Pia-Maria Hokkanen

WHOSE HERITAGE?

CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL HERITAGE
EXHIBITION ″TOLD BY THE GRAVES″ IN MIKKELI REGION, 1994

Tourism Research, TourCIM

Master's thesis

Spring 2020

University of Lapland, Faculty of Social Sciences

Heritage has many meanings depending on the context. The previous studies have disclosed that heritage is a choice, and it is part of various negotiations and embedded power relations. It is a social practice, a discourse that strengthens and repeats certain values, memories, and experiences, which often involve age, aesthetics, and monumentality as material features of heritage. Many times, these aspects have been defined by heritage experts, elites, and gentlemen, which has evoked critical attention towards the groups and identities whose experiences have been defaced – women, for instance. The studies have found stereotypical stories of women, male-centered and gender-blind representations of heritage interpretations. Despite an increased interest in gender issues, there still exists a lack of gender-focused studies in Finnish heritage research, and in the Mikkeli region, hardly any critical attention towards these matters have been raised.

Therefore, this study aims to understand how certain ways of defining and understanding heritage have constructed gender and identity in the texts regarding archaeological heritage exhibition, which took place in the Mikkeli region in 1994. The main research question is: *Whose heritage is represented in the newspaper texts about the archaeological exhibition in the Mikkeli region in 1994?* The data consisted of local and regional newspapers published in the Mikkeli region, which were looked at with the perspectives of post-structural and feminist standpoints to investigate language use, representations, and power relations. The analysis method of critical discourse analysis was used to explore these matters.

The results of the study indicate there existed three dominant ways to see heritage: materiality, locality, and authority. The discourses constructed heritage as a material thing, which was connected to the geographical locations, and knew through heritage experts. These features constructed Savonian identity with exclusion and inclusion of certain meanings. The dominant discourses formed an understanding of gender, which focused on women, but some women only: the limiting practice favored certain age, class, and occupation and proved the intersectionality of gender. Yet, the discourses repeated heteronormative, stereotypical roles of women and men in the past and present. The study found the dominant ways of constructing heritage hinder equality, community participation, and inclusiveness and therefore, suggested employing feminist understanding to make a difference.

KEYWORDS: heritage, gender, representations, identity, critical discourse analysis

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Figures

List of Tables

1   INTRODUCTION

1.1   Background of the study

> In the peace of the cemetery
> sleeping here
> generations gone
> quiet night
> We bless them
> We will bless their work
>
> (Writing in a memorial stone in Tuukkala, Mikkeli, 1937, translated by the author)

A local museum guide said to me: "It [the ancient costume of Mikkeli] should be raised into daylight". The guide was talking about "Iron age woman", who is placed in Suur-Savo museum's glass vitrine on the second floor. The ancient costume of Mikkeli is the object that is exhibited in this old granary, but there is more in it. I spent lots of time with her when I was working in the Suur-Savo museum in summer 2018, and I noticed how this "object" started to exist and breathe in the place: she evoked a feeling of belonging in me and made me ask questions about my identity. *What would she tell about our past?* The near future of her stories does not look that promising though. A regional newspaper announced 6th November the Suur-Savo museum will be closed temporarily on 9th November 2019 onwards (Harmanen, 6.11.2019). Yet, due to the coronavirus epidemic in Spring 2020, it looks like the shutdown will continue (Ajankohtaista museoissa, 2020; Porvari, 14.3.2020). According to the Museum director Karttunen (personal communication, 11.2.2020), the Suur-Savo museum is the only museum in Mikkeli that holds prehistorical reconstructions. Hence, I would say, the Iron age woman has been left into darkness.

Despite this particular shutdown in Mikkeli, it has been acknowledged that museums have a meaningful place in Finnish society and culture and they are responsible for their actions: the museums operate with public funds and are accountable for their products to the communities that maintain them and the values they uphold (Heinonen & Lahti, 2001, pp. 9–11). This responsibility is emergent in the Finnish constitution law, which states the societal importance of cultural heritage: responsibility for nature and its diversity, the

environment, and cultural heritage lies with everyone (Suomen perustuslaki 1999/731 20 §). Besides these aspects, the numbers show the increased roles of museums in Finland: the number of museums and museum types have increased especially after the II World War and collections of museums have got bigger (Heinonen & Lahti, 2001, p. 16). Yet, cultural-historical collections of Finnish museums increased with 76 000 objects in 2000, which has caused a lack of museum resources in storing and listing the objects (Heinonen & Lahti, 2001, p. 16). The museums were visited 7,127 million times in 2018, which was 1,5 million visitors more compared to the year 2015 (Museoiden menestys jatkuu, 2019). The most popular museum destinations are in the capital area, and they are the Helsinki city museum, National Gallery Ateneum, Museum of Contemporary Art Kiasma, Amos Rex, and National Museum (Museovirasto, 2019; Rinta-Tassi, 2.1.2020).

Besides the museums attract visitors and exhibit objects, they also have a deeper meaning in societies. Heinonen and Lahti (2001, pp. 9–11) disclose that museums participate in making cultural heritage, which means they store heritage, objects, buildings, or samples that are many times chosen by authorities. It has been revealed that the cultural heritage is many times considered with three meanings: heritage is positive, it holds symbolical value and is inherited from previous generations (Heinonen & Lahti, 2001, pp. 9–11). Therefore, as Heinonen and Lahti (2001) argue, heritage includes links to wider discussions about identity, peoplehood, and immigration issues, for instance. Moreover, cultural heritage gets the meaning in the present and through museum experience, it can evoke many kinds of thoughts and feelings, for instance, as Heinonen and Lahti (2001, p. 10) refer to one British man's quote: museums are the most arousing and dangerous places on earth.

Indeed it was a dangerous issue: ever since I stepped my foot inside the Suur-Savo museum I have been bothered with the thought ″why is it as it is? ″. Why the Iron age woman is represented in a way and whose heritage she is? When I acknowledged her uniqueness in a sense of prehistorical reconstruction as one of kin in Mikkeli, it certainly got more attention in my mind. I noticed myself thinking about the imposing statue of Marshall Mannerheim in the marketplace, and thought ″why war, why not her? ″

According to Karttunen (personal communication, 11.2.2020), the museums in Mikkeli have not been exhibiting archaeology since 1999 and many archaeological objects found in the region have been transferred to the National Museum's collection in Helsinki. Besides there

is a lack of archaeological exhibitions and collections in Mikkeli, nationally archaeological heritage has been mainly been focused on Western Finland. According to Sliden (2008, p. 488), Turku's Aboa Vetus museum exhibits city archeology in a modern way, museum-cultural center Harkko in Raisio gives temporal archeological exhibitions and Vaskipolku in Raisio and Kurala's Kylämäki in Turku are examples about experimental archeological tourist attractions. Heritage tourism, which consists of stationary relics or ancient attractions as their main component have only little operators in Finland: Stone Age center Kierikkikeskus in Yli-Ii, Stone Age village in Saarijärvi and Iron age center Naurava lohikäärme in Eura (Sliden, 2008, p. 488).

The absence of prehistorical heritage in Mikkeli is worrying, except Astuvansalmi rock paintings (Astuvansalmi…, 2019), which is an internationally recognized Stone Age heritage site and was declared as a meaningful cultural heritage as part of cultural heritage program in Mikkeli (Puntanen & Hangasmaa, 2013). According to Puntanen and Hangasmaa (2013), the program itself intended to raise the awareness of cultural heritage in Mikkeli and to strengthen local identity and a profile and image of the region. Although it seems there have been some actions towards the local archaeological heritage, still it remains in marginals. As it has been declared in the Finnish constitution law, we have the responsibility to our cultural heritage, but since our knowledge of it is limited, how responsible can we be? How our roots will have a chance of growing with these constraints? What if I do not want to familiarize myself with the Marshall's masculine and war-a-like symbolism?

However, the heritage has been a trendy issue recently: the year 2018 was a Year of Cultural Heritage in European Union. The idea of the year was to raise accurate and crucial matters and evoke discussion in and between the EU countries regarding heritage, and to encourage oneself to familiarize oneself with the diverse European heritage (Teemavuoden tavoitteet). The main theme was to improve participation to cultural heritage in museums, communities, and non-governmental organizations, which were encouraged to develop new models of operation in the interaction between individuals and communities (Kulttuuriperintövuosi 2018). According to Hyry (2017), the democratization of cultural heritage and criticism towards global and elitist cultural heritage discourse were behind these developments.

