person who came to find himself in the middle of conflicts between new and old beliefs, and between different cultures and different social groups. As an 18-year-old, he was an active participant in the Kautokeino rebellion of 1852, and was sentenced to death. His sentence was later commuted to lifetime imprisonment, and he was released from prison on account of good behavior in 1863. While he was in prison in Norway's capital, he cooperated with Jens A. Friis, became his informant (or teacher) in questions of

Sámi language, and worked on a new translation of the New Testament into Sámi. Friis also called upon Hætta to write his memoir during his imprisonment. As one might expect, Hætta presented himself and the Laestadian movement from an apologetic perspective. Thus, he tried to show that the pre-rebellion Sámi society was dominated by heathendom, immorality, theft and drunkenness, and that the "Saved" or the Laestadians had good reason to make a change, even though the violence went too far. He also described how some persons still worshipped the heathen sieidis. It was symptomatic for his new Laestadian view that instead of understanding the continuity of the belief practice in relation to reindeer luck, he tied sieidi worship to greed. The relation to the sieidi has thus been transposed into a Christian universe, and the wish to obtain reindeer luck has been transformed into greed, one of the seven deadly sins:

From what I know, there were in our time almost no idol or sieidi worshippers. However, during the last Christian revival there was among the Kautokeino Sámi a man, Rasmus Andersen Spein [1819–1894], who secretly had taken a stone as an idol and made sacrifices to it for some years. He had heard that sieidi worshippers often got rich, and came into possession of beautiful reindeer and large herds. Therefore he was infatuated by love of this world into making himself a sieidi stone (Hætta 1923: 78; my translation from Norwegian).

Spein made his annual sacrifices to the sieidi with butter and brandy, and he thought his reindeer were getting fatter and bigger and his herd was increasing in numbers. But one year he forgot to make his sacrifice and soon some of his best animals died close to the stone. He interpreted this as a sign of the sieidi's anger. But instead of showing any regret or remorse, he scolded the stone and swore that he would never bring it sacrifices again, if the sieidi really was that vengeful.

Professor Jens A. Friis also refers to this narrative in a book he wrote based on a trip to Northern Norway, Russian Lapland and Karelia (Friis 1880),

under the heading “The Last Lappish Idol”. Even though the story is more elaborate, Friis likely heard it from Lars Hætta. Friis, the first professor of Sámi language at the University of Kristiania, uses the story to illustrate the importance of teaching the Sámi about Christianity in their own language, and shows this as one example of how the Sámi could be led astray if they did not understand the language spoken by the clergy. But he concludes that Spein’s bad experiences with the sieidi must have led to the salvation of his soul (Friis 1880: 67). Lars Hætta seems to be better informed. He concludes that while Spein may have stopped making his annual offerings to the sieidi, this did not make him a devout Christian:

But this did not contribute to his soul’s salvation. He continued to live his unholy life, and served the most prominent idol, the Devil himself, with reindeer theft and swearing as before (Hætta 1923: 79; my translation from Norwegian).

Thus the sieidis continue to be sites that produce new narratives. But changes in context lead to changes in the meanings communicated. With the introduction of new religious movements and changing value systems, the stones are put into new perspectives. Couched in narration, the sieidis could be used in discussions of ethical standards, religion, and language. Things look different from a prison cell in Kristiania than they do from the Finmark tundra, herding reindeer. While still standing in nature, the sieidis could be maintained as carriers of multivocal messages within a multifaceted reality, in contrast to the monovocal condemnation of heathen, sacrificial stones on the part of clergy and Laestadian preachers. A possible spatial and contextual solution for this conflict is that the sieidis attain only one meaning in the church and in the congregations, where they are associated with a pre-Christian and pagan past. But in nature and on the tundra, where the resources still are harvested, the narratives continue to carry multivocal messages, and the old supernatural powers are still relevant. Questions of ownership and property are of course closely tied to this conflict between new and old, between contemporary Christi-

anity and pagan past. New groups with political and economical interests were being established in the old Sámi environments, but some of the old values would continue to govern people’s interactions.

Entextualizing Narratives about a Sieidi in Skilggašjávri

When the sieidis became a focus of special interest for folklorists and ethnographers, a new decontextualization of narratives and material objects set in, leading to the production of new meanings in new contexts. Everyday vernacular practices and stories among the Sámi became an object of documentation and research and established them either as remnants of primitive belief systems or as relics of folk poetry. Research paradigms, popular understandings and new spatial contexts broadened or changed the understanding of the sieidis. But this also radically changed the question of ownership, whether the sieidis and their narratives were interpreted as primitive religion, ethnography, or folklore. Research established specific forms of ownership, allowing them first of all the possibility of radical de-locations, transformations, and decontextualizations (Briggs & Bauman 1992). These processes also associated the sieidis with new value systems, and new forms of representation established ownership on new arenas.

