

LIISA SEPPÄNEN

University of Turku  
Department of Archaeology

# Urban Archaeology and Heritage

## as a Part of Contemporary City Planning and Identity Building

### ABSTRACT

This article discusses the role of archaeological excavations and research in urban planning, development projects and the contemporary townscape of Finland. Using the examples of two Finnish towns, this article demonstrates how archaeological and cultural heritage are represented in urban townscapes today, as a part of their history and city building. One of the towns, Turku, is the oldest town of Finland, with a long history of urban archaeology. The other town, Lahti, was established in the late 19th century and was the site of archaeological excavations in the 1990s and 2010s.

The author reflects on the work of the last few decades and makes some overtures about developing collaboration and on-going dialogue among urban archaeology, city planning and urban development. No matter what the nature of collaboration among these parties is, it certainly has a great impact on a city's environment and the formation of its identity. Furthermore, it also affects how people living in and visiting the city feel and experience it as well as how their awareness of the city's past is inculcated and supported.

**KEY WORDS:** Finland, urban archaeology, cultural heritage, city development, identity

### ARCHAEOLOGY, CONTRACTS AND CONSTRUCTING A CITY

People living and working in or visiting a city often have the opportunity to meet archaeologists unearthing hidden evidence of the city's past on urban excavations related to construction work and land-use projects. Everyone who has ever worked on an excavation knows that these encounters with the public or developers and other workers involved in the project may have either a positive or negative outcome and that archaeologists can affect how attitudes can be changed.

In most cases, archaeology and excavations attract and fascinate people. Archaeology is connected with unexpected findings, discoveries and intriguing information about an unknown past. Excavations are interesting pop-up performances that may result in new ideas and experiences and offer a concrete view into the past. But what happens to this past after the excavation is done?

In Finland, investigations and surveys are generally carried out in advance of development projects and land use activities or alongside them if they come under the purview of the Antiquities Act and are required by the authorities responsible for

Figure 1. Map presents the location of the Finnish towns mentioned in this article 1 – Turku, 2 – Lahti.



Original map: [https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Maps\\_of\\_Finland#/media/File:Finland\\_1996\\_CIA\\_map.jpg](https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Maps_of_Finland#/media/File:Finland_1996_CIA_map.jpg)

archaeological heritage. Urban excavations conducted exclusively for research are rare and exceptional. For example, in Turku, which is the oldest town of Finland and has been the site of nearly 600 fieldwork investigations of different kinds so far, there have been only a few excavations without any connection to development or building projects. (KL; Pihlman & Kostet 1986: 68–117.) Consequently, there is a direct and consequential relation between city planning, archaeological excavations and construction activities. Although this relationship is not always balanced, archaeological research is clearly subordinate to planning and construction activities.

There may be considerable differences between different excavations depending on many factors such as the previous archaeological history of and practises in the town, the organisations responsible for the excavations and the different parties involved in the project. Naturally, archaeological practises and collaboration with different parties including city officials, developers and the public are highly dependent on individual archaeologists and their way of conducting projects. Traditionally, the National Board of Antiquities has been responsible for the majority of excavations, except the ones carried out in Turku, where the excavations have been conducted mainly by the local city museum, The Museum Centre of Turku. In the city of Lahti as well, the local museum, Lahti Historical Museum, has been responsible for the excavations in the area. Today,

there are nineteen parties conducting archaeological fieldwork and excavations in Finland. These include organisations such as the National Board of Antiquity, various museums and universities as well as small private companies. Furthermore, there are fifteen organisations and companies that conduct underwater excavations and marine archaeological projects of different kinds. (<http://www.nba.fi/fi/kulttuuriymparisto>.)

According to prevailing archaeological practises, prior to beginning any construction project, the developer is supposed to consult with the authorities responsible for the archaeological and cultural heritage of the area regarding the possible existence of heritage on site. The officials must then provide their authoritative statement regarding the development project. They estimate the impact of the project on the cultural heritage of the area and define the level of archaeological investigations needed if the heritage is likely to be affected by the develop-

ment work. In case archaeological research is needed prior to the development project, the developer is responsible for arranging the required investigations. Furthermore, the developer may decide who will conduct these investigations and on what terms. Unfortunately, far too often, the decision is made on the basis of costs alone, and it is not unusual that the selection criterion (the lowest cost) is mentioned in the request for offers. This means that the archaeologists who may have the best experience and knowledge of the area and period in question are not necessarily chosen for the job. In 2014, the National Board of Antiquities that is responsible to give permits for archaeological investigations in Finland set general guidelines for archaeological fieldwork. These guidelines are meant to standardise archaeological fieldwork practices, to monitor the quality of investigations and enable comparisons between the practises of different of different parties carrying out archaeological excavations. The guidelines, however, are more like suggestions, which are compiled as best practises but need not necessarily to be followed to the letter. (<http://www.nba.fi/fi/File/2905/laatuohje-2016.pdf>)

Sometimes, archaeological heritage is seen as a hindrance to the construction and development of city areas, and archaeologists are positioned as cultural saviours of the past, who collect and document the findings of areas where objects of cultural heritage may be destroyed due to development work. During the fieldwork conducted prior to construction projects, archaeologists translate the history of the site into text, numerical and visual data, disconnect the information and material evidence from where it was formed and house it in the relevant museums, archives and storages. After the excavations, clearance is done and the development of the city may go on. This practice does not give archaeologists many opportunities to participate in planning development or construction projects. Usually, construction and development plans are already made by the time an archaeologist comes into the picture.

