3 Heritage discourse and voices of change

Kadri Koreinik and Laura Hodsdon

Any consideration of heritage that addresses notions of majority and minority must inevitably engage with notions of power, of potential dissonance and contestation, that shape the heritage contexts under study. Indeed, critical heritage studies have engaged extensively with these dynamics in highlighting that heritage is socially constructed and therefore, intertwined with processes of power and privilege, not neutral. The role of discourse in shaping and controlling what can be considered 'heritage' has also been identified as particularly important (Smith 2006). In this chapter, we draw on heritage and language studies to consider the discursive dynamics of national majority and minority cultures and their intangible cultural heritage (ICH), which incorporates discourses that can both confine and liberate. In particular, we focus on tools and approaches that can be used to analyse discourse in this context and those that might effect change. In better understanding what voices are present in the ecosystem, how they interact, and how they construct perspectives on difference, discourse, language, and heritage as intimately related facets of their minority identity, we seek practical pathways to revoice minority ICH within a hegemonic discourse.

The rationale for attending to discourse is interwoven with how key concepts are socially constructed. The label 'minority' is an inherently relative term denoting its counterpart 'majority', and in that relation lies a plethora of economic, political, and spatial dynamics that contribute to the construction and maintenance of difference. For our purposes, minoritisation can also be understood as a social process with potential material consequences in terms of distribution of resources or social inequality. It involves construction of difference that leads to 'systemic inequalities, oppression, and marginalization [which] place individuals into "minority" status' (Sotto-Santiago 2019: 73). Through minoritisation (note the de-agentialised use of the word 'minoritisation'), which can be transmitted and reified through, for example, master narratives or mainstream discourses and (inter)national institutions, minority and majority groups in a given context are established and maintained. One mechanism by which these differences are discursively constructed germane to the study of minority ICH is described by linguistic anthropologists Susan Gal and Judith Irvine (Irvine & Gal 2000, Gal & Irvine 2019), who offer a semiotic approach to understanding ideologised processes construing 'convincing stereotypes of people, spaces and activities'. Gal and Irvine were concerned with

better understanding the discursive nature of difference 'in language and in social life' and how such discourses 'naturalise hierarchy and domination' (2019: 1), and therefore offer a useful account of these processes in our context of national minority and majority cultures. Although originally formulated to describe language ideologies (Irvine & Gal 2000), their account of 'the semiotics of differentiation' (Gal & Irvine 2019) can also describe broader dynamics and has been extended to consider, for example, ideologies of communication (Spitzmüller 2022). Language ideologies 'connect discourse with lived experiences' (Woolard 1998: 27), and as such complement more explicitly social formulations of such processes while retaining a focus on the discursive, the voiced, that also fits ICH's performative, social character. Gal and Irvine outline some discursive processes by which construction of difference can occur, including:

– *Iconization* which 'involves a transformation of the sign relationship between linguistic features (varieties) and the social images with which they are linked' (Irvine & Gal 2000: 37). These features are then made to be (and are subsequently interpreted as being) iconic of the identities of the speakers. For example, Livonian speakers are given attributes such as being tall; Frisian speakers as freedom-loving, independently minded and stubborn; a Cornish accent stereotyped as harmless but simple. In such a way, stereotypes are galvanised as part of a majority-forged narrative that then becomes an integral part of the discourse concerning that minority group.
– *Fractal recursivity* in which binaries or categories, which do not form taxonomies, are created, such as dividing landscapes into East and West (Gal & Irvine 2019).
– *Erasure*, the process by which these distinctions are built and maintained 'in which ideology […] renders some persons or activities […] invisible' (Irvine & Gal 2000: 38) or in other words, 'experience that does not fit is erased' (Gal & Irvine 2019: 137). For example, providing signage only in English erases the visual presence and awareness of societal and individual multilingualism (Bednarek & Meek 2024); language endangerment discourses have ignored semi-speakers, passive language users and other linguistic knowledges or skills, because the intention has been to document the last 'real' speakers of the 'dying' language (Meek 2016; Bednarek & Meek 2024: np).

These processes are not self-sufficient but (re)produced by people, as 'people construct ideological representations of linguistic differences' (Irvine & Gal 2000: 37) – and, by implication, cultural differences. The processes of iconisation, fractal recursivity, and erasure can be imagined working well outside the realm of language ideologies. For example, Cosgrove (1984/1998) holds that each socioeconomic formation, state or another form of governance makes efforts to 'erase' the landscape of an earlier formation (see Vītola et al., this volume). As these semiotic processes indicate, these representations may originate from hegemonic discourses. This power relationship has real-world consequences and causes, but is to some degree constructed and maintained in the narratives and imaginaries of

powerful discursive actors. The social process of minoritisation, then, is in part a discursive one in which majority ideologies construct and assign the cultural position of the minority as such.