Printed versions of legends rather than archive material will be used here, since my focus is on the specific entextualization of the narratives and the influence this had on the understanding of the narratives as a communicative phenomenon (see also Klein 2007). The texts were produced to communicate knowledge of how people in more “primitive” cultures established contact with supernatural powers, to describe central values in one specific culture, or simply to contribute to scholarly knowledge. One of the most prominent collectors of Sámi folklore was the Norwegian folklorist Just Knud Qvigstad (1853–1957), who published extensive collections covering a large amount of Sámi oral traditions (cf. Mathisen 2000: 106f). Qvigstad published narratives on sieidis and holy places in his book *Lappische Opfersteine und heilige Berge in Norwegen* (Qvigstad 1926). He offers

listings of sieidis and the narratives related to them known to him at that time. There are some narratives about a sacrificial stone by the lake Skilggašjávri. One of these is a memorate, as it concerns personal experiences made by *Oskkal áddjá* who can be identified as Anders Andersen Spein (1851–1929) from the Oskal farmstead (about 20 kilometers south of Kautokeino). His narrative about what had happened with him and his half brother *Hukka-Salkku* (Salomon Salomonsen Näkkälä 1862–1933) is reported as follows:

Oskal addja (...) told that he once was fishing with nets by Skillggašjávri with his half brother Salomon Salomonsen, who usually was called Hukka-Salkku or Iso-Salkku. As they were about to throw the nets in the lake, they said between themselves that if they got a lot of fish, they would cook some of the entrails and smear the fat on the sieidi. Iso-Salkku said: “That poor one has been standing there for such a long time all dried up and rusted, he needs to be smeared with fat.” As they had pulled the net close to the shore so that the bottom of the net was only 70–80 meters away, they could see that the net was all filled with fish. Then Iso-Salkku said: “Satan himself should care about that old devil (*rietas*) over there, because now the fish belongs to us.” Oskal áddjá agreed with him on this. But barely had they spoken like that, when a strong wind caught the net and fastened it to some stones in the lake. There it was stuck, and they could not get it loose without great labor, and then all the fish were gone⁴ (Qvigstad 1926: 344; my translation from German).

Another narrative Qvigstad presents connected to the Skilggašjávri sieidi concerns Mattis Mattisen Hætta (1869–1951) from Siebe, a neighboring farmstead. This narrative is very similar to the other:

Later Mattis Mattisen Hætta from Siebe once wanted to make the same effort. He waited until the sack of the net was pulled close to the shore. There was much fish in it, but not more than one man could lift. As Mattis was about to lift it up to

the shore, he looked to the sieidi and said: “Now I don’t need your help any more; because these fish are now mine.” But as he lifted the sack of the net, it cracked, and all the fish escaped back into the water again⁵ (Qvigstad 1926: 344; my translation from German).

Qvigstad was not the only folklorist who visited this area. Finnish folklorist Samuli Paulaharju (1875–1944) recorded variants of the same narratives when he visited the Oskal farmstead in 1921. Paulaharju was interested in narratives and belief traditions among the Sámi, but also more specifically in their sacrificial stones. In his book *Lapin muisteluksia* there is a photo of the Skilggašjávri sieidi (Paulaharju 1922: 170) and even a photo of the old Oskkal áddjá (Paulaharju 1922: 172), whom Paulaharju visited, and who told him narratives about the sieidi. In Paulaharju’s later book about sacrificial stones, *Seitoja ja Seidan palvontaa*, there is another picture of the sieidi (Paulaharju 1932: 6), and a picture of another unfortunate fisher in Skilggašjávri, Hukka-Salkko (Paulaharju 1932: 13). Paulaharju relates his printed variant of these narratives in his book *Lapin muisteluksia* (Paulaharju 1922, Swedish translation in Paulaharju 1977) in this way:

Not so many years have passed since Oskala’s seventy-eight-year-old man told about this, when he was making his offerings to the sieidi together with Hukka-Salkko. The men were fishing, but Kilkkanen⁶ had little fish to offer, not enough for a single meal. Then the men approached the sieidi and complained:

*Oh, what bad weather!
We are now catching fish for sacrifice,
That the Sieidi will give us.
If we get many fish,
We will smear you with fat.
You poor one, you have rusted there.
But if we get a good catch of fish,
We will come to you with fat,
And make you clean.⁷*

Then they again went out on the lake to draw the nets, and now Kilkkanen filled the net with fish. Satisfied they drew the net to the shore. But just as they were about to secure their catch to the land, one of the helping boys uttered the following words: “If we get these fish, we will not, you poor stone, smear you with fat. We won’t let you have anything. We will crack your head with a stone.”

But just then a strong wind came, and threw the net upside down. And all the fish in it escaped. The old sieidi took what belonged to him, and he could not even stand the scornful words from the helping boy.

Both of the fishermen began to shudder, hurriedly they ended their fishing, and frightened they looked at the brown sacrificial stone and made their way towards home (Paulaharju 1977: 156f; my translation from Swedish).

The most obvious difference between the two variants presented by Qvigstad and Paulaharju concerns the way the men communicate with the sieidi. This is also the case in Paulaharju’s version of the second narrative:

The same thing happened to some other Lapland fishermen on Kilkkasjaur. They begged the sieidi:

Let me have fish

Like before!