After the excavation, archaeologists continue analysing and reporting the data, storing the findings and documents in archives and hoping that someday somebody will have the resources, time and money to continue with research and publica-

tion of the data collected. Consequently, the role of the archaeologist is restricted to conducting excavations only as stipulated by the Antiquities Act. Is this role sufficient? Could much more be achieved through a wider collaboration where the role of archaeologist extends beyond planning and conducting surveys and excavations and archiving the cultural heritage found on the site?

Even though the acquisition and storing of material evidence and data is important for the new information, research and understanding the past, archaeology's contribution to urban research extends far beyond merely studying materiality from the past. Urban archaeology is also concerned with documenting and explaining the multi-layered history and multifaceted structure of a city in a more holistic way and aims at answering larger questions such as, how have cities been developed and formed; what kind of local, national and global features do they have and why; how cities accommodate the juxtapositions of architecture of different kinds with different cultures and how cities operate as places of innovation, opportunity and development but also as places of oppression, destruction and settings of political power and actions? Consequently, archaeological research is not only restricted to studying the material remains and evidence found underground but also to those above the ground, including all existing features, standing buildings, constructions, space layout, landscape and functions. The challenge of urban archaeology is to weave the material and spatial evidence of the city together with historical records and the functions and aims of the people. (E.g., O'Keeffe & Yamin 2006.) In this article, using the examples of two cities, I reflect on how urban archaeology has been practised in Finland so far and what kind of role it fulfils.

## URBAN ARCHAEOLOGY, BUILT HERITAGE AND COMMEMORATION OF THE PAST IN TURKU

In Finland, the history of urban archaeology spans more than one century. Turku, the oldest town of Finland, has been the target of antiquarian research and archaeological excavations since the late 19th century (Fig. 1). So far, nearly 600 registered



▲▲ Figure 2. Despite all the destructions, the cathedral has faced, the cathedral of Turku looks almost the same as it did at the end of the 15th century. The surroundings of the cathedral have, however, changed a lot. Since the big fire of 1827, the monumental cathedral has become surrounded with squares, streets and parks, while before the fire it was surrounded by a dense settlement. Photo: Lasse Andersson.

▲ Figure 3. Turku Castle has welcomed arrivals from the sea for more than 700 years. Today, the castle is surrounded by the park as well as harbour activities and parking areas. Photo: Liisa Seppänen.

excavations and archaeological observations have been made in the town area of Turku, resulting in an abundance of different kinds of discoveries and material. (KL; Pihlman & Kostet 1986.) Until the 1990s, the main focus of archaeological interest was in the first few centuries of the town, the period from the late 13th century until the 16th century. (Pihlman 2007; Pihlman & Kostet 1986.) From that period, there are only two visible monuments in the townscape of Turku today, the cathedral and the castle, that were probably the first two buildings erected as the main symbols of the town. (Niukkanen et al. 2014: 30, 77; Uotila 2003b.) In the past 700 years, both of these buildings have experienced some changes, but they still symbolise the Middle Ages and give Turku its visible identity as a historical town (Figs. 2 & 3).

One can find concrete evidence from medieval times in the Aboa Vetus & Ars Nova Museum located approximately 400 metres from the cathedral, downstream the Aura River (Fig. 4). The origin of the museum is in the early 1990s when excavations were carried out as part of a construction project in the area. The aim of the project was to build a storehouse for the artworks of the Matti Koivurinta Foundation, which bought the plot along with the Rettig Palace building in 1991. The excavations carried out in the area in 1992 and 1993 revealed well-preserved remains of masonry houses, which were regarded as worth preserving *in situ*. After negotiations between the Matti Koivurinta Foundation, the National Board of Antiquities and the Ministry of Education, the decision was made to build an archaeological-historical museum on site and preserve the remains for museum visitors of future generations. The museum opened in April 1995, and since then, several small-scale excavations have been carried out on site as part of the museum's exhibition activities. (Sartes 2002: 374–375; 2003: 77–79.)

These excavations were revolutionary in Finland since they were able to change the course of the original construction plans. If the original plans had been followed, the archaeological material and data would have been collected, preserved and stored in the Provincial Museum of Turku, which was responsible for excavations in 1992 and 1993. We may ask

why the decision to preserve the heritage site was made and how archaeology at that time was capable of changing the original construction plans. Among the archaeological reasons were the centrality of the place, the size of the excavations (c. 1200 m<sup>2</sup>) and the level of preservation of the brick and stone constructions. However, there had been discoveries of similar kinds in Turku since the beginning of the 20th century, with the discovery of several cellars and well-preserved constructions. There had also been archaeological observations and excavations on the site of the present-day Aboa Vetus & Ars Nova Museum at the end of the 19th century and at the beginning of the early 20th century as well as in 1927–1928 when Rettig Palace was under construction. However, in the 20th century, the remains were either demolished or hidden under new constructions and filling layers. In the 1990s, however, this site was considered as a unique ensemble of the history of Turku.

Due to the previous excavations and findings in the early 20th century, it was no surprise that the excavations in the early 1990s revealed masonry constructions dating back to Middle Ages and the Early Modern period. Furthermore, the history of the

area was quite well known especially from the 18th century onwards due to preserved written and cartographical sources. However, there was no reliable information about the preservation and condition of the archaeological remains found in the eastern part of the area. (Uotila 2007: 19–20.) The findings were considered unique and their destruction had probably led to much discussion around the constructor's priorities and the values of the Matti Koirurinta Foundation.

In the mid 1990s, the timing was right in many respects. Methods of building conservation had advanced and ideas of preservation were widely acknowledged in Finland among archaeologists. Interest in medieval times had grown and the general attitude towards history and archaeology was highly positive. However, this was a cultural, financial and political decision, which was completely up to the individuals involved in the negotiations related to the matter. It was entirely up to their particular set of values, interests, ideas and determination how to handle the situation and make decisions about the remains of the past.