The social construction of heritage likewise draws on discursive processes articulated and embedded by powerful actors, and presupposes a socially constructed process of meaning-making. As Laurajane Smith famously asserts, 'there is no such thing as heritage', but rather it is a cultural practice (Smith 2006: 13ff) that is contained and constrained by an authorised heritage discourse (AHD). Besides conceiving of heritage as (im)material artefacts, heritage can be regarded 'as a cultural and social process, which engages with acts of remembering that work to create ways to understand and engage with the present' (Smith 2006: 2). Since heritage is a discourse, 'a form of social practice […] meanings, forms of knowledge and expertise, power relations and ideologies are reproduced through language' (Smith 2006 : 2). And just as processes of minoritisation can be understood as being constructed and maintained by mechanisms such as those described by Gal and Irvine above, heritage itself is intimately linked with voicings of power and privilege. This has consequences: as Smith says, the idea of discourse as a social action 'acknowledges that the way people talk about, discuss and understand things, such as "heritage", *have a material consequence that matters'* (Smith 2006: 14; *our emphasis*). Stereotypes constructed via iconisation (often exoticising or patronising) about people, place, and culture; erasure in which distinctive cultures are assimilated to the majority – we can see these processes coming together within an ICH context, as Hodsdon and Moenandar describe in this volume. In seeking to counter the AHD and seek socially just outcomes, it is therefore important that inclusive approaches to heritage engage proactively with any discursive constructions that 'may inadvertently work to discourage the equitable participation of those groups whose understandings of the nature of heritage are excluded from that discourse' (Waterton et al. 2006: 340). Just as the nature of ICH as a social practice invites focus on its broader sociological context as we do in this volume, so a better understanding of its discursive dynamics (as a facet of that social practice) is important in both countering the AHD and filling the discursive gaps it has left behind. So in this chapter, first we consider how discourse studies have been brought to bear on understanding – and in seeking to dismantle – hegemonies, including the AHD; then, we explore the potential of combining a critical approach to discourse analysis with an appreciative one in seeking to open up the space to revoice minority ICH.

Discourse, hegemony, and (intangible cultural) heritage

One genealogy of hegemony comes from post-structuralist discourse scholars, Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe. With their aim 'to establish the "archaeology of silence"' – echoing Gal & Irvine's concept of erasure described above – they hold that the concept of hegemony 'alludes to a kind of contingent intervention required by the crisis or collapse of what would have been a "normal" historical development' (Laclau & Mouffe 2001: 7). Moreover, they 'try to detect the presence of

that void which the logic of hegemony will attempt to fill' (Laclau & Mouffe 2001: 8). For example, building 'the unified national state' was among the most prominent political projects that necessitated hegemony (Laclau & Mouffe 2001: 7–42, 65–71). The ultimate task of nation-building is creating or strengthening a single collective identity which transcends ethnic, cultural, and linguistic differences both regional and based on social classes: 'the nation is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship' (Anderson 1983: 6–7).

The AHD is likewise a discursive construction based on a hegemony in which institutions have shaped what heritage is, and what it is not. Its manifestation upon ICH has been discussed (Smith 2006; Smith & Waterton 2009), and although ICH does present something of a challenge to the AHD, the extent to which it has successfully challenged existing power relations is less clear (Smith 2015; Akagawa & Smith 2019). This is readily evident in the somewhat patronising tone of much media coverage of ICH. For example, one UK newspaper headline reporting UNESCO listing reads: 'What links baguettes, bees and bear hunts? All join UNESCO "human treasures" list', with the subtitle 'French delegates at conference greet announcement with delight, *brandishing bread sticks aloft'* (Henley 2022 (*The Guardian*); *our emphasis*) (see Hodsdon & Moenandar, this volume, for a more in-depth analysis of othering or erasing media discourse of ICH). In this example, a discursive construction is doubly at work where an AHD works to discredit ICH via belittling language – hinted at in the headline and confirmed in the subtitle – seeking its erasure in relation to a tangible, Western norm; and where the culture to whom the ICH belongs is likewise iconised by being cast as comic figures in a tableau which evokes medieval peasants wielding pitchforks, and thereby constructs French people as different from – and arguably inferior to – the author of the piece, here representing a British majority voice. While a French majority may be viewed by the UK media as 'fair game', such framings of ICH are not without consequence, particularly for minoritised cultures, in which the impact of the discursive minoritisation in creating broader narratives can have real-world consequences in terms of autonomy or resource allocation, for example.

In the context of minority ICH, indeed, discourse analysis has been less prominent an analytical tool beyond broad considerations in the context of the AHD (e.g. Waterton & Smith 2009; Smith 2015), including UNESCO's policy context, on which Melis and Chambers (2021) and Melis, Wise, and Badurina (2022) have used Foucauldian analysis to consider 'ICH' as a discursive object bound up with that of UNESCO and related policy and legal frameworks. Indeed, the vast majority of our interview participants had not heard of 'ICH', and had difficulty understanding it when it was explained. There are fewer studies of the discourse surrounding ICH in minority contexts, despite the need to understand the various hegemonic voices at play in shaping it. Discourse studies, and the variety of discourse analytical approaches within it are, we suggest, a key way in which these particular majority–minority dynamics have been understood, and which we consider in more detail below in order to ask what the basis might be of a minority ICH that is underpinned by counter-hegemonic and inclusive discursive principles.