The current debates concerning the elitist cultural heritage, community participation, and democratization of heritage have forwarded my gaze to a certain direction what it comes to

the Iron age woman. My interest in gender as part of heritage making connects me to other critical attentions of e.g. Grahn (2012), Reading (2014), and Smith (2006, 2008), and strives me to investigate and conduct gender recognition as part of heritage. Yet, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization's (UNESCO) statement concerning gender equality in heritage processes work as a good starting point:

> Support interdisciplinary research on gender equality in heritage and the creative industries that involve groups and communities concerned and consider the complexity and diversity of gender relations and the underlying power structures. (Unesco 2014)

1.2   Previous research

The current debates of cultural heritage and criticism towards global and elitist heritage have been influential (Hyry, 2017; Smith, 2006) and they have tackled to increase community participation and democratization of cultural heritage within EU, and critical heritage studies (e.g. Smith, 2006) have embedded those goals in their studies as well. It has been revealed that heritage is something someone has defined as meaningful and important and many times it is defined by authority, for example by UNESCO (Hovi, 2017, pp. 65–68). For instance, some scholars have challenged UNESCO's narrow definitions of local culture, and certain kinds of preservation practices of cultures and cultural manifestations have been criticized (e.g. Hovi, 2017). Laurajane Smith (2006) has come up with *Authorized Heritage Discourse (*AHD) to raise concerns regarding authorities and emphasizes that focus on materiality, pastoral care of heritage experts, and goal of edification the public are in the center of AHD. According to Smith (2006), AHD has been a common way of perceiving heritage since the nineteenth century.

The concerns and observations about the heritage that embeds power relations, which both enable and limit identity formations have directed curiosity towards another interesting aspect of heritage: gender (see Grahn, 2012; Smith, 2006, 2008; Reading, 2014). For instance, recent *Critical heritage gender studies* (Wilson, Waterton & Smith, 2018) take gender in the center of heritage research and *New Museology studies* have employed intersecting feminist and queer studies in heritage context (Kosut, 2016). The research has disclosed that visual representations of heritage, such as in museum collections and displays have been naturalized and neutralized in terms of gender and male-centered, and Eurocentric assumptions in representations of women and men have been common (Reading, 2014;

Smith, 2008). Holcomb (1998, as cited in Smith, 2006) has talked about *his*tories, and Smith's (2006) considers AHD makes e.g. women's, indigenous, and first nation people's stories absent.

Reading (2014, p. 399) discloses heritage studies have been long blind for gender. Gender has been studied as an essential part of a Scandinavian context, but elsewhere it has a "secondary status": "it functions as an interest, an extra layer of analysis, an addition to a complex study, but not a subject in its own right. " (Reading, 2014, p. 399). Wilson (2013, p. 3) discloses that gender has been a matter of fashion or passing trend and has not got the broader attention in heritage studies theory and methods. For further studies, Reading (2014, pp. 399–401) suggests that gender should be understood with altering formations of masculinity and femininity, which communicate with what is valued and entailed in heritage. To bring forth the primary inquiry of gender as part of heritage the scholars have aimed to address concerns of equality and social justice through their works (Wilson & Grahn, 2018). The recent previous studies have tackled issues such as performance, place, and politics to demonstrate gender studies critique to the field of heritage (Wilson, 2018, p. 9).

Axelsson and Ludvigsson (2018, pp. 17–30) study performance through historic walking tours in Eastern Sweden. Their research informs about identities and values in a post-industrial landscape, challenge normative ideas, and point out a mean of liberation. Furthermore, a study of Clopot and Nic Craith (2018, pp. 30–44) opens up a nexus of religious sites, gender, and heritage. Palmsköld and Rosenqvist (2018, pp. 44–60) discuss gendered characteristics of crafts in the Swedish context, and Ebeling (2018, pp. 61–78) studies the museum's natured gender representations. Smith (2008, pp.167–178) studies English labor history museums and gendered performances of visitors, through examining identity and memory-work at those sites.

Studies about heritage places such as museums, heritage parks, monuments, and teaching facilities have found out gendered locales, where gender values are studied, acculturated, or contested (Wilson, 2018, p. 10). Scott (2018, pp. 81–98) studies gender representations in British heritage context through exploration of "Pilgrim Fathers", and Bergsdóttir and Hafsteinsson (2018, pp. 99–112) focus on the absence of women in cultural heritage museum in Iceland, whereas Setlhabi (2018, pp. 113–128) finds out praise of masculine monuments

of men in Botswana. Golding's (2018, pp. 129–147) study employs feminist pedagogy in the United States museum environment, and Lariat (2018, pp. 148–166) searches for more inclusive narratives in heritage discourse within the postcolonial context in Indonesia. The politics, heritage, and gender, which intertwine structures of power defining gender and gender roles have been in the recent focused studies as well (Wilson, 2018, p. 10). Gender politics in heritage sites in the United States and Germany have been explored by Sayner and Mason (2018, pp. 185–206) and Stefano (2018, pp. 221–238). Blake (2018, pp. 207–220) researches gender role in international law regarding intangible cultural heritage, and Gorman-Murray and McKinnon (2018, pp. 239–252) research about queer acts in heritage places in New Zealand reveal other than official heritage practices.

Enqvist (2014, p. 111) states that awakening for critical heritage studies has started to evolve recently in the Finnish academy too. It must be noted that heritage studies as a conception are scattered among various subjects in Finland, and only one university offers doctorate-level education in a subject of "Cultural heritage studies" in Turku. The previous critical studies within the subject have been focused on media discussions about values regarding the cultural environment and its development (Kivilaakso, 2017). The studies that employ AHD (Smith, 2006) are few in Finland: Vahtikari's (2013) doctoral dissertation applies the concept to World Heritage City of Old Rauma, Finland. Moreover, Tuomi-Nikula, Haanpää, and Kivilaakso (2013) have touched AHD and other critical aspects of Finnish cultural heritage in their work.

Gender has been part of other heritage studies in Finland and it has been studied through various interests in the three main Universities in Finland, Oulu, Turku, and Helsinki. Kurvinen (2013) studies gender and profession of reporters in 1960–70s Finland, Aali (2017) researches queenship in France in the 19th century and Toropainen's (2016) interest has been in burgher women in an urban community in Turku in the seventeenth century. Kupiainen (2019) discovers gender, meanings, and competences as part of the expertise in her doctoral dissertation, Försti (2013) studies gendered motoring in 1920s Finland and Piludu (2019) investigates gender as part of in Finno-Karelian Bear Ceremonialism. The research that has concerned archaeological heritage has been conducted by historians (Ahl-Waris, 2010; Derek, 2006), and folklorists (Aarnipuu, 2008) in Finland. Within the archaeology discipline itself, only a few scholars have studied mainly the ideological and scholarly history of archaeology (Salminen, 1993; 2003, as cited in Enqvist, 2014, p. 111). The previous

literature in Finnish archaeology regarding archaeological heritage appears to be less relevant subject to study, apart from a few exceptions of Enqvist (2016) and Modarress-Sadehgi (2018).

Gender has not been that important research question in Finnish archaeological studies, and it has been overlooked (Immonen, 2008, p. 414). The previous archaeological study that employed gender archaeology perspectives was conducted by Kuokkanen (2016), which explored clothing in historical Oulu during the 17th to 18th centuries. According to Immonen (2008, p. 415), the previous archaeological studies of other Scandinavian scholars about gender have been studied by Elisabeth Arwill-Nordbladh (2008) and Ericka Engelstad (2007) and they have been revealing. However, Immonen (2008, p. 415) states that even though there exists an increased interest in gender archaeology in Finnish archaeology too, still gender remains as an obligatory and transient rhetorical sign within the discipline. Hence, this present study aims to fill the gap as participating in the multidisciplinary study by applying gender in the archaeological heritage context.