When the decision was made to preserve the remains *in situ* and to build a museum to protect and



◀ Figure 4. The ruins of a "lost city" can be seen in the Aboa Vetus & Ars Nova Museum as well as in its lobby and cafeteria. Photo: Markus Kivistö.



▼ Figure 5. Old Market Square of Turku has preserved its shape since the early 14th century. Today, the elongated square is no longer the heart of the city but silent and deserted most of the time. The square is packed with people only twice a year—during the medieval markets held in the summer, and in December during the Christmas markets and the declaration of national Christmas peace on Christmas Eve. Photo: Liisa Seppänen.



Figure 6. Luostarimäki Handicrafts Museum offers a view into life on the outskirts of Turku in the 18th and early 19th century. Photo: Liisa Seppänen.

present them, it was decided that all of the remains from different periods, over 500–600 years of the area's history, were equally important. This decision presented a great challenge for archaeologists as well as for building conservators. (Uotila 2007: 20.) In archaeology, we are normally used to the idea that if we want to reveal older features and layers, we need to destroy the younger ones covering them. In some cases, we can estimate and even prove that the older constructions and layers were likely destroyed when the younger ones were built and formed, but this is not always the case. The main question is, however, on what basis we make decisions about what to preserve and what to destroy, when not everything can be saved for future generations.

Visitors to the Aboa Vetus & Ars Nova Museum who wish to continue learning about Turku's medieval and early modern history should head towards Old Market Square near the Cathedral. This square has had the same elongated shape since its construction at the beginning of the 14th century. On the eastern end of the square is an old Town Hall dating back to the 19th century, standing on the very same spot where the first Town Hall was constructed probably at the beginning of the 14th century. (Uotila 2003a: 116.) The southern side of

Old Market Square is surrounded with handsome buildings, just as it was in the Middle Ages, although the buildings standing there today are from the construction phase of the early 19th century (Fig. 5).

The present layout of Turku, including the old medieval centre in the vicinity of the cathedral, was constructed after the big fire of 1827, which destroyed nearly three quarters of the town. Today, there are only a few buildings standing that were built before the fire. Most of these buildings are situated in the open-air Luostarimäki Handicrafts Museum, which also preserves remains of the lifestyle and skills of craftsmen from the pre-industrial period (Fig. 6). In 1827, this area was situated on the outskirts of the town and was thus saved from the flames. Discussions around the preservation of the area as an open-air museum had already started at the beginning of the 20th century. In 1931, a new city plan was made to build new multi-level houses in this area. This plan triggered a discussion about the protection of the area and, in 1937, the Town Board of Turku decided to save the area from demolition. This decision was upheld by the Ministry of the Interior in the following year. All in all, this decision required 30 years of discussion and persuasion. (Drake 1995: 118–119.)

Over these years, Finland experienced great changes and impactful events including general strikes in 1905 and 1917, independence from Russia in 1917, a destructive civil war in 1918, political conflicts and the beginning of modernism in the 1920s and the recession at the beginning of the 1930s. (Virrankoski 2012: 285–372.) We may speculate, if this decision had not been made in 1937, would it have been made at all after the Russians attacked Finland in 1939. This attack after all resulted in many years of war and the resultant heavy reconstruction and modernisation of several Finnish cities, including Turku.

In the centre of the town is yet another museum, Qwensel House, which has preserved the atmosphere and milieu of the 18th century. The house was built before the big fire in 1827, and today the building houses the Pharmacy Museum of Turku. The museum was opened in 1958, after a construction process of over twenty years. This was possible due to substantial financial support from The Association of Finnish Pharmacies, who in 1956 gave one million Finnish marks for the protection of the house and opening of the museum. The donation helped

the members of the town board feel more favourable about the project, and the town signed the property over to the Historical Museum (now known as the Museum Centre of Turku), which immediately proceeded with the practicalities needed to turn the building into a museum. (Drake 1995: 128–129.)

The protection of these 18th century buildings in Turku took a couple of decades. In archaeology, 30 years does not seem to be a long time, but it is an eternity in the context of urban archaeological research and excavations, which are typically tightly scheduled, intense and closely intertwined with on-going construction projects. Decisions about possible preservation and changes in construction plans need to be made within a matter of days or weeks at most, since time-sensitive construction



▲ Figure 7. Pieces of ceramics found during the excavations have been presented in a showcase outside the restaurant, with a sign that reads, "On this spot there has always been a restaurant – the fragments prove it". Photo: Liisa Seppänen.



► Figure 8. Some of the ruins found during the excavations in the mid-1980s have been preserved inside the new building. Today, they can be found surrounded by groceries. Photo: Liisa Seppänen.

work means it is not possible to wait for several years for a decision. Furthermore, the construction schedule and plans are usually made well in advance and can be changed only for very good reasons. Therefore, archaeologists should be involved in city and land use planning activities very closely, from the very beginning, and have the ability to conduct archaeological and geophysical surveys and test drillings. More proactive involvement would also enable them to make more precise estimations about the preservation of material and to discuss in a more collaborative spirit about the wider role of archaeology in projects of different kinds.

In Turku, some archaeological remains have also been preserved beyond the *Aboa Vetus & Ars Nova* museum. However, the situation was somewhat different a decade before the opening of the archaeological-historical museum. In the mid 1980s, the construction of a new building complex including a hotel and a cinema theatre resulted in archaeological excavations on the western side of the Aura River. During the excavations, the remains of buildings and a graveyard with more than 600 graves were discovered along with the remains of a masonry building believed to be a church dedicated to the Holy Spirit. (Kykyri 1985; Laaksonen 1984; 1985; Pihlman 1994.)