Emancipatory discourse studies? From critical to appreciative approaches

Most discursive studies in one way or another either apply or depart from the Foucauldian understanding of discourse. By forming 'the object of which they speak', discourses are conditioned by the regularities of a particular discursive formation (Foucault 1972: 49). Yet 'discourse' has also been used somewhat vaguely in theory and research (Pennycook 1994; Jørgensen & Philips 2002; Waugh et al. 2016). Discourse Theoretical Analysis (DTA) and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) are two approaches that apply a critical lens, although they have conceived of the concept somewhat differently (Jørgensen & Philips 2002; Carpentier & De Cleen 2007: 277; Carpentier, De Cleen & Van Brussel 2019). Drawing on Laclau and Mouffe, with 'discourse-as-representation' or 'discourse-as-ideology', DTA regards the social as a non-exclusively discursive reality, focusing on how it is constructed via the structures of meaning (Carpentier et al. 2019: 5). DTA is preoccupied with the discursive (or ideological) constructions behind linguistic (and other signifying) practices (Carpentier, De Cleen & Van Brussel 2019: 9). This ontology has been described as having 'important critical potential, because it allows us to question the inevitability of particular representations of society, and the unchangeability of particular ways of doing and organizing communication and media. This, in turn, opens up spaces for envisaging alternatives' (Carpentier, De Cleen & Van Brussel 2019: 14). CDA is similarly interested in social justice, and brought together scholars explicitly interested in unmasking the power and interests of particular groups (e.g. van Leeuwen 1995; van Dijk 1998; van Leeuwen & Wodak 1999; for an account of its utility to heritage studies, see Waterton, Smith & Campbell 2006), by taking a more explicitly language-based approach. Arising from Critical Linguistics, CDA focuses on discourse-as-language that (re)produces unequal relationships between groups, by representing some phenomena and positioning some groups as of greater worth than others. Nevertheless, it has moved beyond Critical Linguistics in adopting an interdisciplinary approach, studying not only texts, but also their contexts (Waterton, Smith & Campbell 2006). CDA likewise explicitly distanced itself from the trend in postmodern philosophy and cultural studies to reduce the social to discourse only (van Leeuwen 2006: 290). The application of CDA in heritage contexts by Smith, Waterton, and others has enabled insight into the processes by which these hegemonic constructions take shape at an institutional level (e.g. Waterton 2010; Waterton, Smith & Campbell 2006; Whittington 2021), and in particular contexts (e.g. De Bernardi 2019; Hodsdon 2022, 2021) and forms part of a wider discursive engagement with the imbrications of societal power structures within heritage.

Casting a critical eye on these structures yields vital information about the social and discursive mechanisms by which hegemony is shaped and upheld. In considering how minority voices might be amplified as part of a polyvocal approach (see Hodsdon, this volume), the notion of revoicing implies an additional analytical frame that also attends to discursive mechanisms deployed by groups that have been minoritised in these hegemonic processes. This desire to analyse a fuller range of voices underpinned a call by scholars in discourse and language studies

for a more 'positive' discourse analysis (PDA). For them, critically oriented discourse theories that expose how hegemonic power is constructed and maintained have not achieved their 'emancipatory potential', and it has been argued that in critical approaches there is 'little space for an understanding of human agency, interpretation, or change' (Pennycook 1994: 126). CDA is clearly concerned with effecting positive social change but, as Hughes observes, although it 'explicitly theorizes both oppression and opposition, the overwhelming majority of published CDS scholarship focuses on the former', in that it attends 'primarily to semiotic mechanisms of oppression in an effort to expose hegemonic discourses and their negative impact on society' (Hughes 2018: 193). As a result, Kress has argued that CDA is not effective in advancing '(productive) accounts of alternative social organization' (Kress 2000: 16). As Martin, drawing on Kress' call, puts it, a 'positive' approach would enable a better 'understanding of how change happens, for the better, across a range of sites – how feminists remake gender relations in our world, how Indigenous people overcome their colonial heritage, how migrants renovate their new environs and so on' (2004: 184). While these negotiations are studied in the context of ICH, the use of discourse as a methodological tool and framing is less prominent. Instead of being an alternative to CDA, PDA is described as 'a necessary complement to "negative" studies aimed at progressive social change' (Hughes 2018: 196–197), or what Martin calls 'a yin/yang perspective' (Martin 2004: 183; Bartlett 2012); in other words, deconstructive and constructive activities are required for emancipation, in Critical Discourse Studies (Bartlett 2012) but also elsewhere. For example, for analysing language policy and planning,

> a deconstructive and emancipatory activity such as CDA can play a key role
> […] in reversing negative language ideologies adopted by some groups of
> speakers towards their forms of speech or writing and should be incorporated
> into positive language planning and language policy projects.
> (Lo Bianco 2009: 101)

The difference between PDA and CDA lies 'in the power position of discourse they study, the former targeting marginal, non-hegemonic discourses and the latter – hegemonic, mainstream ones' (Chojnicka 2015: 225). A 'positive' approach in our context, then, would not in and of itself attend to the shaping power structures such as derive from the AHD, although these are vital in our understanding of the dynamics at play. Rather, in *addition* to critical approaches that study how powerful voices shape discourse, they also study how marginalised voices answer back.