Yet there seems to be a research gap concerning the interest in Southern East Finland's heritage, and to my knowledge, there exists no research concerning heritage and gender touching the Mikkeli region. Overall, a few heritage and social-cultural studies in Finnish academia have seen Southern East Finland as relevant for their research (Piispanen, 2009; Rekonen, 2013). Besides, a project regarding digital production and storing of cultural heritage has been implemented in Mikkeli, which concerned some local heritage sites, such as Marshall Mannerheim's saloon car and Astuvansalmi rock paintings (Palonen, 2011). These examples show the need for further research to add knowledge also locally in the region.

1.3   Archaeological exhibition ″Told by the Graves″

The exhibition ″Told by the Graves″ (Kalmistojen kertomaa–Rautakautinen Mikkelin seutu idän ja lännen välissä) was a big co-operative project between the Suur-Savo Museum in Mikkeli and the Savonlinna Regional Museum in 1994. Another collaborator was the Finnish Heritage Agency, which borrowed the objects for the exhibitions (Lehtinen & Nousiainen, 1994, p. 4). The exhibition was considered one of the most significant archaeological

exhibitions in Finland at that time (Savonlinnan maakuntamuseo, 1994, p. 9). 1994 was a meaningful year in Finland. It was a celebration year of national culture, and the Finnish Local Heritage Federation (Kotiseutuliitto) turned 100 years old in the same year (Tanner & Piela, 1994). The exhibition was organized as part of these celebrations. Tanner and Piela (1994) state the celebration year worked to highlight cultural dimensions in the discussion about Finland's EU membership and argue that a condition for the EU membership should include support and respect for local and national culture's characteristics (Tanner & Piela, 1994).

As the name of the exhibition tells, ancient graves and cemeteries and their objects tell stories about Iron age Mikkeli region, Southern East Finland, which is timed approximately between 500 BCE-1200–1300 AD (Huurre, 2004, pp. 117–118). The graves are stationary relics and part of archaeological cultural heritage and researched through archaeological methods (Finnish Heritage Agency). The graves provide information about prehistorical past: they tell about dressing, jewelry, livelihoods, and physical features of people (Lehtinen & Nousiainen, 1994, p. 4).

The most important stationary relics in the Mikkeli region are Tuukkala and Visulahti cemeteries from 1000s to 1300s (Lehtinen, 1989, p. 125). Other meaningful cemeteries are Kyyhkylä and Moisio (Kankkunen, 2012; Lehtinen, 1994, p. 4). Visulahti cemetery is timed between 1100-1200s and is located next to Highway 5, near Visulahti tourist attraction. The cemetery was found in 1954 during the road construction (Nousiainen & Lehtinen, 1994, p. 16; Visulahti kalmisto, 2001). Kyyhkylä cemetery from the 1100s is near a rehabilitation center and it is part of a larger discovery area (Kyyhkylä; Lehtinen, 1994, p. 13). Moisio Latokallio cemetery is located near the Moisio hospital and is timed the year 1000 (Latokallio).

Excavation reports of Kankkunen (2012), Mikkola (2009) and Museovirasto (2001) state Tuukkala cemetery is one of the biggest and richest Iron age cemeteries in the Savo region. It is argued to be one of the most nationally significant research sites, and it has prevailed information about the society and trading during Iron Age-Middle Age Finland (Kankkunen, 2012, p. 3). The oldest graves are claimed to be from 1000s and the youngest from the 1400s (Kankkunen, 2012, p. 2). From a visitor's perspective, the cemetery is an open flat field. I

visited the place the first time in Summer 2018 (see Figure 1). Memorial stone is placed in 1937 and information board in 1998 from the behalf of Finnish Heritage Agency.

Figure 1. Tuukkala cemetery in 2018 (Hokkanen, 2018).

The graves had deceased bodies and the researchers found some of them were buried with rich decorated costumes and precious jewelry. A.O Heikel (see Heikel, 1889) illustrated a draft of Tuukkala ancient costume in 1889, which was based on the archaeological excavations. His draft led to a reconstruction of the costume in the 1930s, which was made for the Finnish author Elsa Heporauta (Lehtosalo-Hilander, 1984, p. 28). After more discoveries and research, more than 100 years later in 1994, the ancient costume of Mikkeli was reconstructed for the "Told by the Graves" exhibition (Lehtinen, 1994, p. 15) (see Figure 2). The costume's details are based on grave number 26, which is from the 1200s. The ancient costume of Mikkeli is argued to be the most colorful of all the ancient costumes in Finland (Museovirasto, 2001).

Figure 2. Mikkeli ancient costume in a postcard (Suur-Savo museum, 1994).

According to Lehtinen and Nousiainen (1994, p. 4), the exhibition participated in explaining the roots of the Savonian people. It was important because at that time Southern Savo was losing ″its remains of identity″, because of the ″Europe fever″ (see Tanner & Piela, 1994). Lehtinen (1993, p. 62) states the identity issue in Southern Savo has been problematic overall. Southern Savo, which in 1993 contained 24 municipalities and three cities of Savonlinna, Mikkeli, and Pieksämäki, have not had a clear and strong regional identity (Lehtinen, 1993, p. 62). Lehtinen (1993, p. 62) thought the reason for this poor state lays in the history of the region, where wars and demarcations took a place (see Puntanen & Hangasmaa, 2013, pp. 8–9). These considerations about Savonian identity in the Mikkeli region and its ″poor state″ at that time reveal something about the identity negotiations that took place. Yet it offers a starting point to another dimension of identity, which is under this study: gender (see Smith, 2006, 2008).

1.4 Purpose of the study

The present study aims to reveal how discursive power is intertwined in representations of heritage and how it constructs Savonian identity and gender. The discursive power of this study means awareness of unequal resources of the discourse's participants, and recognition that some ″truths″ can become more rooted in societies and take space from other meanings. In other words, there exist dominant discourses and more hidden ones, which leads to the imbalance of power. This critical perspective of the study touches sakes of human rights and equality (see Grahn, 2018; Reading, 2010, 2014) and the emphasis in power relations can help to understand how the power works in society, so they can be questioned and reshaped (Butler, 2008; Puustinen et al., 2006). Hence, the main research question of the study is formed: Whose heritage is represented in the newspaper texts about the archaeological exhibition in the Mikkeli region in 1994? This study participates in scientific conversations within heritage and gender studies.

Following supportive research questions are formed:

> RQ1: Which dominant discourses are found in the newspaper texts?
> RQ2: How the dominant discourses of the newspaper texts represent heritage?
> RQ3: How the dominant discourses construct Savonian identities?
> RQ4: How gender is represented as part of the dominant discourses?

This study is a response to the lack of heritage studies in Finland, which have not taken gender into focus. Also, because the previous heritage studies have not considered the Mikkeli region and Southern East Finland as important location, this study's purpose is to fill the gap with the local focus too.

1.5 Data and methodology

This qualitative study investigates the local archaeological exhibition's representations in regional and local newspapers in the Mikkeli region in 1994 through a discursive perspective. The newspapers are collected by hand in 2018 and 2019 in the Suur-Savo museum's collections and Mikkeli city library. I utilized critical discourse analysis as a theory and analysis method to understand the meanings of archaeological heritage, its

connections to identity and gender in language use. The critical perspective of the study is based on post-structural feminist paradigms, where Michel Foucault's (1972) and Judith Butler's (1993, 2008) theories of power in discourses and gender production have been influential (see Juvonen, 2016, p. 49; Kantola, 1999, p.103).

The first phase of the analysis included exploration of dominant discourses, where I sought repetition, naturalization, and self-evidence in language use (Jokinen & Juhila, 1993, pp. 76–81) with the guidance of the previous heritage and gender literature. Especially I applied the perspectives of Smith (2006) about Authorized Heritage Discourse (AHD) in defining the dominant discourses in the analysis. When the first phase of the analysis was to investigate the power relations between discourses, their hierarchical formations, the next phase of the analysis sought to explore how the dominant discourses construct and produce Savonian identity and gender, to deepen the understanding of heritage representations. I sought to understand the power relations inside the discourses through the exploration of the different speech acts and the agencies.