And I will smear you with butter. ⁸

And they caught a net filled with fish. But in their arrogance even they mocked the sieidi: “We won’t let you, sacrificial stone, have anything!” But the guys should not have anything either. The net was torn, and the fish rushed out in the lake. But this made the men furious, and they swore: “Let’s take that detestable stone and sink it in the lake!”

And they removed the old sieidi from its ancient place and threw it into the waves of the lake. But when the fishermen crawled out of their turf hut the next morning, they could see that the stone was again standing in its old place. Brown

and rugged it was standing there like before. The morning sun made it glisten even clearer, wet as it was. And in that same old spot the little brown stone god is still standing (Paulaharju 1977: 156f; my translation from Swedish).

Whereas Qvigstad lets the men speak to the sieidi in ordinary language, Paulaharju shifts to poetic verse whenever the men communicate with the sieidi (underlining its supernatural status, and in a style that is reminiscent of mythical epic poetry). Qvigstad’s more prosaic and sober rendering has the two men’s communication with the stone in the first text only in referred speech: “... they said between themselves that if they got a lot of fish, they would cook some of the entrails and smear the fat on the sieidi” (Qvigstad 1926: 344). In the second text, the communication is reported as direct speech, but it seems to be more directed towards the fishing mates than towards the stone: “Iso-Salkku said: “That poor one has been standing there for so long all dried up and rusted, he needs to be smeared with fat”” (Qvigstad 1926: 344). While Paulaharju’s version seems to leave little doubt that the men take actions with respect to the stone that are based on a strong and authentic belief in the sieidi’s powers, Qvigstad’s version seems to be more equivocal in the description of what is really going on here.

The movement of a narrative from a local Sámi cultural context to a published text points to the importance of contexts for the value and meaning given to a certain cultural item. But this changing contextualization also has other implications. With Bauman and Briggs (1992) one may say that the folklorists by collecting these narratives about the sieidi decontextualized the oral versions they heard, to recontextualize them (in various ways) in written versions (with varying interpretations) which establishes them as something new. But these movements not only change meanings, the change in context also changes power relations. In this process:

... producers of discourse assert (tacitly or explicitly) that they possess the authority needed to decontextualize discourse that bears these historical

and social connections and to recontextualize it in the current discursive setting (Briggs & Bauman 1992: 148).

These decontextualizing and recontextualizing discourses in folklore research might not have influenced the local narratives directly or immediately, but certainly had the potentiality of doing so, at least in the longer perspective. Any interest in the sieidís from the outside world had the potential of interfering with fine balances that existed locally between different belief systems, and between different strategies for managing local resources.

Ethnographic Authenticity and Local Tricksters

But there is yet another story connected to this sacrificial stone, and this time the narrative comes from the families of the unlucky fishermen in the Skilggašjávri narrative above. This narrative concerns Samuli Paulaharju's visit to Oskal and Oskkal áddjá in 1921. This time the visit is interpreted and related from the local Sámi point of view. This story reached me from my colleague at Finnmark University College, the Sámi cultural researcher Odd Mathis Hætta who himself grew up in Siebe, a farmstead not far from Skilggašjávri (Hætta 2003). In an article from 1993, Hætta relates from his father's family narratives the story about Samuli Paulaharju visiting Guovdageaidnu, Oskal and Skilggašjávri. In Hætta's words, Samuli Paulaharju came to Kautokeino once in the early 1920s, with the purpose of describing and photographing the old sieidi in Skilggašjávri. In Kautokeino, he first turned to the local *lensmann* (sheriff), but was then sent to Oskkal áddjá as the person who would be most likely to know the whereabouts of the sacrificial stone. One day just after Midsummer, Paulaharju arrived at the Oskal farmstead, a little more than 20 kilometers south of Kautokeino church. Oskkal áddjá's son, Isak Andersen Oskal (1893–1964), and his companion, Daniel Mathisen Hætta (1904–1995) from the neighboring farmstead of Siebe (who was professor Odd Mathis Hætta's father), were just preparing for their annual fishing trip with draw-nets to

Skilggašjávri, and Samuli Paulaharju was allowed to follow them to the lake. But before the three of them left, Oskkal áddjá took the two young boys aside and gave them the following instructions:

“As you know, today no sieidi can any longer be found by lake Skilggaš, but one of you two can accompany the Finn into the *fiskegamme* (fishing turf-hut), make coffee, and have a rest. The other can walk along the beach at the southeastern end of the lake, find a suitable stone and raise it there, so that the Finn is satisfied.” And while Isak Oskal went to the *gamme* with Paulaharju, Daniel Hætta went some hundred meters along the beach, and found an approximately one meter high triangular, flat stone that he raised there (Hætta 1993: 16; my translation from Norwegian).

That was the stone documented by Paulaharju in his books *Lapin muisteluksia* (Paulaharju 1922) and *Seitoja ja Seidan pylvontaa* (Paulaharju 1932). But when Paulaharju describes the sieidi in anthropomorphic terms as: “... a little, diminutive brown Lapp grey-beard, dressed in a worn out coat of reindeer fur...” (Paulaharju 1977: 156), “... brown and rough...”, and “... the little brown stone god...” (1977: 157), this is probably due to the fact that Daniel had found the stone he looked for under water in the lake. There are no brown-colored rocks in the area, but a sea weed (algae) in the water colors the stones under the water brown (based on my own observations when visiting the area).