Despite the term being coined two decades ago, PDA is not widely used. As Bartlett (2017) suggests, its 'ambivalent status' is due to various factors such as that it *is* used in different contexts that 'often [do] not use the label directly', and that CDA 'is positive inasmuch as critique is a necessary step in promoting change for the better' (Bartlett 2017: 133). He has also suggested PDA can be reactive, that is, focused on texts that resist the hegemonic rather than considering how they gain a foothold and actively reshape them, in particular by considering the link between discursive practices and the social context that gives the 'conditions

of possibility' for their realisation (2012). It is also the case that the impact of academic analyses – CDA or not – can be realised by the nature of the recommendations they make and the ways they are translated (or not) to those who are empowered to interpret and enact them. Yet in this subtle shift in emphasis – from how power structures are maintained to how they are, or might be, dismantled – there is potential for valuable insights; like CDA, 'PDA is also fuelled by the potential for analysis to have an effect – however small – on the social world. The difference being that it analyses the discourse we like rather than the discourse we wish to criticise' (Macgilchrist 2007: 74).

Notwithstanding reservations about PDA's distinctiveness or its potential to be practically emancipatory any more than CDA has been, the lens is particularly germane to the concept of revoicing. Indeed, Bartlett (2012) considers 'revoicing' to be a key means by which PDA has an effect. Drawing, as we do throughout this volume, on the notion of polyphony, Bartlett draws on Bakhtin's definition as 'truth, or in this case power, as distributed across an array of voices and across a range of orders of indexicality in which different speakers' voices and the identities they construe for themselves are differently legitimate and hence powerful' (Bartlett 2012: 19) (see Chapter 1 for the notion of revoicing as applied in this volume). An effective voice must, as Bartlett points out, be legitimate: that is, 'one through which the individual is entitled to identify themselves within that social milieu' (Bartlett 2012: 18). While our ecosystem approach hypothesises that more voices will be identified than may be expected, it also cautions that some voices may not be legitimate in all circumstances. In an ICH ecosystem the effect of these new voices sometimes – though not always – will be a new, hybrid one forged in the in-between space of the majority—minority intercultural encounter (Bhabha 1994). This is one potential outcome of an ecosystem-level approach, as described by one aspect of our concept of revoicing, which involves better understanding the plurality of voices in a particular ICH practice. Here, 'the creation of a hybrid voice will not be an individual effort but the collaborative achievement of a variety of speakers each making their own contributions and revoicing the contributions of others as appropriate' (Bartlett 2012: 19). There may be other times when voices do not collaborate and so become hybrid, but where the power relationship can be effectively contested, disrupted, undermined, or simply sidestepped, to comprise 'a voice that carries local social structures into contexts generally dominated by the voices of outsiders' (Bartlett 2012: 16). That is, what we see in this volume is an 'amplifying' approach where majority and minority remain separate, but where the former act as allies or are in turn silenced (or choose to silence themselves).

Various methodological approaches to PDA have been advanced, although its close relationship with CDA indicates likewise a concern with linking micro-level textual features with a broader genre/situational and societal context (Fairclough 2003). Beyond this, for example, Bartlett (2012) draws on Systemic Functional Linguistics to consider the separate functions of '(i) the construal of experience, (ii) the enactment of social relations and (iii) the signalling of relations between parts of texts to each other and to the here and now of the context' which comprise respectively 'the field, tenor and mode of the discourse'. These three in combination 'activate the register of a text' (Bartlett 2012: 21). In terms of voice, this register is

'the linguistic means by which competing social systems are realised in discourse' (Bartlett 2012). Of its component parts, field deals with intratextual content (such as syntax, terminology, or control as to which concepts are under discussion and their definitions); mode is concerned with the status of the text itself and its means of transmission; tenor, with the relationality between actors and texts, such as who asks questions of whom and the positions taken towards interlocutors. Macgilchrist, conversely, considers five different discursive strategies in relation to media texts: logical inversion, parody, complexification, partial reframing and radical reframing (Macgilchrist 2016: 76). There are also examples of counter-discursive analyses and other framings as summarised by Bartlett (2017), about which there is no consensus in terms of what PDA is and how it works: although all are agreed that a more pluralistic approach to analysing what discourses there are and how they are working together to voice new narratives is a valuable complement to one that focuses on a more binary lens of power and resistance. The characterisation of these approaches as either 'negative' or 'positive' discourse analysis is, we feel, somewhat too stark and value-laden a characterisation, and we suggest 'critical' and 'appreciative' as possibly more useful framings that better describe how the two might work in tandem. 'Appreciative inquiry' was introduced in 1987 by Cooperrider & Srivastra, themselves drawing on social constructionism and discourse theory, in the context of organisational behaviour, and 'advocates collective inquiry into the best of what is in order to imagine what could be, followed by collective design of a desired future state that is compelling' (Bushe 2013).