The construction of the new building complex was completed as planned, but some of the archaeological remains were preserved *in situ*. A private chapel was built to house the remains of the church and the skeletons of the deceased. Some pieces of ceramics found during the excavations have been presented in a showcase outside the restaurant next to the chapel (Fig. 7). Another presentation of the past can be found in a grocery store inside the same building, where some of the archaeological constructions have been preserved and presented *in situ* (Fig. 8). Thus, archaeological discoveries can be presented in different ways to fulfil different purposes of the people.

In 1998, three years after the opening of *Aboa Vetus & Ars Nova* Museum, excavations of a similar scale were conducted approximately 150 metres south of the Cathedral, on account of a new construction project. These excavations revealed more than 100 constructions from the Middle Ages and

the Early Modern period along with an abundance of different kinds of finds. This time, there was no discussion between the plot owner and the constructor, the Foundation of the Åbo Akademi University, and the party responsible for the excavations, the Provincial Museum of Turku (today the Museum Centre of Turku), about whether the remains should be preserved. Most of the constructions were made of wood and therefore the conservation of the remains would have been expensive and difficult. The remains of only one building were saved on the initiative of the National Board of Antiquities. The archaeological material found in the excavations has



▲▲ Figure 9. A few artefacts found in the excavation of the new main building site of Åbo Akademi University are presented in a showcase in the entrance hall. Information about the excavation and the history of the site is available only for those who know to look for it inside the building. Photo: Liisa Seppänen.

▲ Figure 10. Ruins found at the Rettiginrinne site are today visible in the garage of the building erected on the site. Photo: Jani Vidgren.



been studied in many theses and articles of different kinds, but a large part of the material still remains to be studied. (E.g., Halonen 2007; Harjula 2005, 2008; Kirjavainen 2004; Martiskainen 2008; Sepänen 2012; Sipiläinen 2002; Tourunen 2002.) Today, one can find some information about the excavations in a small exhibition in the entrance hall of the building (Fig. 9).

A couple of years later, in 2000 and 2001, extensive excavations were conducted across the Aboa Vetus & Ars Nova Museum on the Rettiginrinne site, on account of the construction of a new residential building. A stone foundation unearthed in the excavations was left *in situ* and is presented in a showcase in the garage accessible for the residents only. (Fig. 10).

These examples demonstrate that historical buildings and archaeological remains are visible in Turku today if one knows where to look for them. One can find archaeology and history in the museums (*in situ* and in open-air museums) as well as in glass cases inside new buildings erected on the sites where these remains were found. However, we may ask in what way the past discovered in excavations communicates with the present city and its development. Although the excavations have been frequent and increased remarkably our knowledge about the past and attracted lots of attention of the public, urban archaeology is mainly limited either to protect and preserve archaeological heritage underground or to move data from excavations into archives and storages. I am not saying that this is not enough considering the resources available for archaeologists today. However, archaeologists can contribute much more to urban planning and development. Furthermore, the dissemination of information about the history of a town could be done in various ways, in order to give glimpses and views into the past beyond traditional museums and showcases.

## URBAN ARCHAEOLOGY IN THE BUSINESS CITY OF LAHTI

While Turku firmly holds the title of being the oldest city in Finland, Lahti on the other hand used to be known as the youngest city of Finland (Fig.

1). Although the urban history of Lahti is 600 years younger than Turku's, the town's history dates back to the medieval times. The town of Lahti was preceded by a village, which was destroyed in the big fire in 1877. The destruction of the village gave birth to the town, which was built on the ruins of the village. Historical records of the earliest times of the village are very limited, and archaeological excavations conducted in the area have not revealed much evidence of the village from the medieval and post-medieval periods. The village was first mentioned in 1445 and, according to historical sources, there were 23 houses in the village in the 1520s, meaning that it was a lively village of a considerable size at the time. The size of the village remained more or less the same, with only minor changes in the number of houses and people until the end of the 18th century. Lahti started to flourish especially at the end of the 1860s and early 1870s due to the construction of the railway, which attracted industrial activity and more people to the area. (Airamö 1999: 53; Hassinen 1999: 20–22.)

Although the city of Lahti is not usually combined with history and archaeology, the earliest inhabitation of Finland was in the region of Lahti, dating back to 9000 BC. (Takala 2004.) Besides this, there is one event, which is highlighted in the history of the town: the civil war in Finland in 1918 with its dramatic events in Lahti. (Takala 1998.) Otherwise, the town has actively branded itself as a business city and Finland's capital of winter sports and events. The town and especially the market square of Lahti has been a focus of major archaeological excavations organised by the local City Museum in 1997, 1998 and 2013. Although the excavations have revealed some evidence from the 14th century onwards, the clear majority of the findings and remains are from the 19th century representing the last few decades of the former village. (Poutiainen et al. 1999; Poutiainen & Uotila 1999.)

The excavations conducted in 2013 were the largest urban excavations carried out in Finland thus far, covering an area of approximately 12,500 m<sup>2</sup>. The reason for the excavations was the construction of a two-level parking lot underneath the market square. The archaeologist of the museum, Hannu Takala, had negotiated and agreed on the condi-

tions and plans of the excavation project with the city planners, architects and developers responsible for the project. After the plans were made, a team of archaeologists, including me as the responsible excavation manager, was hired to realize the excavations. The fieldwork lasted six months as planned and was carried out alongside the construction of the parking lot.