Contrary to the narratives collected by the folklorists who visited the area, this narrative seems to question many of the established scholarly “truths” about the stone. Was the stone after all not so important to the Sámi in the area, as only some thirty years after what happened in the narratives they were no longer able to remember where the stone could be found? Had the local Sámi fooled the foreign researcher by concentrating his attention on a false stone? Or could it have been the right stone all along, with later narration obscuring its status? Was this narrated because the local Sámi did not know where the real sieidi was, or was the narrative told

to protect the real whereabouts of a genuine sieidi? Is it possible that Oskkal-áddjá was ignorant of the existence of a stone with which he himself had had supernatural experiences, or that Daniel Hætta had never been told about the stone his father had similar experiences with, in an area they visited every year?

This new narrative certainly reestablishes the multivocality of the older narratives. It creates a new ambivalence in relation to the established understandings of the stone at many different levels. It obscures whether the stone that Paulaharju documented is really the authentic sieidi. This in turn influences the question of the “authenticity” of the stone in its other contexts, including its textual and photographic appearances in books. This narrative might even have been told in a humorous setting, and not meant to be taken altogether seriously in the first place. The lack of more contextual information about actual performances makes this difficult to establish. But the main function of this narrative could well be understood as counter-hegemonic, hence also the description of the foreign ethnographer being sent to a specific farm by the local representative of the Norwegian authorities. The ambiguity created around the status of the stone certainly affects the meanings communicated in a very effective way. Values are turned upside down, when the important Sámi sieidi is revealed as just any ordinary stone. Questions of ownership turn out to be irrelevant, as the value of the in-authentic stone is more or less absurd in any given context.

Heritage, Removal and Repatriation

Samuli Paulaharju had no doubts about the authenticity of the stone he had photographed at Lake Skilggaš. To him this was a genuine Sámi sieidi. This is also the reason for his fascination with the stone, and not only with the narratives about it. The sieidi must also have been the reason for setting out on the journey to Skilggašjávri in 1921 together with the two young men. Paulaharju wanted to see the sieidi with his own eyes, and as a cultural researcher he also wanted to document it in the proper, scientific way.

Further attempts to move the sieidi followed, this

time as a part of Finnish heritage building. Later, after Samuli Paulaharju had returned to Finland, he participated in efforts to have the sieidi moved from Norway to Finland, so that it could find a new place at the *Suomen kansallismuseo* (the Finnish National Museum) in Helsinki. Why he chose this specific sieidi as the one to make a part of Finland’s ethnographic heritage is not easy to understand. An ample amount of fishing sieidis by the many lakes of northern Finland would have seemed equally accessible. But in his texts Samuli Paulaharju seems to have been fascinated by this stone because of its antropomorphic shape. The comparatively light weight of the stone (74 kg, based on measurements made by Odd Mathis Hætta and myself in 2005) might also have made the stone an appealing candidate for transport to Helsinki. But other ideas, more directly connected to cultural politics, could have influenced the decision to move a sieidi from the Norwegian side of the national border to a museum in Finland. At this time, the Finnish National Museum saw it as one of their main obligations to exhibit ethnographic objects from other cultures belonging to the Fenno-Ugric “family”, but not from within the national borders of the Finnish nation state. The political message that these collections conveyed was that they established Finland as the responsible keeper, defender and guardian of small Fenno-Ugric peoples who existed as minorities in nation states dominated by other ethnic and linguistic groups. Finland took on the role of “father figure”, the paternal safeguard of these small peoples, and this became an important issue in the cultural politics of the Finnish nation (Anttonen 2005: 172f).

An application for the stone’s removal was sent to the Norwegian authorities, but it was turned down. In the early 1920s, this refusal was probably not based on any awareness that one should respect and protect the culture and religion of an indigenous population. At this time, Norway was, like Finland, a young nation and had early on secured regulations to protect national heritage. When the Union with Sweden ended in 1905, the ownership of the newly excavated Viking ship *Osebergskipet* became uncertain, and the danger that this important national

symbol could end up in Sweden called for immediate new laws and regulations to secure the national cultural heritage. In this context it was important that the sieidi was on the Norwegian side of the border, and that the Sámi who used it were Norwegian Sámi.

But Paulaharju's interpretation of the refusal to have the sieidi moved to the Finnish National Museum again sets it in the context of his construction of a specific Sámi religious attitude. In a footnote to his book *Lapin muisteluksia* from 1922, Paulaharju presents his version of what had happened:

A proof that the Lapps still have faith in their old sieidi is that when it recently was planned to ship the stone to the National Museum in Helsinki, and the authorities in Kautokeino had given their consent, the Lapps refused to agree to this transfer. They feared that if the stone was removed they would forever lose their fishing luck in Skilggašjávri (Paulaharju 1922: 172; my translation from Finnish).