Without prescribing an overly dogmatic approach about terminology or method, then, it seems that this broader discursive approach has the potential to provide valuable insights into the inter-relation between minoritised cultures and their constructions of narratives in and around ICH in relation to that minoritisation. In what follows, we will provide a brief, illustrative analysis (Bartlett 2017; Macgilchrist 2016) of data gathered through semi-structured interviews held with people involved in ICH, ranging from casual visitors to deeply involved volunteers and professionals (see Appendix 1 for more information on these events). These interviews were held in the context of the Golowan Festival – midsummer celebrations – in Penzance, Cornwall (UK); Padstow's May Day, a centuries-old annual celebration with festive, highly ritualised processions in another Cornish town; and a number of events centred around Livonian language and culture in Latvia and Estonia (see Appendix 2 for more information about the dataset). The aim of this analysis is to explore what sorts of insights appreciative discourse analysis might offer in terms of revoicing.

Appreciative discourse and constructions of minority intangible cultural heritage

Remembering the solar cycle in Cornwall

Both case study events in Cornwall are traditional events (Penzance Golowan revived, Padstow May Day continuous), and both align with events in the solar calendar (the summer solstice and May Day). They both retain this link alongside

normative cultural practices such as food stands and funfairs. Within each event, then (as well as within the socio-cultural lives of people from Penzance and Padstow more generally) co-exist both dominant and marginalised discourses. Applying the lens of appreciative discourse to the data reveals a variety of ways in which these discourses are reconciled, contested, or circumvented.

One local, though not Padstonian, visitor to May Day (K11), links the event to a historic Padstonian – 'of course Padstow is a fishing village originally' – and then Cornish heritage – 'you know Cornwall…mining, fishing, farming: that's our heritage, tourism came on a little bit later….[laughs]'. The 'of course' and 'originally' moves the tenor (to use Bartlett's terminology) of the statement to a position of authority relative to the interviewer. The appeal to a Padstonian and Cornish past is juxtaposed with a light-hearted parodic (to use Macgilchrist's term) dismissal of the majority narrative that overexaggerates tourism's role in Cornwall's cultural and economic identity. The link with a normative 'real' heritage of Cornwall opens space for the replacement of majority narratives such as tourism with older ones more linked to the land and which represent an alternative Cornish identity more rooted in Cornish perspectives than outsider ones. A Golowan stakeholder (K92) emphasises the importance of the solar calendar, manipulating the mode of the text across spatial scales in a way that bypasses the national majority narrative. First, they appeal to a pan-European and then global tradition, seemingly establishing its legitimacy and normality: 'we celebrate that midsummer as much as people do all around Europe, all around the world'. This global scale is then immediately juxtaposed with the reassertion of the local – 'But that has a definite presence within Penzance'. A similar tactic is used by another Padstow insider (K86), although with a negotiation in tenor foregrounding storytelling ('I was always told as a little boy') before hesitance in stating the alternative narrative: 'it's more of a …. Probably a…. Pagan um… originated in Pagan times'. But then shifting spatial scales contextualises May Day within a more authoritative, meta-national discourse, 'I know there's various other… um… traditions throughout the world that do feature the same… similar thing', emphasising May Day's paradoxical normativity within a global system. The small self-correction ('the same…similar thing') is used to segue the mode back from the global scale to the particular, re-establishing Padstow's distinctiveness: 'but I don't think there's anything quite like Padstow May Day'. In all three examples, a temporal (appeal to the original past of Cornwall) or spatial (European and global practices) link bypasses national-level narratives that privilege tourism, or that would potentially stand to other or erase it. A cultural confidence is thus forged in a way that is neither contingent on, nor seeks to directly counter, a majority narrative such as has frequently erased the voices of marginalised cultures. The role of ICH is to provide not only a focal point but a permissive context in which to enact these alternative discursive constructions of the world.

Resurrecting 'the last Livonian' in Estonia

For Livonian, the fragility of the culture and relative youth of its renaissance seemingly require different approaches to reframing majority narratives than those deployed in Cornwall, underlining Bartlett's call to account for the 'conditions of

possibility' of the socio-political contexts under which positive discourses can be enacted (2012). For many of those we interviewed, the simple act of mentioning Livonian in everyday discourse (to tourists, or national majority individuals) constituted a discursive incursion (Hodsdon 2022) into the hegemonic narrative, which reports the death of Livonian on a regular basis. This narrative has been countered more directly by, for example, an artwork in a Latvian context (arguably aligning to Macgilchrist's technique of parody) 'There Are No Livonians', an installation on the Livonian Coast by Valts Ernštreits displaying placenames in Latvian and Livonian, with the Livonian versions ironically crossed out (Figure 3.1).

In Estonia, this narrative of Livonian demise is pervasive, although there are signs that it is beginning to be countered. One Estonian creative practitioner (E4), who identifies as being of Võru (a South Estonian minority culture) heritage – linguistically similar to, but different from, Livonian – framed their encounter with this narrative as a personal, rather than collective, task. She described Livonian

Figure 3.1 Installation 'There Are No Livonians' (2021), by Valts Ernštreits (Photo: Valts Ernštreits).