The excavation revealed plenty of information about the last years of the village, prior to its destruction in 1877. Remains of several houses, outbuildings, yard constructions, wells, plot borders and three roads were found. None of these could be



▲▲ Figure 11. A large amount of glass was collected during the excavations. The material was not classified to be saved but to be reused or destroyed. Photo: Liisa Seppänen.

▲ Figure 12. Some pieces of ceramics from the late 19th century will be saved and stored. The majority of the ceramics was found in a shop destroyed by the fire. Today, a variety of these material findings are presented in museum exhibitions. Photo: Liisa Seppänen.

preserved *in situ*, because the parking lot was constructed to a depth of nine metres. During the excavations, we collected all find material in order to get a holistic idea of the use of the area. The material older than the 19th century is quite limited and the majority of the finds are from the late 19th century contexts. All in all, approximately 1408 kg of material was found, ranging from pins to bombs, the latter being related to the events in 1918. The findings also included a large amount of glass and ceramics, textiles, metal and wooden objects of different kinds as well as waste material resulting from the production of different objects (Figs. 11 & 12). The assemblage of finds provides information about the material culture, trading, way of life and cultural contacts of the people as well as about the early industrialization of Lahti.

Although the material found provides insights into the life of the people and the history of the village, we had to select the material that was important enough to be stored and archived. This meant that we needed to create criteria for the evaluation of the material and then categorise the findings accordingly. To begin with, the material was divided into two main categories: A) material to be archived and saved in museum collections, and B) material that could be removed, reused or destroyed after its listing and documentation. The majority of the artefacts (86%) belonged to category B and only 14% of the objects were categorised as worth saving and displaying as part of the museum's collections. The bones found on site have not been included in these figures, but they primarily belonged to category B.

During the fieldwork period, I presented some ideas on how the archaeological data and material that would not be archived could be presented or utilised in the parking lot and in the reconstructed market square. For example, ceramics, glass and metal could have been used as decoration on surfaces or as material for artworks. Plot borders or the location of houses and other constructions could have been marked with different kinds of paving in the market square. Photos taken during the excavations could have been used as decoration inside the parking lot or in the ventilation and lift cabins. Also, the names of the plot owners and of the houses of the village could have been used to demarcate sec-



◀ Figure 13. There are no visible traces of the village and archaeological excavations in the Market Square of Lahti. The idea to represent the plot borders or locations of the buildings by altering the colour of the paving was not executed. The reason given was the accessibility of the market square for disabled and elderly citizens. The markings, however, would not have limited the accessibility of the area. Today, symmetrical squares and straight lines create a sense of harmony in the market square. Photo: Liisa Seppänen.



▼ Figure 14. The car park of Lahti does not hint at the archaeological excavations and heritage found on its site prior to its construction. Photo: Liisa Seppänen.

tions in the parking area. Since the majority of the findings (86%) would not be preserved after listing and analysis, I suggested that this material be given to local artists for reuse and possibly for making installations of some kind in the market square, to commemorate the village of Lahti and its former inhabitants.

These suggestions were not seriously considered or discussed, the ideas remained unrealised and the development of the area was completed according to the original plans (Figs. 13 & 14). Artwork made by Jan-Erik Andersson, an artist from the city of Turku, was erected on one end of the square along with a playground for children and exercise equipment (Fig. 15).

Those who are interested in the history and archaeology of Lahti can visit the local City Museum where some of the material is displayed along with information about the excavations (Figs. 11 & 12). The 19th village of Lahti is presented in a model that was made some years before the excavations and the model is based on a map representing the

village in 1870 (Fig. 16). Another model was made in the spring of 2014 in collaboration with the students of Lahti School of Applied Sciences and the team of archaeologists working on the project. The 3D model shows a shop from the end of the 19th century and its surroundings as revealed in the 2013 excavations.

In the spring of 2015, I was able to test some of my ideas presented above with a couple of students from Lahti School of Applied Sciences. The students created virtual models of some of my ideas, for instance, we created a model of the parking lot as it is and added photos, decorations and artwork as per my suggestion. The models showed that the additions we made virtually did not suit the existing constructions and spaces. On the basis of this, I am convinced that it would be better if ideas of different kinds were taken into account when plans are made. This is not only relevant to Lahti or the ideas presented above but for all construction activities and city development projects undertaken at different levels and in different places.



Figure 15. Artwork made by Jan-Erik Andersson on the western end of Market Square frames a statue of a young woman. (Photo: Liisa Seppänen.)



Figure 16. A model representing the village of Lahti in 1870 can be found in the City Museum of Lahti. (Photo: Lahti City Museum / Hassinen 1999: 34.)

## DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND COMMEMORATIONS

*History is more or less bunk. It's tradition. We don't want tradition. We want to live in the present, and the only history that is worth a tinker's damn is the history we make today.* (Little 2007: 13.)

This famous quote by industrialist Henry Ford is from one hundred years ago, but we still encounter his viewpoint today when we need to justify and reason why the past matters and why the work of historians and archaeologists is important. I have justified the work I do by saying for example that understanding the past helps us to understand the modern world, where we come from and why we are where we are. Even though information about the past as such is important for humanistic studies, it does not seem to be important enough to the decision-makers of today. Therefore, we still need to be able to connect and reason the importance of the past for society today and decisions to be made for the future. In fact, this is an extremely important aspect of and justification for history. Naturally, archaeology and history are always practised for reasons as they stand in the present—whatever they may be. However, in practice, archaeological and historical research does not seem to have much relevance when plans and decisions are made for the future. Only then when the plans and development

projects are contradicting the protection of cultural heritage, archaeologists and other professionals involved in heritage management are consulted for solving the problem.