This statement further contributes to the ethnographic entextualization of what was now understood as an important cultic stone in Sámi culture. It is now possible to understand how effective the local counternarrative was in preventing this development. That narrative sheds a slightly absurd light on the whole attempt to bring the stone to Finland, including the official letter-writing back and forth between national authorities. But even though knowledge of the stone, a certain interpretation of its use, and a literary and poetic rendering of the narratives attached to its use had entered other localities and contexts, the stone itself rested in its old location. Its old use could have been continued there, at the same time as it now had attained the status of an ethnographic specimen, as well as a valuable piece of heritage. But what would have happened if the stone had really been brought to Finland?

This development can best be understood in relation to another fishing sieidi in the Kautokeino area, a stone that was not left in its place but set in motion over great distances. Already in 1786 Samuel Bugge Budde (1755–1792), then the clergyman responsible

for the Christian congregation in the Kautokeino area, wrote about a stone pillar at "Kargovara": "... which the Sámi in Koutokejno have worshipped and brought sacrifices to in the old days" (Budde 1808[1786]: 507; my translation from Danish). The Aurora Borealis researcher Sophus Tromholt (1851–1896), who stayed in Kautokeino between 1882 and 1883, wrote that the stone had been in use until recently, and added that two men would be capable of moving it (Tromholt 1885: 432). In 1906, Brage Høyem (1874–1960), who was then the clergyman of Kautokeino, had the sieidi removed from its old place and brought to the Ethnographic Museum in the Norwegian capital, then called Kristiania, where it became a part of the Sámi exhibitions. When the Sámi ethnographic collections later were transferred to the Norwegian Folk Museum for political reasons (see Mathisen 2000: 185f), the sieidi followed the collections in that relocation. In these new surroundings, the stone was again made an important part of the exhibition of Sámi culture.

But times and (ethno)politics changed again, and in 1996 an official request was sent from Kautokeino Sámi Searvi (the Kautokeino Sámi Association) to the Norwegian Folk Museum, demanding that the stone be repatriated and brought back to its old place at Gárgovárri. The letter following the request argued that the removal of the fishing sieidi from Gárgovárri had caused the fisheries to be very poor in the lakes surrounding that area. As we have seen, traditional narratives support the idea that the removal of a fishing sieidi would have dire consequences for fishing. In the new political context of 1996, the request to have the sieidi repatriated could be supported by indigenous Sámi political and administrative authorities. The Department of Environmental and Heritage Affairs at the Sámi Parliament (*Sametingets miljø- og kulturvernavdeling*) assisted in tracking the present location of the sieidi in the museum and in claiming repatriation (Schanche 2002). The sieidi was now seen as something that belonged to the entire Sámi population, or better yet: the Sámi as an indigenous ethnic group. The Sámi department at the Norwegian Folk Museum responded positively to the idea, and the sieidi was transported back to

Kautokeino in 1997. Two years later, a ceremony in the centre of Kautokeino marked the repatriation and the *seiði* was brought back to its original place at Gárgovárri (Edbom 2005: 28). In the Sámi department at the Norwegian Folk Museum there is now a cast copy of the *seiði*. This copy of a *seiði* represents an interesting parallel to the “fake *seiði*” that Daniel Hætta presented to Paulaharju in the former narrative. This cast copy seems to have retained its value as a heritage specimen worthy of exhibition in a museum, at least as long as it is presented with a contextualizing narrative. In the present exhibition, the copied *seiði* has a label explaining some of the history of the stone. The end of the text reads like this: “We do not know if there are now more fish to be had in the lakes around Gárgovárri. But an old injustice to the local population had been made good again” (Norsk Folkemuseum, quoted in Conrad 2004: 187).

The ethno-political implication of the repatriation is clear; the process illustrates an important, anti-colonial stance among indigenous peoples globally. But both the process of colonization and the work of bringing a colonized culture back to the people, who due to the ethno-political development now have been rightfully established as its moral owners, have altered the meanings attached to these cultural objects. The *seiði* at Gárgovárri is now a repatriated *seiði*, prior to this first taken from its original location by the representative of the local clergy, then exhibited in the Ethnographic Museum in Kristiania as a Lapp specimen, and then transferred to the Norwegian Folk Museum in Oslo as a cultural object from the Sámi, a people living within the borders of the Norwegian nation state. After all these transformations, it may be the same stone, but it is hardly the same authentic *seiði*.

The American folklorist JoAnn Conrad, who has written on the use of Sámi traditions in contemporary ethno-politics (Conrad 1999), mentions the Gárgovárri *seiði* in a footnote to an article on relations between place-claiming and ethno-politics, and provides the following observation from a visit to the local museum in Kautokeino:

Its location, as well as those of many other such *seite*, is indicated by push pins on a map in the Kautokeino Museum. In June 2000, visiting the museum, I asked the director, Alf Isak Keskitalo, about the locations and functions of some of these sites. When he came over to the map, however, all of the push pins had been mixed up and placed randomly – a favorite activity of visiting school kids, according to Keskitalo, so that the location of these sites again has become somewhat indefinite (Conrad 2004: 187).

At a certain level, these “subversive” activities performed by school children continue the strategic obfuscation of the narrators who perform the story about two young Sámi fishermen bringing a Finnish ethnographer to Lake Skilggaš in 1921. The narrative obscures the status of the stone, since authenticity is such an important factor in the construction and evaluation of heritage sites. In this way the actions of the school children in the museum also interfere with the heritage status of the *seiðis*, but obscuring their location has the possibility of preserving other functions the *seiðis* might still have out there on the tundra.