(aligning with the field of the majority narrative) as 'maybe even like a mythological concept' in which 'what I knew about Livonian was that the last Livonian as a native language speaker passed away in 2013', framing the majority narrative as fact. However, her knowledge of the Southern Estonian variety of Võru enables her to frame Livonian differently to others without this background: 'I heard a folk song in the Livonian language called "Sadā vīmõ" in 2018. And I understood those words from the beginning to the end'. As a result of this experience, in her account, she radically reframes (pace Macgilchrist) the hegemonic narrative that this is no longer a living culture. This takes the form of a personal journey, as 'the more I began to study the nature of the Livonian language, the clearer it became that I have perhaps a little better understanding of the Livonian language than, for example, my friends from Tallinn [North Estonia]'. Although she does not claim authority, armed with this knowledge she implies that she is now able to be a part of, indeed transcend, an authoritative community that is 'in the know'.

Another Estonian municipal stakeholder (E1), involved with organising the North Livonian Festival, was fully aware of the discourse of 'the last Livonian' and invited a musician 'who is supposedly the last Livonian' to perform at the festival. Her repetition of the myth serves to discursively reinforce it, despite the possibly parodic 'supposedly' that casts it into the realm of hearsay. These two accounts expose the ubiquity and absurdity of the 'last' claim, given that this event took place ten years after the apparent death of the last Livonian in the previous account. Nevertheless, 'unfortunately' that person 'couldn't come to the festival'. The attempted act of replacing the negative discourse with practical action was unsuccessful due to the very fragility that could make it, ironically, self-fulfilling by perpetuating a lack of visibility and so the narratives about its demise.

Indeed, the tenuous visibility of Livonian in Estonia seems to leave space for greater discursive authority to be claimed by outsiders. An Estonian public official who had recently begun engaging with the Livonian heritage of their municipality was open that 'I don't feel a direct personal connection' with Livonian. But this did not seem a barrier: 'But I have read a few things and it seems interesting', setting out a basis for potential allyship. She continues, 'There I even read that you don't have to be born a Livonian, that if you have an interest in the Livonian culture or language, then that already qualifies you as an expert on Livonian, so to speak [laughs]'. Again, the authority for this statement itself is kept at arm's length by its being claimed second-hand ('I even read'), although here this could arguably also function as an additional truth claim. The appeal to the language of institutionalised authority ('qualifies' and 'expert') emphasises the discursive space available for even outsiders with a small amount of knowledge to claim to be significant actors within Livonian culture – although the laugh, and the qualification 'even', perhaps parodies her own assertion, to express a discomfort with the level of insiderness claimed. Insights into discursive negotiations or narrative such as this could provide a clue as to whether outsider involvement is a welcome act of hybridity or allyship or, as the laugh seems to indicate, a more ethically tenuous taking up of insider space.

Reframing minority narratives

In both regions, majority narratives that stereotype or appropriate identities abound (see Moenandar & Hodsdon, this volume), and constitute a dominant discourse relative to which further voicings of culture are placed. Use of fact to overturn outsider discourse (inversion, in Macgilchrist's terms) is evident, for example, by a Golowan insider (K77) who takes a 'mythbusting' approach to dismiss arguably the most readily accessible (majority) semiotic association of 'Penzance':

> Pirates have got nothing to do with Penzance, really. The Pirates of Penzance opera was called The Pirates of Paignton up until three days before the actual launch. They just thought Penzance sounded more exotic. And pirates is a particularly dodgy subject to celebrate, if I'm honest with you.

The provocative opening sentence that discursively undermines the link between 'pirates' and 'Penzance' (a link which neatly demonstrates Gal & Irvine's process of 'iconisation' described above, a means by which this differentiating narrative is solidified and made available to wider discourse) is qualified by the explanation that this was a majority act of exoticisation. The shift in field to suggest that the celebration of pirates is 'particularly dodgy' is also accompanied by a shift in tenor to judgement, not fact, and a more intimate 'if I'm honest with you' seemingly reluctantly underscoring the argument. Use of different discursive strategies within a single statement serves effectively to dismantle a pervasive stereotype.

Some interviewees in Padstow took a somewhat different perspective on othering majority narratives about their culture. One (K85) felt outsider researchers' paternalistic view of Padstonians is passive and uninformed, where 'There's a certain presumption of naivety amongst the native informants', the word 'native' parodically underscoring the discourse of othering primitivism perceived as being deployed by the outsider. They then directly counter this assumption: 'Most people in Padstow […] have read everything academic published on May Day'. Having inverted the perception of paternalism in this way to assert equality, they then go a step further and position Padstonians in a more dominant role, suggesting that as informants they are unreliable (in general, but by logical implication also in this research interview itself): 'Depends on people's mood. The answers that people give are as much about winding people up, as anything else'. Placing themselves in this empowering role, in which the counter-discourse itself becomes suspect, is an extremely effective discursive means of bypassing and disrupting a majority-forged narrative without having to substantively contest it.

Another Padstonian (K87), conversely, downplayed the significance of this narrative, nuancing a more benign (yet still outsider) majority narrative that casts Padstonians as disempowered. Asked what they would ask the tourist board or other outsider organisations to say to visitors to ensure they act appropriately, the interviewee shifts the tenor away from the interviewer's question, with a rhetorical question that discursively casts them as interviewer rather than interviewee: 'Do you know what?'; and then undermining the question in a partial reframing: 'it's

less of a problem than you might think', the tenor of the second person making clear that it is the interviewer's misconstrual. Although there are some 'people who choose to interfere and be rude', in fact 'generally the vast majority of people are respectful, and the vast majority of people are delighted to be there and delighted to watch from the side lines, so I wouldn't overstate it'. The repetition of 'vast majority of people' with positive adjectives, with the clear indication that this is not a fruitful line of questioning, rhetorically asserts their own narrative upon the outsider one; and the shift in tenor again, to first person (I wouldn't overstate…), signals control of the narrative. Indeed, in another partial inversion they frame Padstonians as the potential transgressors:

> We get plenty of Padstonians who cause us trouble on May Day so, no I don't think it's for a second homeowner or a hotelier or a pub to say how people should behave, I think pests will be pests.