1.6 Structure of the study

This study has seven main chapters, including the introduction chapter. The main chapters are the theoretical background of the study, research methodology, findings, suggestions for making gender differently, and finally discussion and conclusion. The second and third chapters of theory consist of previous heritage and gender discussions. The chapter sorts out the critical perspective of heritage studies, shows post-structuralism in discursive thinking, and explains the connections between heritage, identity, and gender. The fourth chapter explains the methodology of the data collection and analysis and reveals the ethical considerations in the study. The fifth chapter presents the findings, and the sixth chapter gives recommendations on how gender could be done differently. The seventh and final chapter discusses the findings, answers the research questions, and concludes the study.

2   HERITAGE

2.1 Heritage is a choice

The conception of heritage is hardly defined, and it gets various interpretations depending on the context of discourse (Hieta, Hovi & Ruotsala, 2015, p. 311). One common way to understand heritage is to perceive whether it is tangible or intangible. United Nation's Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) defines monuments and groups of structures, which have special world-wide artistic, historical and scientific value and, places, where nature's and human being's actions are combined and which have some special world-wide historical, aesthetic, ethnological or anthropological value as tangible heritage (Hieta et al., 2015, pp. 313–314). However, worry about the continuation of cultural diversity and sustainable development led to the definition of intangible cultural heritage in UNESCO in 2003, when a focus was in the preservation of indigenous people's traditions of oral traditions and expressions, language, performance arts, social actions, rituals and celebrations, traditional handicraft skills and knowledge of nature and universe (Hieta et al., 2015, pp. 313–314).

Heritage is also meaningfully connected to tourism (see Hovi et al., 2015; Su & Lin, 2013; Timothy, 2011). Tourism has used heritage for productization, and heritage is a significant resource for the tourism industry (Hovi et al., 2015, p. 319) and especially UNESCO's World Heritage Sites have had an increasing number of visitors (Su & Lin, 2013, pp. 46–47). A conception of heritage tourism has evolved with these developments, although the definition of heritage tourism differs: it can be considered as simple ″people visiting heritage places or viewing historical resources″, on the other hand, it has to do with a more personal touch with a connection to objects or places (Timothy, 2011, p. 4). Timothy (2011, pp. 4–5) sees other definitions of heritage tourism consider aspects of learning about the past or learning something new to improve people's lives is in the core of the definition.

According to Timothy (2011, p. 2), pilgrimage was one of the earliest forms of heritage tourism: searching for spiritual experiences with religious reasons people visited sites to fill that need and purpose. Burial sites of famous leaders and places with mystical significance concealed healing powers and were considered as important for the religious pilgrims (Timothy, 2011, p. 2). *The Grand tour*, another early example of heritage tourism, involved

young men with economic and social motives to travel around European classical art cities and architectural wonders in the seventeenth-mid nineteenth century (Timothy, 2011, pp. 2–3). Their purpose was to become cultural aristocracy through learning languages, history, art, and architecture, and as Timothy (2011, pp. 2–3) states, The Grand tour is "among the earliest known examples of pre-packaged and mass-produced cultural tours of Europe". Today heritage is a property, a living culture, which is harnessed as the most popular attractions, since almost all destinations offer heritage elements for tourist consumption, and cultural areas are the most valued destinations (Timothy, 2011, pp. 2–3).

Besides these before mentioned definitions of tangible or intangible cultural heritage and its connection to heritage tourism, heritage also has instrumental value in various negotiations: heritage is used in political purposes, in strengthening national identities and in justifying the preservation of old buildings, customs and traditions that are considered important (Hieta et al., pp. 312–316; Pihlman, 2015, pp. 312–313). Therefore, cultural heritage is a choice and there always exists someone or something behind the definition, use, and representation of cultural heritage (Hovi et al., 2015, p. 315). Power relations in society are embedded in heritage processes and society's legal structures, institutional power and cultural politics shape and are included in heritage process: for instance, laws of conservation and regional development organizations have their impact in cultural heritage (Hieta et al., 2015, pp. 312–316; Pihlman, 2015, p. 312; Smith, 2006).

European council's statement about the societal meaning of heritage is:

> Cultural heritage is a group of resources inherited from the past which people identify, independently of ownership, as a reflection and expression of their constantly evolving values, beliefs, knowledge and traditions. It includes all aspects of the environment resulting from the interaction between people and places through time. (Council of Europe, 2005)

On the contrary, it has been argued that heritage is not shared with everyone (Hovi et al., 2015, p. 314). Ashworth and Turnbridge (1996, as cited in Smith, 2006, pp. 80–82) talk about "dissonant heritage", which emphasizes strong dissonance of heritage, especially in the context of the heritage industry. They disclose heritage is always interpreted in a way and by some, and therefore it does not always find consensus. What is embedded in dissonance, are emotional, cultural and political consequences: "all heritage is someone's heritage and therefore logically not someone else's." and then, "some groups, individuals or

communities will have a greater ability to have their values and meanings taken up and legitimized than others, and power both molds and is molded in this process.″ (Ashworth & Turnbridge, 1996, as cited in Smith, 2006, p. 80). Hence it can be argued heritage is a political legitimizing discourse, which strengthens and replicates specific cultural social values, also memories, and experiences (Smith, 2006, pp. 80–81). Hieta et al. (2015, p. 316) see that when considering these aspects of heritage as a negotiation, the following questions should be asked: Who are those people who choose and whose cultural heritage is talked about? Who does cultural heritage? Who uses cultural heritage? For what cultural heritage is used and for what purpose?

Heritage has its institutional dimension as ″official cultural heritage″, which exists in museums, libraries, and archives (Hieta et al., 2015, p. 317). These institutions are society's ″memory organizations″ and they are responsible for conserving heritage: materials must be permanently accessible for citizens since citizens have a right to their cultural heritage (Hieta et al., 2015, p. 317). According to Harrison (2013, as cited in Lähdesmäki, 2018, p. 90), so-called unofficial perspectives of cultural heritage have stood out beside the official viewpoints, which considers commonplace objects, buildings and places that are not recognized and protected by the official understanding of cultural heritage. Lähdesmäki (2018, pp. 90–91) states the so-called *The New Heritage* -orientation has a critical point of view towards dominant cultural heritage processes, and it has strengthened in Western countries in the 2010s. The orientation calls after self-critical observations and a need for change in the field of heritage, and it has especially been strong in the UK during the past years (Lähdesmäki, 2018, pp. 90–91). *Critical heritage studies* have also questioned official, governmental, and regulative heritage understanding (Lähdesmäki, 2018, p. 91). As a research orientation, it started in the 1980s and has combined multidisciplinary fields of research, questions, and methodologies from Social sciences too. Critical heritage studies professor Laurajane Smith (2006) established the term ″Authorized heritage discourse″ (AHD) to reveal the official and expert knowledge in heritage. Smith (2006) states AHD has long roots in the nineteenth century and it is still a prominent and influential way of seeing heritage in societies.

Smith's (2006) critical theories imply that heritage is a cultural process, not only a material thing but inherently intangible and dynamic (see Pihlman, 2015, pp. 312–313). According

to Smith (2006), heritage is a process, and means experience, intangible, identity, performance, memory and remembering, place, and dissonance. Therefore, heritage is not a site, not a thing, and not a material object (Smith, 2006, p. 44). Smith (2006, p. 44) discloses that even though these are important, they are not heritage itself, but all that what happens at these sites – hence, physical place or site does not tell the whole story of heritage. Smith (2006) discloses heritage is an activity in places, where emotions, experiences, and memories occur and those facilitate formations of sense of identity and belonging. Also, social networks and relations participate in creating a sense of belonging (Smith, 2006, p. 83). Smith (2006) has aimed to discuss different ways of considering heritage, and to build a more holistic understanding and significance of heritage in the societies (Smith, 2006, pp. 44–45). However, Smith is not a first one who discusses other than material aspects of heritage: Harvey (2001) suggests heritage is a verb, which relates to human action and agency, which involves legitimization of power of national and other cultural-social identities and Lowenthal (1985, as cited in Smith, 2006, p. 45) has argued heritage is ″a way of acquiring or engaging with a sense of history″.