Power, Property, and Multivocality in a Border Zone

In the ethnic, religious, national, and cultural border zone where these narratives take place, both cultural phenomena and narratives are and have been intertwined in complex relations and set in ever changing contexts. The traditional narratives communicate these complicated relations multivocally. But such narratives transform cultural objects in various colonizing processes. They have been transformed from cultic prerequisites, then into pagan relics; into exhibited ethnographic objects, and then into repatriated objects of valued indigenous heritage. Questions of cultural value and ownership have changed considerably in the course of this process, and the meanings attached to these natural stones have made them cultural objects, transforming in the course of dislocation and movement from one cultural context to another.

Instead of looking at this as *one* coherent development, I suggest it should be understood as many different narratives taking place in various contexts, where people are planning their actions and formulating their narratives based on changing motives and rationales. The question of ownership and cultural property is easier to grasp in this perspective. All of the narratives have been produced by acting subjects who in their different contexts argue their case in relation to their particular type of *seidi* ownership. The ability to establish ownership is dependent on positioning oneself in specific contexts, and being able to attain an amount of power and influence in these contexts.

Ownership with regard to the *seidis* is at once simple and complex. The colonizing aspects present in some of the contexts produce narrative versions of relations between the *seidi* and their users of an obvious sort. In an article from 1980, Alf Isak Keskitalo clarifies the importance of understanding the contexts that up to that point had produced a body of Sámi oral tradition: “To some extent one can say that the Sámi treasure of tales is like a wax cabinet exhibiting the remnants of the territorial, state building peoples of the north. There has been a meeting between iron and wax” (Keskitalo 1980: 101; my translation from Swedish).

But as I have pointed to, the Sámi narratives can also be used in counter-narrative strategies, aimed at confusing some of the hegemonic narratives being established by external or colonizing forces. Strategies of avoidance and the use of deception instead of open confrontation in such contexts can be found in Sámi folklore (Hætta 1993; Saressalo 1987), as well as in other areas of ethnic or border zone folklore (Basso 1979; Paredes 1993). It is perfectly understandable in specific historical contexts, where other peoples have colonized areas and resources for centuries. Ownership to the *seidis* can be constituted through narrative strategies.

The combination of valorization, organization, social agency and political power inevitably has produced hierarchies and differences. This is not different in the heritage context. The same hierarchies are being established in negotiations and ongoing strug-

gles in heritage contexts all the time, and it bears consequences for questions of ownership. Discussions about heritage preservation among officials given the responsibility for the cultural heritage of an area, or theoretical discourses among academics, can also be seen as practices of social actors who, while they certainly are a part of heritage discourses, also use certain strategies to represent and reproduce heritage in various projects designated for specific purposes.

Analyzing the various narratives in context brings out the agency of the actors involved and reveals the multivocality of the narratives. The different narratives in changing contexts presented in this analysis can be understood in relation to various agencies. The narratives are about actants often acting contrary to the traditional and prescribed ways; in so doing, they relate to conflicts or tensions between traditions and individuals, between different traditions, and between different ways of relating to traditions. Even if these factors often are simplified in the entextualization processes, the multivocality of the narratives relating to religious, ethnic and social categories can still be analyzed in contextual perspective as examples of narrative agency, and strategies to seek control of ownership associated with the *seidis*.

Notes

- 1 Ellen Johnsdatter Utsi, “Jonssa-Elle” (1902–1988). As a 24-year-old, she told Qvigstad 40 of the tales and legends printed in his collection of Sámi folktales and legends (see more information on this narrator in Skjelbred 2001: 47ff). It is likely that the narratives were related to Qvigstad at a time when Jonso-Elle visited the hospital in Tromsø.
- 2 Laestadianism was a Lutheran religious movement named after its founder, Lars Levi Laestadius (1800–1861) who was the clergyman of Karesuando in Swedish Lapland.
- 3 Jens Andreas Friis (1821–1896), professor of Sámi and Kven languages at the University of Kristiania. He also wrote popular novels based on Sámi culture, and dedicated himself to improving religious conditions among the Sámi.
- 4 The original text in Qvigstad: “... Os’kal-ad’ dja (...) erzählte, dass er einst mit seinem Halbbruder Salomon Salomonsen, gewöhnlich Hukka-Salkku oder Iso-

Salkku genannt, am Skilgaš-jaw're mit Zugnetz fischte. Als sie das Netz in den See warfen, sagten sie unter sich, wenn sie viele Fische fingen, würden sie die Eingeweide kochen und mit deren Fett den Seiden schmieren. Iso-Salkku sagte: 'Der Arme hat jetzt dort so lange gestanden und ist vertrocknet und gerostet; er hat nötig geschmiert zu werden.' Als sie das Netz nahe ans Land gezogen hatten, so dass der Netz-sack nur 70–80 Meter entfernt war, sahen sie, dass das Netz von Fischen wimmelte. Da sagte Iso-Salkku: 'Der Henker sollte sich an den alten Teufel (*rietas*) dort kehren; denn die Fische sind jetzt unser.' Os'kal-ad'dja stimmte ihm darin bei. Kaum hatten sie so gesprochen, als ein heftiger Windstoss kam, der das Netz auf einen Steingrund trieb. Dort blieb es stecken; sie konnten es nur mit grosser Mühe losmachen, und dann waren die Fische weg."