By undermining the sense that there are clearly drawn dividing lines, they claim discursive authority in a way that effectively disempowers outsider actors, whether those actors are well-intentioned or not. The cumulative sense is that outsider discourse is not something to be contested, negotiated with, or hybridised, but is simply irrelevant.

Interestingly, one Livonian tourism operator (L22) in Latvia describes this interaction in a very different way. In informing visitors about Livonian heritage: 'I try to make it interesting for them, make it natural, so that I don't have to tell them something, make it up, then they come back next time and I tell them a different story'. Unlike the deliberate misdirection claimed by Padstonians that seeks to undermine not only the substantive narrative (field) but the very foundations on which the narrative is formed (mode), here there is a more tenuous power relationship with the outsider, where there is a concern with 'getting the story straight'. This more fragile majority—minority encounter is underlined by a backdrop of discursive invisibility but also more recent prohibition and hostility. It also differs from the more prevalent, often othering and disempowering, outsider gaze to which May Day has long been subject and which – along with the gentrification of Padstow further disempowering local people economically – also acts as context by which to understand their different discursive strategies.

Revoicing and amplifying minority intangible cultural heritage?

As can be seen in the worked examples above, an 'appreciative discourse analysis' can shed light on the encounter between majority and minority cultures via ICH. The conditions of possibility in the examples from Cornwall are arguably more germane to construction of a new, empowering narrative than in the more fragile context of Livonian, where subtler partial reframing with less direct shifts in register are more evident (at least, within this limited dataset). It may be that this is a process that will change over time: as gradually it becomes more widely known that Livonians did not become extinct in medieval times and there is a different

narrative to contest, more discursive spaces will be opened up for more experimental, disruptive, and complex new discourses. Bartlett describes the potential of positive discourse as enabling an analysis which describes 'how the emergent reconfigurations of power relations that are realised in isolation at the local level […can…] undermine or reorient the existing structural conditions of domination within wider society' (Bartlett 2012: 7–8). Moreover, bringing in minority discourses and perspectives, even if via fictional screen characters or narratives, enables shift away from the discourses of language endangerment which often frame minoritised contexts (Bednarek & Meek 2024). There remains a vital role for critical discourse in uncovering majority–minority ICH dynamics; but by enabling us to better understand the discursive dismantling or countering of hegemony – as manifest both through the AHD and broader ideologies of communication and semiotics of difference – an appreciative as well as critical approach to discourse analysis can point to ways in which minority ICH is already being revoiced, and offer an additional perspective in shaping the tools to support this in the future.

References

Akagawa N and Smith L (2019) 'The practices and politics of safeguarding' in Akagawa N and Smith L (eds) *Safeguarding Intangible Heritage: Practices and Politics*: 1–13 London: Routledge

Anderson B ([1983] 1991) *Imagined Communities* London: Verso

Bartlett T (2012) *Hybrid Voices and Collaborative Change: Contextualising Positive Discourse Analysis* London: Routledge

Bartlett T (2017) 'Positive discourse analysis' in Flowerdew J and Richardson J (eds) *The Routledge Handbook of Critical Discourse Studies*: 133–148 London: Routledge

Bednarek M and Meek B (2024) ''Whitefellas got miserable language skills': Differentiation, scripted speech, and Indigenous discourses' *Language in Society* First View: 1–26

Bhabha H (1994) *The Location of Culture* London: Routledge

Bushe G (2013) 'Appreciative inquiry' in Kessler E (ed) *Encyclopedia of Management Theory*: 41–44 London: Sage

Carpentier N and De Cleen B (2007) 'Bringing discourse theory into media studies: The applicability of discourse theoretical analysis (DTA) for the study of media practices and discourses' *Journal of Language and Politics* 6(2): 265–293

Carpentier N, De Cleen B and Van Brussel L (2019) 'Introduction' in Van Brussel L, Carpentier N and De Cleen B (eds) *Discourse Theory, Media and Communication. The Collected Works of the Brussels Discourse Theory Group*: 3–31 Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Chojnicka J (2015) 'Contesting hegemonic gender and sexuality discourses on the web: Latvian and Polish discourses of gender dissidents' *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis across Disciplines* 7(2): 222–242

Cooperrider D and Srivastva S (1987) 'Appreciative inquiry in organizational life' in Woodman R and Pasmore W (eds) *Research in Organizational Change and Development* 1: 129–169 Stamford, CT: JAI Press

Cosgrove D ([1984] 1998) *Social Formation and Symbolic Landscape* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press

De Bernardi C (2019) 'Authenticity as a compromise: A critical discourse analysis of Sámi tourism websites' *Journal of Heritage Tourism* 19(3): 249–262