2.2 Heritage is an authorized discourse

Smith (2006, p. 4) discloses precondition of Authorized Heritage Discourse (AHD) that exists in the notion that heritage is a form of social practice, a discourse. Discourse is not only attached to language use but also ″social meanings, forms of knowledge and expertise, power relations and ideologies are embedded and reproduced via language.″ (Smith, 2006, p. 4). Smith (2006, pp. 2–4) considers AHD is embedded in the Western orientation of heritage, which highlights values of age, monumentality, and/or aesthetics of the site or the place. Moreover, these material values of heritage and its physicality make it subjected to manage, map, and conserve with national laws and international agreements, conventions, and charters (Smith, 2006, pp. 2–4).

Smith (2006, p. 17) traces the roots of AHD to the nineteenth century. Nationalism was developing then, and it joined people together with an idea of territorial identity (Graham, Ashworth & Turnbridge, 2000, 2005; Macdonald, 2003). Smith (2006, pp. 17–18) sees nationalism is embedded in heritage: monuments express New Modern Europe, and they are considered as physical constructions of national identities, European taste, and accomplishment. However, the emphasis on national identities means that other forms of

identities are often defaced (Smith, 2006, p. 29–30). The sub-national cultures and social-cultural experiences that have been absented in AHD include women, a range of ethnic and other community groups, indigenous communities, and working-class and labor history (Smith, 2006, p. 30). Smith (2006, p. 30) states that besides AHD excludes experiences of a variety of groups, it also constrains their critique, which is happening on a broad scale by advantaging the expert and their values over the non-experts.

Therefore, Smith (2006, p. 35) argues AHD is a marginalizing practice because there exists the number of dissenting and competing discourses about the heritage. Smith (2006, p. 35) considers one has to do with community participation, and there is a growing desire in heritage literature considering that matter in management, interpretation, and conservation of heritage (Hodges & Watson, 2000; Newman & McLean, 1998). Hence, the demand for greater inclusion of community groups and recognition of their values and needs about the past have emerged (Smith, 2006, p. 35). The criticism has touched primarily the ones with intellectual power: archaeologists, anthropologists, museum curators, and historians (Smith, 2006, pp. 35–36), but also World Heritage Convention has got criticism from indigenous people and non-Western cultures (Munjeri, 2004). The criticism of subaltern groups has challenged traditional heritage practices and modify new perspectives of heritage (Smith, 2006, p. 36). Besides, the debates have evoked a concern towards nationalizing stories of AHD, which do not resonate with the subaltern experiences. Smith (2006, p. 36) sees it is especially problematic because it reduces subaltern groups' political interests by trivializing or marginalized their experiences.

So, AHD defines who has the right to speak about the past (Smith, 2006, p. 29). Smith (2006, p. 29) talks about a ″rhetorical device of the past″ that is used as an alternative for heritage: ″the past is vague″ device works as an article, which renders experts, such as archaeologists and historians knowledge. Smith (2006, p. 29) discloses that ″hard to pin-downness″ as a description of the past demands expertise, and the past is looked after by those disciplines, which disengages communities and individuals from the emotional and cultural work the heritage does. However, as a counterargument, Smith (2006, p. 29) states ″the past is not abstract; it has material reality as heritage, which in turn has material consequences for community identity and belonging.″

Smith (2006, p. 19) regards heritage experts also take care of an inborn value of heritage and an idea of inheritance: a French concept of inheritance talks about a duty that the present has for the past: "the duty of the present is to receive and revere what has been passed on and in turn pass this inheritance, untouched, to future generations." (Smith, 2006, p. 19). Yet, a thought that everything in the past is good, and had contributed to the progress of the present culture signifies the inborn value of heritage (Choya, 2001, as cited in Smith, 2006, p. 19). Smith (2006, p. 29) discloses the experts work as "stewards" or "caretakers" of the past, which detaches the present or/and certain actors of the present. When this disempowering of the present happens, rewriting cultural and social meanings again becomes more challenging (Smith, 2006, p. 29). An idea of pastoral care, where heritage experts are stewards and caretakers of heritage, equates with a moral responsibility to educate the public: it came to heritage discourse in the nineteenth century and taught public its civil and national responsibilities, promoted national community ideals and social duty (Smith, 2006, p. 18).

Not only certain disciplines dominated the heritage discourse, but it was also located in the European social and political elite's rooms in the nineteenth century (Smith, 2006, p. 22). For instance, upper classes monopolized conservation movement with established organizations and affected legislation in Britain. Also, in the United States, the upper-middle class and upper classes ruled the preservation movement (Smith, 2006, pp. 22–23). Barthel (1996, as cited in Smith, 2006, p. 22) argues the movement aimed to strengthen the American "love of country", patriotism. All in all, the upper-middle classes experiences and their understanding of material culture, also social achievements and power, were embedded in these movements of American patriotism and European nationalism – they formed a lineage for today's frameworks of heritage conceptions and movements (Smith, 2006, p. 23).

Smith (2006, p. 31) states AHD attempts to ignore heritage as an active process and it considers heritage as something that is engaged with passively: "popular gaze" of the audience makes people uncritically consume the message provided by heritage experts (Smith, 2006, p. 31). Merriman (2004) talks about a glass gaze mentality display of the museum exhibitions that occurs in traditional interpretations and presentations of heritage sites and places. Yet, the visitors are not assumed to value non-traditional approaches in heritage aesthetics, for instance, industrial places, which represent "raw masculinity" and have "layers of dirt and grime" (Barthel, 1996, as cited in Smith, 2006, p. 32). Waterton

(2005) also talks about manicured presentation of heritage sites: a principal of keeping sites neat and tidy is based on conservation ethics. Besides the conservation ethic, Smith (2006, p. 32) sees that the principals and ideas of liberal education movement and the ethos of ″conserve as found ″ affect to passiveness because it recalls heritage as something to be looked upon and transited to the future as unchanged (Smith, 2006, p. 32). Waterton (2005) reveals the embedded conservation ethic through the studies of visual imagery of England's heritage, which carries a systemic nonappearance of people in heritage imagery.

In addition, the aspect that influences to passiveness stems from the current developments of mass tourism (Smith, 2006, p. 32). Critiques towards heritage and its connection to mass consumption and tourist marketing emerged during the 1980s, which claimed that tourism decreased heritage to bare entertainment and made heritage places like theme parks (Smith, 2006, p. 33). Moreover, the critiques argued that tourism had been simplifying and sanitizing historical messages (Brett, 1996). Smith, Clarke, and Alcock (1992), Nuryanti (1996), and Waitt (2000) have also discussed the challenges in tourism marketing and interpretations of heritage. The studies have pointed out the problematics in the heritage industry, which e.g. commercializes, disinfects, creates a fake past, and suppresses cultural development and creativity.

Malcom-Davies (2004) discloses mass tourism has decreased the engagement processes to simply consumption in heritage places. This matter goes hand in hand with the AHD's idea about heritage, which is a ″thing ″ and it can be passively consumed without criticism (Smith, 2006, p. 34). Ian Hodder (1999, as cited in Smith, 2006) discusses a metaphor of ″passing through ″, which reduces both visitors and locals into the status of tourists in heritage sites. Smith (2006, p. 72) discloses that heritage literature considers visitors especially in archeological sites and historical buildings as tourists, which are just passing by. Smith (2006, p. 72) argues that it stems from the custodianship or stewardship of a certain discipline: ancient archaeological sites are accessible only with expert study and knowledge, and the non-expert visitors are disconnected emotionally, historically, culturally, and personally. Also, the passiveness creates a top-down relationship between the expert, the site, and the one who interpreters the experts' messages and then ignores memory work, performativity, and acts of remembrance at the heritage sites and places (Smith, 2006, pp. 34, 72).

Various studies have offered a critical response to heritage commodification and passiveness of visitors: Watson, Waterton and Smith (2012) question given, distinctive category of the behavior of a cultural tourist, and instead they present adjectives of ″sensuous″, ″emotional″, ″imaginative″, ″affected″ and ″reflexive″ for the agency. Scholars have observed experiences of identity formation within the spaces and intricacies created between tourism and heritage, and their studies imply the matter of affect, emotion and bodily interaction in engaging with heritage (e.g. Crang, 1996; Crang & Tolia-Kelly, 2010; Tolia-Kelly, 2004, 2007, Tolia-Kelly & Nesbitt, 2009). Also, Crouch (2003, pp. 1945–1960) as a cultural geographer has studied corporeality, bodies, and their performances as they move in tourism sites. Opposing the commodification thesis, these perspectives emphasize embodiment and experience, and more ″nuanced, more performative, more expressive, becoming an opportunity for increased reflectivity and heightened awareness″ as part of heritage experience (Andrews, 2009, as cited in Watson et al., 2012, p. 5).