- 5 The original text in Qvigstad: "Später wollte einmal Mattis Mattisen Hætta aus *Siebe* denselben Versuch machen. Er wartete, bis er den Netzsack ans Land gezogen hatte. Es waren viele Fische darin, aber nicht mehr als dass ein Mann konnte den Netzsack heben. Als Mattis ihn auf das Ufer heben wollte, kehrte er das Gesicht dem Seiden zu und sagte: 'Jetzt brauche ich deine Hilfe nicht mehr; denn diese Fische sind jetzt mein.' Indem er den Netzsack in die Höhe hob, zerriss dieser, und alle Fische schlüpfen wieder ins Wasser hinaus."
- 6 Kilkasjaur is the Finnish version of Sámi Skilggašjávri.
- 7 The original poetic part of the text in Paulaharju reads like this (in Finnish):
 "On huono sää
 Veämme nyt palvoskalaa
 Jos saamme hyvin kalaa
 Niin kyllä voijamme sinut rasvalla.
 Kyllä sinä, raukka, olet siinä ruostunut.
 Mutta jos saamme hyvin kalaa,
 Nin kyllä me sinulle tuomme rasvaa,
 Ja puhistamme sinut" (quoted by Paulaharju 1932: 14).
- 8 The original verse reads (in Paulaharju's transcription of Sámi language):
 "Addi munji kuulit,
 nuko ouddike addam!
 Me vuuoilli vuojiam duu" (Paulaharju 1932: 14).

References

Unpublished

Discussions with associate professor Odd Mathis Hætta (b. 1940) about the Skilggašjávri sieidi, Alta, Siebe and Skilggašjávri 2005.

Literature

Antonen, Pertti 2005: *Tradition through Modernity. Post-*

modernism and the Nation-State in Folklore Scholarship. (Studia Fennica Folkloristica 15.) Helsinki: SKS.

- Basso, Keith H. 1979: *Portraits of 'the Whiteman'. Linguistic Play and Cultural Symbols among the Western Apache.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bergsland, Knut 1986: Sørsamiske arvefjell på 1700-tallet. *Åarjel-saemieh. Samer i sør. Saemien Sijte Årbok* 2 (1984/85–86), 55–78.
- Briggs, Charles L. & Richard Bauman 1992: Genre, Intertextuality, and Social Power. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 2: 2, 131–172.
- Budde, Samuel Bugge 1808[1786]: Blandede Efterretninger om Koutokejno's og Afjovarra's Præstegjeld, i Finmarken's Amt og Throndhjem's Stift i Norge. *Theologisk Maanedsskrift*, hefte XII (1808), 502–568. København.
- Cocq, Coppélie 2008: Polyphony in Sámi Narratives. *Journal of Folklore Research* 45, No. 2, 193–228. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Conrad, JoAnn 1999: *Contested Terrain. Land, Language, and Lore in Contemporary Sami Politics.* Ph.D. dissertation. Berkeley: University of California, Berkeley.
- Conrad, JoAnn 2004: Mapping Space, Claiming Place. The (Ethno-) Politics of Everyday Geography in Northern Norway. In: Anna-Leena Siikala, Barbro Klein & Stein R. Mathisen (eds.), *Creating Diversities. Folklore, Religion and the Politics of Heritage*, 165–189. (Studia Fennica Folkloristica 14.) Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.
- Edbom, Gunilla 2005: *Samiskt kulturarv i samlingar. Rapport från ett projekt om återföringsfrågor gällande samiska föremål.* Arkeologisk rapport 2005:1. Jokkmokk: Åjtte.
- Friis, J.A. 1880[1867]: *En sommer i Finmarken, Russisk Lapland og Nordkarelen. Skildringer av land og folk.* 2. ed. Christiania: Alb. Cammermeyer.
- Friis, J.A. 1881: *Fra Finmarken. Skildringer.* Kristiania: Alb. Cammermeyer.
- Hætta, Lars Jakobsen 1923 [written between 1856 and 1863]: En beretning om de religiøse og moralske forhold i Kautokeino før den læstadianske vækkelse. *Norvegica Sacra* 1923, 39–79.
- Hætta, Odd Mathis 1993: Samiske offersteder. *Fortidsvern* 3, 12–17.
- Hætta, Odd Mathis 2003: Siebe – etterkrigstid og marginalitet i grenseland. In: Marit Anne Hauan et al. (eds.), *Karlsøy og verden utenfor. Kulturhistoriske perspektiver på nordnorske steder*, 149–161. Tromsø: Tromsø Museum.
- Keskitalo, Alf Isak 1980: Om möjligheten av folklore som ett hinder i en etnisk inkorporasjonsprocess. *Tradisjon. Tidsskrift for folkeminnevitenskap* 10, 97–101. Oslo.
- Klein, Barbro 2007: Folklore Archives, Heritage Politics and Ethical Dilemmas: Notes on Writing and Printing. In: Bente Gullveig Alver, Tove Ingebjørg Fjell & Ørjar Øyen (eds.), *Research Ethics in Studies of Culture and Social Life*, 114–136. (FF Communications No. 292.) Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.