Depending on one's view, the past can be considered as a problem or as potential. Regardless, the past is an integral part of our identities – whether we are talking about human identities, national identities or identities of different places, towns and states. Places as well as humans reflect the past in their experiences, circumstances, events, appreciations, destructions, ambitions, ideas and hopes for the future. The way we pay attention to the past and understand it transforms us and changes our ideas about life, affecting how we experience the surrounding world. Consequently, understanding and experiencing the past is important. The past shapes the identities of towns like it shapes our own identities, creating a continuum where the past becomes the basis for the present as well as for the future. However, the present only reflects the past, which no longer exists as it was. Change is inevitable – we can only decide how it happens and when.

If some people have difficulties in understanding how the past impacts real life and real places, how can we expect that history would be significant to them in contemporary life and that they would think of it as something that needs to be taken into account when planning for the future? When the past is viewed as just something to be housed in a

museum, does it have any connection to the present beyond the walls of the museum? We create the past, whether it is inside or outside museums, displayed in glass cases or experienced and sensed in one's townscape. We create the past with our interpretations, images and memories. As Alfredo González-Ruibal (2013: 15) said, archaeology is the technology for producing material memory. Archaeology provides us with images of the past and cannot exist without interpretations. According to him, by producing material memory, archaeology produces public memory. But does it only create it for those who are able to view it and to whom it is presented as a creation of the past? Another question is, whose memory and history are we presenting and why? Barbara J. Little has posed a vital question: What is important enough to study, to commemorate, to interpret and present to the public? The ways in which archaeologists and other researchers, organisations and sponsors prioritise and elevate certain research topics or time periods into the category of 'worth studying and presenting' are closely related to judgements about what is interesting or important enough to preserve, commemorate and disseminate. (Little 2007: 139.)

Medieval Turku was memorialised in the *Aboa Vetus & Ars Nova* Museum through the preservation of its ruins, which help create images and memories of a different kind. The village of Lahti was remembered and commemorated in the museum, whose personnel recreated its past by presenting historical views, information and interpretation. These memories and interpretations are available for everybody who wants to see them and can pay the entrance fees to the museum. But do these ruins and remains in showcases really reach everybody; are they truly an integral part of the city?

People value historic environments in different ways and for different reasons. Before making irrevocable decisions, it is important to find out and understand why a particular site or area is important, to whom and for what reasons. Each site's value from a cultural, educational, academic, aesthetic, recreational and resource perspective should be discussed and considered along with its economic value, a factor that far too often seems to dominate the discussion around urban planning. (English Herit-

age 2008: 315–316.) According to a study conducted by English Heritage in the year 2000, people value historic environments for the quality of life they afford. To others, visiting historical places offered inspiration, information and enjoyment. The poll showed that 87% of the people in England think that historic environments should be preserved using public funding, and 85% consider historic environments important for the revival of towns and cities. A survey in the United States conducted in the year 1999 had similar results. Almost all the respondents (99%) believed that archaeological sites have educational and scientific value, 94% recognised their aesthetic and artistic value and 93% appreciated the value of their personal heritage. (Schofield & Johnson 2006: 111.)

Hopefully, the figures and opinions will remain the same despite the economic downturn and changes in the political and ideological atmosphere. Studies of this kind revealing the opinions of people about the significance of cultural heritage and historic environments are not new in Finland. My own encounters and experiences from Lahti and Turku prove that the history of the town and the roots of urban identity matter to the citizens. The opinions of the citizens are important as they reflect the values of society. However, the opinions of people in charge of making public decisions play a more significant and decisive role when considering the pros and cons of cultural heritage in the context of urban development.

The actual question is who, on what grounds and with what information and values can make decisions about our living environment, shape the identity of the place as well as create public memory by selecting which things are worth preserving and presenting and which can be demolished and replaced. When political decisions are made by people who consider the past as an important part of the identity of a town and a sound basis for its development, the past becomes an important part of planning and may even change the future of a city.

In this regard, I would like to mention the example of the city of Bordeaux in South West France (Fig. 17). The history of the city dates back at least as far as the 5th century BC. In the 18th century,



Figure 17. Bordeaux experienced an intensive period of regeneration since 1995, which was based on a respect for its cultural heritage and history. In 2007, the city was appointed as a UNESCO World Heritage Site. (Photo: Liisa Seppänen.)

the city experienced the golden age of its economic growth due to its port and the development of worldwide trade, which brought along wealth and wellbeing for the citizens of Bordeaux. They modernised the city, improved the living conditions and constructed beautiful buildings to improve the city's landscape. The second half of the 20th century was marked by a gradual decline of the port, which caused a decrease in industrial and trade activities. This in turn resulted in the downturn of its economy and a reduction in the population. From 300,000 inhabitants in 1900, the population of the city fell to 200,000 in the next 95 years. This was accompanied with the abandonment of many of the city's industrial sites, due to which hundreds of hectares of land were deserted. Bordeaux became an abandoned city with little appeal and few attractions.

In 1995, Alain Juppé was elected as the new mayor of Bordeaux. He started working to bring the city dubbed "the sleeping beauty" back to life. All his decisions were based on the city's heritage, which he considered the city's most precious possession. This heritage consisted of urban layout and architecture whether it was religious, aristocratic, industrial, sporting, educational, military or vernacular. Its non-architectural heritage included the river Garonne, its landscapes, squares and gardens, which were also considered equally valuable. He launched a project to revive the city and invited experts to col-

laborate for the common aim of developing the city. The development project was based on the idea that heritage is essential for the future of a city and its identity. For more than a decade, Bordeaux was an important building site. As a result of the mayor's efforts, the city regained its former splendour and charm by adapting its history into its contemporary way of life. In 2007, Bordeaux was listed as a World Heritage Site by UNESCO. However, the town did not become a museum—on the contrary, in the 15 years since its revival, Bordeaux's population has increased by 30,000 people and the historic centre has once again become the lively site of many activities. (Moniot 2016.)