2.3 Heritage is identity

Identity has a multi-dimensional, dynamic, and subjective beginning (Smith, 2008, p. 160). In heritage discussion, it has been connected to concerns of sense of place and belonging, which stem from national or cultural identities people express and exercise. Identity stirs also from experiences, which touch other cultural, social, and political experiences with ethnicity, class, religion, age, gender, and sexuality, together with associations of regional and national communities (Smith, 2008, p. 160). Moreover, moral, and political values embedded in individual also direct ways of identity construction and expression (Smith, 2008, p. 160).

Identity has a crucial meaning in the global world of politics and contestation, where articulations of feelings and senses of belonging take a place (Graham & Howard, 2008; Smith, 2006). Stuart Hall's (1997, p. 4) considerations of identity imply that identity is formed in discourses, where discourses as social practices form social meanings, knowledge, and expertise, power relations, and ideologies (Hall, 1997, p. 4; Smith, 2006, p. 11). Hall (1997, p. 4) observes there are specific classifications of power in identity formation, which are based on differentiation, othering, and exclusion. Then identity is relying on identification and differentiation to the other, marks various social and cultural identities that

are fostered and maintained through boundaries of behavior and relationships (Corsane, 2005, pp. 9–10; Díaz-Andreu & Lucy, 2005, p. 1; Hall, 1997, p. 4).

Edward Said's (2003) theorization of the "Other " is very appealing here with these observations (Graham & Howard 2008, p. 5). Graham and Howard (2008, p. 5) state that Others, inside and outside to a state, are competing many times with conflicting values, aims, and beliefs. Douglas (1997, pp. 151–152) argues: "As identity is expressed and experienced through communal membership, awareness will develop of the Other--Recognition of Otherness will help reinforce self-identity, but may also lead to distrust, avoidance, exclusion and distancing from the groups so-defined". Heritage is a construction of selected meanings, and then identities too are reproduced and made in a way there exists both social benefits as well as potential costs to some (Graham & Howard, 2008, pp. 5–6).

Heritage and identity are interacting and built upon each other because historical, institutional, and cultural backgrounds are embedded in identity formation, and they have material consequences as heritage (Smith, 2006, pp. 48–53). Heritage is understood of being a physical representation and reality to identity (Lowenthal, 1985, as cited in Smith, 2006, p. 48) and heritage can provide meaning to human existence through infinite values and continuous lineages that support identity (Graham, Ashworth & Turnbridge, 2000, p. 41). Smith (2006, p. 49) states that Bourdieu's idea of cultural capital facilitates a sense of received identity in the heritage process and has been important in heritage discussions. Heritage is part of cultural capital and means a person identifies with a particular social group or class, which may also demand a reach of certain literature to understand meanings and messages of the heritage forms (Smith, 2006, p. 49). On the other hand, heritage can be also used to reject, and contest received identities since the dominant idea of cultural capital can hinder the subversive uses of heritage (Graham, 2002, p. 1004; Smith, 2006, p. 49).

Collective memory and nationalism appear in the discussions of identity and heritage (Smith, 2006, pp. 57–59). According to Maurice Halbwachs (1992), collective memory means that groups form an identity for itself through shared memories, and it connects people, gives stability, and a sense of continuity. Collective memory is also forwarded on and remade in the present through memorializing events (Halbwachs, 1992). Nevertheless, collective

memories bind people together in many levels of society and nations, they are not static meaning-making processes, but constantly negotiated and remade (Smith, 2006, p. 66). Smith (2006, p. 66) sees that in current times these meaning-making processes have made some people more powerful and their formations of meanings have become greater, which implicates the collective memory is also used in synergy with authorized views of heritage. Smith (2006, p. 60) argues the foundations of collective memory aim to build and define the inner type of race and nation, which makes many groups invisible: those groups or individuals who do not support the legitimized collective memory can be culturally marginalized, which might affect wider levels of society (Smith, 2006, pp. 60–62).

However collective memory is calling after continuity, feeling of belonging and emotional security, it does not mean there is historical continuity, as Benedict Anderson (2006, p. 6) has argued in *Imagined communities* (2006). Anderson (2006) sees instead of historical continuity, there might be an emotional affect, which facilitates community continuity. Anderson (2006) draws attention to nationalism and nation and states ″nation is an imagined political community or cultural artefact ″ and imagined communities are imagined because members of the nation ″will never meet or know each other, but that in the minds of each lives the image of their communion ″ (Anderson, 2006, p. 6).

Graham et al. (2000, p. 56) argue that the imaginations of nation-states have evoked an idea of internal homogeneity and draws a certain representation and condition of heritage to Western politics. In these politics of more than two centuries old, modern national identity ″became an object to time and space, with clear beginnings and endings, and its own territory. ″ (Handler, 1994, as cited in Graham et al., 2000). Hence, the roots of nationalism certainly play a fundamental role in identity and heritage formations (Graham & Howard, 2008, p. 7).

> Indeed, nationalism and national heritage developed synchronously in nineteenth-century Europe. The nation-state required national heritage to consolidate national identification, absorb or neutralize potentially competing heritages of social-cultural groups or regions, combat the claims of other nations upon its territory or people while furthering claims upon nationals in territories elsewhere. (Graham et al., 2000, p. 183)

Smith (2006, p. 48) argues that AHD and the official practices of heritage both highlight the meaning of material culture in defining national identity: ″AHD was itself both constituted by, and is a constitutive discourse of the ideology of nationalism.″ Most often the

monuments, ″the grand ″, rare or aesthetically impressive are considered as archetypical representations of national identity (Smith, 2006, p. 49). What Smith (2006, p. 53) sees problematic in AHD is its ″power, universality, objectivity and cultural attainment of the possessors of that heritage. ″

Together with this significant attention of national identities, also an institutionalist aspect of identity formulation is acknowledged in heritage literature (Smith, 2006, pp. 51–52). Smith (2006, p. 52) talks about ″heritage gaze ″ and refers to Urry's (1990) *Tourist gaze*, which emphasizes an institutionalist nature of seeing that constructs reality and normalizes a variety range of tourist behaviors. Smith (2006, p. 52) brings the concept to heritage discourse and sees that gaze builds, regulates and authorizes types of identities and values by focusing on the material heritage: ″subjectivities that exist outside or in opposition to that are rendered invisible or marginal, or simply less 'real'″ (Smith, 2006, p. 53). Foucault's (see Graham, Colin & Miller, 1991) idea of *governmentality* touches the same matter, where heritage mentality and intellectual knowledge is drawn to govern populations and social problems, where the knowledge gives directions to the sense of identity and offers possible ways of making sense of the present (Graham, 2002; Smith, 2006, pp. 51–52). Then, heritage as knowledge makes it also negotiable and set in certain social and intellectual states (Livingstone, 1992 as cited in Graham and Howard, 2008, p. 5). Hence, heritage is changeable and time-specific and entwined with identity, which also has to do with senses of time and memory, it means there are no guarantees of lifelong continuity and permanence (Graham & Howard, 2008, p. 5).

Graham and Howard (2008, p. 7) argue that even though current discussions of nationality are remaining in heritage discussions, going beyond nationalism is important. They see transnational and other territorial aspects of identities as important to consider. This idea stems from theorizations of globalization in the 1990s, which emphasizes identities as ″disembedded″ from bounded locations, ethnicities, nations, class, and kinship (Graham & Howard, 2008, p. 7). Globalization creates hybrid, in-between places and breached boundaries, and in heritage discussion, these thoughts have evoked ideas of World heritage, which replaces the national heritage (Graham & Howard, 2008, p. 7). On the contrary, Graham and Howard (2008, p. 7) argue, this ″bleak epoch″ is overstated because still, national framings of identities work as a powerful agenda (Graham & Howard, 2008, p. 7),

although, as Duncan and Duncan (2004) state, transnational identities and hybridity can challenge and complicate nationalist ideologies.