- Kohl-Larsen, Ludwig 1971: *Reiter auf dem Elch. Volkserzählungen aus Lappland*. Kassel: Erich Röth-Verlag.
- Kuutma, Kristin 2006: *Collaborative Representations. Interpreting the Creation of a Sámi Ethnography and a Seto Epic*. (FF Communications 289.) Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.
- Leem, Knud 1767: *Beskrivelse over Finmarkens Lapper, deres Tungemaal, Levemaade og forrige Afgudsdyrkelse*. København: Trykt udi det Kongel. Waysenhuses Bogtrykkerie. [Facsimile edition 1975, København: Rosenkilde og Bagger.]
- Mathisen, Stein R. 2000: Travels and Narratives. Itinerant Constructions of a Homogenous Sami Heritage. In: Pertti Anttonen et al. (eds.), *Folklore, Heritage Politics and Ethnic Diversity. A Festschrift for Barbro Klein*, 179–205. Botkyrka: Multicultural Centre.
- Paredes, América 1993: *Folklore and Culture on the Texas-Mexican Border*. Austin: CMAS Books.
- Paulaharju, Samuli 1922: *Lapin muisteluksia*. Helsinki: Kirja. (Swedish translation in: Paulaharju 1977.)
- Paulaharju, Samuli 1932: *Seitoja ja Seidan palvontaa. Suomi* V: 15, III, 1–54. Helsinki.
- Paulaharju, Samuli 1977: *Lappmarksminnen*. (Swedish translation of Paulaharju 1922 by William Snell.) Stockholm: Rabén & Sjögren.
- Pratt, Mary Louise 1992: *Imperial Eyes. Travel Writing and Transculturation*. London: Routledge.
- Qvigstad, Just Knud 1926: *Lappische Opfersteine und heilige Berge in Norwegen*. (Oslo Etnografiske Museums Skrifter bind 1 hefte 5.) Oslo: A.W. Brøggers boktrykkeri a/s.
- Qvigstad, Just Knud 1928: *Lappiske eventyr og sagn II. Lappiske eventyr og sagn fra Troms og Finnmark*. *Instituttet for sammenlignende Kulturforskning. Serie B: Skrifter X*. Oslo: Aschehoug.
- Rosaldo, Renato 1989: *Culture and Truth. The Remaking of Social Analysis*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Saressalo, Lassi 1987: The Threat from Without. An Examination of Defensive Ethnic Folklore. In: Tore Ahlbäck (ed.), *Saami Religion*, 251–259. (Scripta Instituti Donneriani Aboensis XII.) Uppsala.
- Schanche, Audhild 2002: Museer, gjenstander, rettigheter. In: *Vem äger kulturarvet? Anföranden vid konferens om återföringsfrågor vid Åjtte, svenskt fjäll- och samemuseum*, 29–33. (Duoddaris 20.) Jokkmokk: Åjtte.
- Skanke, Hans 1943–45[1730]: *Epitomes Historiæ Missionis Lapponicæ, 1730*. Ed. by Johs. Falkenberg. In: *Nordnorske Samlinger utgitt av Etnografisk Museum V: 1–30*, 175–256. Oslo: A.W. Brøggers boktrykkeri.
- Skjelbred, Ann Helene Bolstad 2001: 'These Stories Will Not Lead You To Heaven.' An Encounter with Two Sámi Narrators. *Folklore* 112, 47–63. London: Routledge Journals; Taylor & Francis.
- Smith, P.L. 1938: *Kautokeino og Kautokeino-lappene. En historisk og ergologisk regionalstudie*. (Institutt for sammenlignende kulturforskning B 34.) Oslo: Aschehoug.
- Solem, Erik 1933: *Lappiske rettsstudier*. (Institutt for sammenlignende kulturforskning, Serie B. Skrifter XXIV.) Oslo: Aschehoug.
- Sveen, Arvid 2003: *Mytisk landskap*. Stamsund: Orkana.
- Tromholt, Sophus 1885: *Under Nordlysets Straaler. Skildringer fra Lappernes Land*. Kjøbenhavn: Gyldendalske Boghandels Forlag. (English translation: *Under the Rays of Aurora Borealis. In the Land of the Lapps and Kvæns I–II*. London: Sampson Low 1885.)
- Turi, Johan 1917: *En bok om samernas liv. Muittalus samid birra*. Uppsala.
- Zorgdrager, Nellejet 1997: *De rettferdiges strid. Kautokeino 1852. Samisk motstand mot norsk kolonialisme*. Nesbru: Vett&Viten/Norsk folkemuseum.
- Stein R. Mathisen is associate professor at Finnmark University College, Norway. He has written articles on narratives and ethnicity, and is currently working on border cultures and manifestations of border heritages. (sroar@hifm.no)