As this example of Bordeaux demonstrates, there is no contradiction between heritage and urban development. Urban heritage including archaeological heritage can be used as a starting point to develop cities, thus increasing their individuality and making them unique. There are several examples of cities – Rome is the most well-known and iconic example – that would not be the same unless the layers of their history had not been maintained as alive and visible reminders of the past we can experience today

However, decisions around city planning are often made by professionals in charge of urban development such as politicians, planners, developers and architects. Not all of them think like Alain Juppé nor share his opinion that a city's most pre-

cious possession is its heritage and history. Historians, archaeologists and others working in the sphere of urban heritage have, however, the possibility to change their views by sharing information, explaining the significance of history and increasing an understanding of and interest in the past. It is our duty to build bridges between the past, present and future.

These bridges can be made tangible in townscapes as well as in landscapes. Some places, periods and events can be publicly memorialised in the form of art, architecture or with the help of archaeology. Memorials built for places or events may help convey selected and interpreted information about the past but, more importantly, they reflect the memories and ideas, which were there when the memorials were created. However, integrating elements of history and heritage into the present is not only about creating memorials of the past. It is about building and sharing the unique identity of each place.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writing of this article and my studies about the topic have been supported by Kone Foundation and the Finnish Academy of Science and Letters.

## REFERENCES

Airamo, R. 1999. Lahden ydinkeskustan kaavoituksen vaihteita. In H. Takala & H. Poutiainen (toim.), *Nuoren kaupungin pitkä historia. Tutkimuksia Lahden menneisyydestä*: 53–67. Lahden kaupunginmuseo, Lahti.

Drake, K. 1995. *Menneisyys, nykyisyys, tulevaisuus*. Turun kaupungin historiallinen museo – Turun maakuntamuseo 1881–1981. Turun maakuntamuseo, Turku.

English Heritage. 2008. Sustaining the Historic Environment: New perspectives on the future. In G. Fairclough, R. Harrison, J. H. Jameson Jnr & J. Schofield (eds.), *The Heritage Reader*: 313–21. Routledge, London and New York.

González-Ruibal, A. 2013. Reclaiming Archaeology. In A. González-Ruibal (ed.), *Reclaiming archaeology. Beyond the tropes of modernity*. Routledge, London and New York.

Halonen, A-M. 2007. *Luu- ja sarviesineitä historiallisen*

*ajan Turussa. Åbo Akademin tontin kaivauksen esineistöä esineen elämä -teorian kautta tarkasteltuna*. Pro gradu tutkielma. Turun yliopisto, Kulttuurien tutkimuksen laitos, Arkeologia. (Unpublished MA-thesis, Archaeology, University of Turku.)

Harjula, J. 2005. *Sheats, Scrabbards and Grip Coverings. The use of leather for portable personal objects in the 14th –16th century Turku*. Archaeologia Medii Aevii Finlandiae X. Suomen keskiajan arkeologian seura – Sällskapet för medeltidsarkeologi i Finland, Turku.

Harjula, J. 2008. *Before the Heels. Footwear and Shoemaking in Turku in the Middle Ages and at the Beginning of the Early Modern Period*. Archaeologia Medii Aevii Finlandiae XV. Suomen keskiajan arkeologian seura – Sällskapet för medeltidsarkeologi i Finland, Turku.

Hassinen, E. 1999. Lahden kylä. In H. Takala & H. Poutiainen (toim.), *Nuoren kaupungin pitkä historia. Tutkimuksia Lahden menneisyydestä*: 20–37. Lahden kaupunginmuseo.

[http://www.nba.fi/fi/kulttuuriymparisto/arkeologinen\\_kulttuuriperinto/arkeologisten\\_kenttatoiden\\_tilaaminen](http://www.nba.fi/fi/kulttuuriymparisto/arkeologinen_kulttuuriperinto/arkeologisten_kenttatoiden_tilaaminen) [Accessed 24.3.2016.]

<http://www.nba.fi/fi/File/2905/laatuohje-2016.pdf> [Accessed 24.3.2016.]

[https://www.turku.fi/uutinen/2016-01-08\\_turkulais-museoissa-vierailtiin-ahkerasti-vuonna-2015](https://www.turku.fi/uutinen/2016-01-08_turkulais-museoissa-vierailtiin-ahkerasti-vuonna-2015) [Accessed 24.3.2016.]

Kirjavainen, H. 2004. *Kudo sarkaa, osta verkaa... Menetelmällinen näkökulma Åbo Akademin tontin keskiaikaisiin tekstiililöytöihin*. Pro gradu -tutkielma. Turun yliopisto, Arkeologia. (Unpublished MA-thesis, Archaeology, University of Turku.)

KL = Päivitettävä luettelo kaupunkiarkeologisista kaivauksista. Turku: Turun museokeskuksen arkisto. (An updated list of urban excavation of Turku in the archives of the Museum Centre of Turku.)

Kykyri, M. 1985. *Turku. Julinin tontti. Historiallisen ajan hautausmaankaivaus 1985*. (Käsikirjoitetun tekstin puhtaaksikirjoitus Mari Oikarinen ja Johanna Stenberg 2010). Helsinki, Museovirasto. [http://kulttuuriymparisto.nba.fi/netsovellus/rekisteriportaali/mjhanke/read/asp/hae\\_liite.aspx?id=113383&ttyyppi=pdf&kansio\\_id=853](http://kulttuuriymparisto.nba.fi/netsovellus/rekisteriportaali/mjhanke/read/asp/hae_liite.aspx?id=113383&ttyyppi=pdf&kansio_id=853) [Accessed 14.3.2016.]