Besides the discussions of global heritage and hybrid identities, critical attentions have considered the ways how ideologies of nationalism and national identities have been legitimatized in terms of heritage (Billig, 1995; Crouch & Parker, 2003; Díaz-Andreu, 2001; Meskell, 2002), and in response to those acknowledgments, there has been an increased recognition towards local and sub-national formations of identity (Berking, 2003; Inglehart & Baker, 2000). According to Smith (2006, p. 50), what happens in these contexts is a deeper sense of agency and identity than is found in literature focused on nationalizing uses of heritage. Moreover, the discussions on how ethnic and cultural identities are defined in multicultural contexts, and how gender and sexuality are identified have emerged (Butler, 1993, Perry & Joyce, 2005; Smith, 2006, p. 50).

3 GENDER

3.1 Sex and Gender discussions

Gender as a conception is historical, and it is changing in time and place at the same time when its meanings change: different politics modify it constantly, and it is the target of continuous meaning struggles (Rossi, 2010, pp. 23–24). According to Salomäki (2011), gender as a term originates from the medical context, when the aim was to differentiate things to do with biology and reproduction as sex, from social gender. Biological sex considers chromosomes, sex organs, hormones, and other physical features, while the social gender consists of social roles, status, and behavior (Salomäki, 2011, pp. 224–225). A conception of biological determinism touches this distinction between biological sex and social gender, and it has been studied in medical and biological science since the 18th and 19th centuries (Salomäki, 2011, p. 226). The biology has discussed to be the reason behind women's roles in society: Salomäki (2011, pp. 226–228) talks about Simone de Beauvoir's idea of ″anatomy is a destiny″, where women were given their social positions because of their weakness and passiveness; meaning a lack of muscle power and physical strength. Besides muscles, also organs, such as ovaries in women's bodies have been considered as a definitive for gender roles (Salomäki, 2011, pp. 226–227). Yet, Sigmund Freud's conception of penis envy planted a seed of a thought about a weaker superego of women compared to men (Salomäki, 2011, pp. 226–227).

Feminist critiques have questioned biological determinism and a sex and gender dichotomy together with other dichotomies of culture and nature, light and darkness, white and black (Rossi, 2010, pp. 23–24). Social constructionism as a research orientation has been supported these critiques, which define gender as a result of social and cultural conventions, not as a result of biology (Salomäki, 2011, pp. 224–225, 231). Narrow boundaries of deterministic women behavior have been challenged through a conceptional reformation of an anthropologist Gayle Rubin (1975, as cited in Salomäki, 2011, p. 230), who suggested seeing gender with two parts: with biological gender (sex) and with social gender (gender), which form a sex/gender system. Therefore, what should be taken into question was the whole system that oppressed women. Salomäki (2011, p. 230) argues Rubin considered that women's oppression was done through the demand of being a woman, but this could have been changed through acknowledgment of social gender, which is changeable. Rubin (1975,

as cited in Salomäki, 2011, p. 230) talked about a gender-neutral society, where a person's sexual anatomy (biology) is irrelevant in defining who the one is and what the one does.

Some feminist studies have disclosed the harmfulness of the sex/gender system because it's dualistic and binary thinking, which have been used in repression against women throughout history (e.g. Prokhovnik, 1999). Raia Prokhovnik (1999, s.103) states that a man as a social gender is associated with the mind, choice, freedom, autonomy, and the public sphere. Woman equates with biological sex, associated with the body, reproduction, natural rhythms, and private sphere (Prokhovnik, 1999, s. 103). Salomäki (2011, p. 245) states these associations have caused the sex/gender system as a repressive formation, but it also has potential in some areas. For instance, Toril Moi (1999, p. 4–6) sees the system is useful in a certain framework in understanding the overall problem of biological determinism.

Salomäki (2011, p. 227) encourages to see biological constructions through historical battles in society, where gender is a result of political competitions. French philosopher Simone de Beauvoir (1908–1986) led way and disclosed an idea against biological determinism of sex with a thought: ″One is not born, but rather, becomes a woman ″. (Juvonen, 2016). Juvonen (2016, pp. 47–48) states that Beauvoir (see Beauvoir, 1980) argued women's cultural habitus is not originating from biology, but from their societal situation, where women are humbled and uniformed to obey gender expectations. These developments direct to ask not a question ″what is a truth about gender ″, but to ponder over ″how the truths about gender are born as a result of social battles? ″, as Salomäki (2011, p. 228) states.

Feminist scholars today have not found common ground in defining the social gender category (Salomäki, 2011, p. 246). Besides, what makes the discussion more complex is a shift from one gender difference to multiple differences (Rossi, 2010, pp. 35–37). Since the end of the second millennium, Western gender studies have been influenced by a concept of intersectionality (Rossi, 2010). Intersectionality is mainly associated with American black, Latin, and postcolonial feminists' political movements since the 1970s (see Hill Collins, 2000). According to Rossi (2010), it looked at the more diverse analysis of agency and repression through the crossing and cooperative actions of differences. Intersectionality indicates the inadequacy of gender and sexuality as the basis of analysis in identity and

power relations, and therefore offers other factors into consideration such as class, age, religion, ethnicity, and color (Rossi, 2010, pp. 35–37).

3.2 Gender representations are produced in discourses

According to Paasonen (2010, pp. 42–44), feminist research had been interested in representations at least since the 1970s through criticism of mainstream images of women in advertisements, movies, TV series, and women's magazines. Paasonen (2010, pp. 42-44) sees the stereotypical and narrow images of women have maintained oppression and therefore more diverse, realistic women characters and positive role models have been asked for. Analysis of representations have been aimed to understand relations between symbolical representations (images, movies, texts, daily definitions) and the material, lived reality, which influences in two ways: the ways how groups of people are represented influences the way how to relate to them, and the ways they have been related to influences how they are produced (Paasonen, 2010). According to Anu Koivunen (2005, as cited in Paasonen, 2010, p. 45), the ways how women are represented affect both the cultural image of the woman and women's understanding of themselves.

The representations work in a system, where centuries of images, texts, descriptions, connections, and values are built-in (Paasonen, 2010). Although the system can sound like a systematic, it is more likely contradictory, uncertain by its borders, and in constant change (Paasonen, 2010, pp.42–44). According to Hall (1997, p. 17), representations produce meanings through language: language works as a representational system and is, therefore, a crucial part of meaning-making. Systems of representation can be considered as two processes: mental representations, which we carry in us, and shared language, which enables us to exchange and represent meanings (Hall, 1997, p. 17).

There are three ways to view representations; reflective, intentional, and constructive (Hall, 1997, pp. 24–26). The constructive approach has been common in Cultural studies and Social sciences, and the idea is that language constructs reality, not only reflects it (Hall, 1997; Seppänen, 2005). Representations are constructing reality and therefore a curiosity is to understand what kind of reality representation constructs and how it is done (Seppänen, 2005, pp. 77–78, 94–96). Representations are then both constructive and productive in nature

and they develop different values, mental images, definitions, and yet they build different frames to people how to understand the world and reality (Paasonen, 2010, pp. 40– 41).

Discourse analysis is a common way to research language and representations (Hall, 1997, p. 6). Discursive perspective to representations is concerned with the effects and consequences of representations – their politics and power (Hall, 1997, p. 6). Discourse analysis is grounded in Foucault's theorizing, who studied discourse as a system of representation and focused on the historicity of discourses and in productivity of knowledge/power (Hall, 1997, p. 6). Foucault's (1972) power analysis has been influential in conceptualizing power relations in producing gender representations and in understanding gendered power structures. Foucault's emphasis has been on constructive power and differences inside gender categories, and he talks about a hegemonial symbolical order that directs thinking and observations differently at different times (Foucault, 1972, 1981). His theorizing does not recognize any material basis for different forms of sexuality, but depending on occurring discourses and their quotas, gender and sexuality get different forms in material institutional conventions (Juvonen, 2016, p. 49; Kantola, 2010, pp. 79–80; Puustinen, Ruoho & Mäkelä, 2006, p. 19).