Fairclough N (2003) *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research* London: Routledge

Foucault M (1972) *The Archaeology of Knowledge* New York: Pantheon Books

Gal S and Irvine J (2019) *Signs of Difference: Language and Ideology in Social Life* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Henley J (2022) 'What links baguettes, bees and bear hunts? All join UNESCO 'human treasures' list' *The Guardian* 30 November 2022. Available at https://www.theguardian.com/world/2022/nov/29/pottery-pastry-beekeeping-and-bell-ringing-could-all-be-human-treasures

Hodsdon L (2021) 'Visitors' discursive responses to hegemonic and alternative museum narratives: A case study of Le Modèle Noir' *Critical Discourse Studies* 19(4): 1–17

Hodsdon L (2022) ''Picture perfect' landscape stories: Normative narratives and authorised discourse' *Landscape Research* 47(2): 271–284

Hughes J (2018) 'Progressing positive discourse analysis and/in critical discourse studies: Reconstructing resistance through progressive discourse analysis' *Review of Communication* 18(3): 193–211

Irvine J and Gal S (2000) 'Language ideology and linguistic differentiation' in Kroskrity P (ed) *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Polities, and Identities*: 35–84 Sante Fe: School of American Research Press

Jørgensen M and Philips L (2002) *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method* London: Sage

Kress G (2000) 'Design and transformation: New theories of meaning' in Cope W and Kalantzis M (eds) *Multiliteracies: Literacy Learning and the Design of Social Futures*: 153–161 London: Routledge

Laclau E and Mouffe C ([1985] 2001) *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy. Towards a Radical Democratic Politics* London: Verso

Lo Bianco J (2009) 'Critical discourse analysis (CDA) and language planning (LP): Constraints and applications of the critical in language planning' in Short M (ed) *Critical Discourse Analysis: An Interdisciplinary Perspectiv*e: 101–118 New York: Nova Science Publishers

Macgilchrist F (2007) 'Positive discourse analysis: Contesting dominant discourses by reframing the Issues' *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis Across Disciplines* 1: 74–94

Macgilchrist J (2016) 'Critical approaches to discourse analysis across disciplines' *Círculo de Lingüística Aplicada a La Comunicación* 67: 372–373

Martin J (2004) 'Positive discourse analysis: Solidarity and change' *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses* 49: 179–200

Meek B (2016) 'Shrinking indigenous language in the Yukon' in Summerson C and Lempert M (eds) *Scale: Discourse and Dimensions of Social Life:* 70–88. Berkeley: University of California Press

Melis C and Chambers D (2021) 'The construction of intangible cultural heritage: A Foucauldian critique' *Annals of Tourism Research* 89: 103206

Melis C, Wise N and Badurina J (2022) 'Geo-political complexities of governmentality and Balkanism: Deconstructing UNESCO world intangible cultural heritage discourses' *Political Geography* 95: 102578

Pennycook A (1994) 'Incommensurable discourses?' *Applied Linguistics* 15(2): 115–138

Smith L (2006) *The Uses of Heritage* London: Routledge

Smith L (2015) 'Intangible heritage: A challenge to the authorised heritage discourse?' *Revista d'etnologia de Catalunya* 133–142

Smith L and Waterton E (2009) '"The envy of the world?": Intangible heritage in England' in Smith L and Akagawa N (eds) *Intangible Heritage*: 289–302 London: Routledge

Spitzmüller J (2022) 'Beyond the binarism: Locating past, present and future sociolinguistic research on ideologies of communication' *Sociolinguistica* 36(1–2): 207–218

Sotto-Santiago S (2019) 'Time to reconsider the word minority in academic medicine' *Journal of Best Practices in Health Professions Diversity* 12(1): 72–78

Van Dijk T (1998) *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach* Thousand Oaks: Sage

Van Leeuwen T (2006) 'Critical discourse analysis' in Brown K (ed) *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics*: 290–294 Oxford: Elsevier

Van Leeuwen T and Wodak R (1999) 'Legitimizing immigration control: A discourse-historical analysis' *Discourse Studies* 1(1): 83–118

Waterton E, Smith L and Campbell G (2006) 'The utility of discourse analysis to heritage studies: The Burra Charter and social inclusion' *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 12(4): 339–355

Waugh L, Catalano T, Masaeed K, Hong Do T and Renigar P (2016) 'Critical discourse analysis: Definition, approaches, relation to pragmatics, critique, and trends' in Capone A and Mey J (eds) *Interdisciplinary Studies in Pragmatics, Culture and Society. Perspectives in Pragmatics, Philosophy & Psychology* 4: 71–135 Springer: Cham

Whittington V (2021) 'Gender and human rights within UNESCO's international heritage discourse: A case study of the Convention for Safeguarding the Intangible Cultural Heritage' in Cheng L, Yang J and Cai J (eds) *New Approach to Cultural Heritage: Profiling Discourse Across Borders*: 289–306 Springer: Singapore

Woolard K (1998) 'Introduction' in Kroskrity P, Schieffelin B and Woolard K (eds) *Language Ideologies*: 3–47 New York: Oxford University Press