Little, B. J. 2007. *Historical archaeology. Why the past matters*. Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek, California.

Martiskainen, H. 2008. *Turun kaupunkikaivausten värtinänkebrät 1300–1700-luvuilla*. Pro gradu -tutkielma. Turun yliopisto, Kulttuurien tutkimuksen laitos, Arkeologia. (Unpublished MA-thesis, Archaeology, University of Turku.)

- Moniot, A-L. 2016. *Bordeaux, France. Patrimoine mondial de l'Unesco. Unesco world heritage*. City of Bordeaux.
- Niukkanen, M., Seppänen, L. & Suhonen, M. 2014. Keskiajan kaupunkirakentaminen Suomessa. In H. Lilius & P. Kärki (toim.), *Kaupunkirakentaminen Suomessa keskiajalta 1800-luvun loppuun: 27–94*. SKS, Helsinki.
- O'Keeffe, T. & Yamin, R. 2006. Urban historical archaeology. In D. Hicks & M. C. Beaudry (eds.) *Historical archaeology*: 87–103. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Pihlman, A. 2007. Katsaus kaupunkiarkeologiseen toimintaan 1990-luvulla. In M. Söderström (toim.), *Arkeologisia kaivauksia Turussa 1990-luvulla*: 91–101. Raportteja 20. Turun Maakuntamuseo, Turku.
- Pihlman, A. & Kostet, J. 1986. *Turku. Keskiajan kaupungit 3*. Turun maakuntamuseo, Turku.
- Poutiainen, H., Anttila, M. & Wahl, H-M. 1999. Lahden kauppatorin arkeologiset kaivaukset. In H. Takala & H. Poutiainen (toim.), *Nuoren kaupungin pitkä historia. Tutkimuksia Lahden menneisyydestä*: 114–130. Lahden kaupunginmuseo, Lahti.
- Poutiainen, H. & Uotila, M. 1999. Arkeologiset löydöt, asiakirjat ja kartat valottavat Lahden menneisyyttä. In H. Takala & H. Poutiainen (toim.), *Nuoren kaupungin pitkä historia. Tutkimuksia Lahden menneisyydestä*, 193–207. Lahden kaupunginmuseo, Lahti.
- Sartes, M. 2002. The Aboa Vetus Excavation. In G. Helmig, B. Scholkman, M. Unterman (eds.), *Centre-Region-Periphery. Medieval Europe Basel 2002, Vol 3.*: 374–6. Hertingen.
- Sartes, M. 2003. Rettigin palatsin tontista tuli Aboa Vetus –museo. In L. Seppänen (toim.) *Kaupunkia pintaa syvemältä – arkeologisia näkökulmia Turun historiaan*: 77–86. AMAF IX, TS-yhtymä & Suomen keskiajan arkeologian seura, Turku.
- Schofield, J. & Johnson, W. G. 2006. Archaeology, heritage and the recent and contemporary past. In D. Hicks & M. C. Beaudry (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Historical Archaeology*: 104–22. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Seppänen, L. 2012. *Rakentaminen ja kaupunkikuuvan muutokset keskiajan Turussa. Erityistarkastelussa Åbo Akademin päärakennuksen tontin arkeologinen aineisto*. Väitöskirja. Turun yliopisto, Historian, kulttuurin ja taiteen tutkimuksen laitos. <http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-951-29-5231-1>.
- Sipiläinen, K. 2002. *Turun arkeologiset leulöydöt*. Pro gradu -tutkielma. Arkeologia, Turun yliopisto. (Unpublished MA-thesis, Archaeology, University of Turku.)
- Takala, H. 2004. *The Ristola Site in Lahti and the Earliest Postglacial Settlement of South Finland*. Gummerus Kirjapaino Oy, Jyväskylä.
- Takala, H. 1999. *Taistelu Lahdesta*. Gummerus kirjapaino Oy, Jyväskylä.
- Tourunen, A. 2002. *Karjanhoito keskiajan Turussa. Arkeo-osteologinen analyysi Åbo Akademin tontin eläinluuaineistosta*. Pro gradu -tutkielma. Turun yliopisto, Kulttuurien tutkimuksen laitos, Arkeologia. (Unpublished MA-thesis, Archaeology, University of Turku.)
- Uotila, K. 2003a. Kivitaloja keskiajan Turussa. In L. Seppänen (toim.), *Kaupunkia pintaa syvemältä – Arkeologisia näkökulmia Turun historiaan*: 121–34. Archaeologia Medii Aevi Finlandiae IX. TS-Yhtymä ja Suomen keskiajan arkeologian seura – Sällskapet för medeltidsarkeologi i Finland, Turku.
- Uotila, K. 2003b. Turun linna ja sen kaupunki. In L. Seppänen (toim.), *Kaupunkia pintaa syvemältä – Arkeologisia näkökulmia Turun historiaan*: 153–60. Archaeologia Medii Aevi Finlandiae IX. TS-Yhtymä ja Suomen keskiajan arkeologian seura – Sällskapet för medeltidsarkeologi i Finland, Turku.
- Uotila, K. 2007. Aboa Vetus -museon kivirakennuksen tutkimukset v. 2002–2006. *SKAS 2/2007*: 18–26.
- Virrankoski, P. 2012. *Suomen historia. Maa ja kansa kautta aikojen*. SKS, Helsinki.