Kantola (2010) and Puustinen et al. (2006) state that Foucault talks about ″normalizing control″ as a form of constructive power, where people are forced to think themselves through regulated models, and this control gets dominant in subject's self-definition. Regulated models are repeated and reproduced rarely without criticism in society's conventions and the normalizing control makes people try to fulfill the norms what it comes to health, accommodation, family, and work (Kantola, 2010, pp. 84–85; Puustinen et al., 2006, p. 19). Feminist scholar Susan Bordo (1993) have discussed how women have assimilated to the patriarchal gaze of society and are observed oneself through that gaze and Iris Marion Young (2002) have explored gendered spaces as mechanisms of power, whereas Kantola (2010, p. 85) states that normative femininity and masculinity are the constructions of normalizing control in society, where ideals and norms of womanhood and manhood are then produced and executed in daily lives.

Another poststructuralist Judith Butler (1993, 1997, 2008) widens the perspective of Foucault's idea of sexuality as a playground of power to gender as a repeated action: Butler sees gender fundamentally as doing, as performative. Performatives are actions, which are

repeated in a variety of cultural and societal power relations and conventions (Butler, 1990, p. 229; Pulkkinen, 2000, p. 52). Therefore, gender means a socially produced linguistic category that is a production of historical thoughts, ways of talking, manufactured causes of acts, gestures, and enactments (Butler, 1997, p. 119).

> Gender is, thus, a construction that regularly conceals its genesis; the tacit collective agreement to perform, produce, and sustain discrete and polar genders as cultural fictions are obscured by the credibility of those productions -and the punishments that attend not agreeing to believe in them; the construction "compels" our belief in its necessity and naturalness. (Butler, 1997, p. 121)

Butler (2008, p. 241) considers that the rules of discourses form gender identities and are formed partly with a matrix of gender hierarchies and compulsory heterosexuality, which operate through repetition. Discursive genders are both historical and penetrated by power and the nature of discourses is normative, regulative, and forced (Butler, 2008, p. 241). Kantola (2010, p.86) sees that discourses provide certain ways of seeing bodies and gender, where the recent Western idea about heteronormative gender dominates: compulsory heterosexuality generates two kinds of human beings and political agents, which are biologically men, who are sexually attracted to women, and biological women, who are attracted to men. Other kinds of identities are not permitted under the control of compulsory heterosexuality (Kantola, 2010, p. 86). Therefore, as Pulkkinen (2000, p. 49) states, Butler has investigated the heterosexual order, which has rejected homosexuality.

Compulsory heterosexuality has been questioned among other feminist scholars too (e.g. Rossi, 2003). Rossi (2003, p. 11) has investigated Finnish TV advertisements and has pondered formal gender representations and their heterosexual assumptions. The studies have evoked a thought about similarities between categories of men and women, rather than considering them as distinctive (see Halberstam, 1998). For instance, studies women's masculinity has been revealing (Rossi, 2003, p. 59). Rossi (2003, p. 61) states masculinity has been many times connected to e.g. rationality, free naturality, honesty, activity and virility, power, aggressiveness and violence, athleticism, and controlled body. As well as to independence, insensitiveness, and plainness (Jokinen, 2000, pp. 209–210). These features have been mainly attached to men. However, as Rossi (2003) discloses, masculinity and femininity explicitly are mixed with both men and women: for example, masculinity can emerge in women's bodies, their being in space, and in clothing (Rossi, 2003, pp. 61–62).

Studies of masculinity of women (and femininity of men) are one example of breaking the patterns of compulsory heterosexuality (Rossi, 2003, pp. 12–13). Yet, the patterns are maintained through repetitive performatives, and cultural and social norms are forcing and regulative - but not deterministic because discursive norms include a chance of potential change (Butler, 2008, p. 241–242; Puustinen et al., 2006, p. 19). Butler (2008, p. 246) sees it in a way that the possible gender identities are already there, but their locations in unthinkable areas of culture mute them. Butler (2008, pp. 238–239, 246) argues that to drive towards more diverse identity politics, subject's pre-discursive existence should be reconsidered, and yet she suggests that the subject does not exist pre-discursively, because identity is always remade, constantly changing and getting new meanings in discourses.

3.3 Gender in heritage studies

According to Wilson (2018, p. 5), increased awareness of gender issues emerged in cultural heritage, anthropology, and archaeology during the 1970s and 1980s. Museums curators and heritage practitioners have been interested in gender identities in the representations of past focusing on ″gendered assumptions within museums, galleries and heritage sites that reinforced normative values within contemporary society.″ (Wilson, 2018, p. 5). The studies aimed for gender and sexual equality in museum displays and collections by acknowledging repressed gender identities (Wilson, 2018, p. 5). Wilson (2018, p. 5) states that over the past two decades the analysis of gender and heritage perspective has enabled scholars, museum professionals, and heritage practitioners to pay attention to gender in their studies (see Colella, 2018; Jones & Pay, 1994). Recent studies have gone in the direction where an understanding of gender representation includes an emphasis on gendered power relations and analysis of masculinities and femininities constructed in the intersection with the past (Grundberg, 2012).

Definitions of heritage have for long been in the hands of gentlemen (Lowenthal, 1992, as cited in Smith, 2008, p. 162). Smith (2006, p. 30) argues AHD plays a meaningful role in this: AHD calls upon materiality, innate universal values of heritage, consensual views of nationhood and nationality, and heritage experts' stewardship in heritage protection and maintenance for future generations. Moreover, AHD was built in certain social and historical context, particularly in European educated and upper-middle classes, and through certain

class and gender experiences (Smith, 2006, p. 30). Sites, artifacts, places, and monuments are protected and managed by the dominant elite classes, often linking masculinity and nationalism: great men have become symbols of nationhood (Aitchison, 1999, as cited in Smith, 2008). The heritage literature has also pointed out gender aspects in workplaces: disciplines, professions, and work procedures associated with heritage are majorly masculine (Smith, 2008, pp. 162– 164). Masculine heritage, which is telling a male-centered, or elite-Anglo-masculine story of the past and present is constructing and contesting gendered identities through heritage, and therefore, questions of whose heritage and whose identities are represented, and how are identities linked with the heritage places and events are crucial to ask (Smith, 2008, pp. 159–161).

Heritage discourse has neglected women's histories and experience and represent stereotypical stories about women and men in museums and heritage places (Reading, 2014). To response to the neglect of women's histories, representational studies have tended to focus in the absence of women representations in the context of museum exhibitions: a thought "counting the gaps and silences of women" have emerged and in turn to establish special exhibitions focusing on women to fill these gaps have been common (Reading, 2014, pp. 401–402). Colella (2018, p. 268) argues that counting the gaps with quantitative analysis within institutions is necessary to cut down sexist practice and discrimination to achieve a goal of equality (see Reilly, 2015). The studies on visual representations of gender have found male-centered and Eurocentric assumptions in describing women and men, and the primary role of men as active agents in human history has been criticized by feminist historians (see Reading, 2014). The thought of Holcomb (1998, as cited in Smith, 2008): "history is his story", is very appealing in these critiques.

Moreover, Machin (2008) studies representations in natural history galleries and finds male-centric biases in museum displays: male representations dominated in number, in posture and position, and amount and style of language in interpretive descriptions. Reading's (2002, as cited in Reading, 2014, pp. 401–402) work on Holocaust's social inheritance worldwide reveals gender representations in museums and memorial spaces and finds male-centered and heterosexist stories about genocide as dominating interpretations. Research on statues of important male figures has found that heritage has prioritized mainly men of political and military life (Lähdesmäki, 2007). Although many representational studies have a focus in museums and heritage sites (e.g. Ebeling, 2018; Grahn, 2006), there is also research on

monuments, clothing, and textiles (e.g. Burman & Turbin, 2002) and archaeological objects, such as brooches and their intersections to gender, ethnicity and social status (e.g. Thedéen, 2012). A conception of ´difficult heritage´ has also appeared in the research and it has pointed out women's rape and sexual violence as part of history (see Logan & Reeves, 2009). Difficult heritage -studies have aimed to address silencing that tends to happen concerning these aspects of history (e.g. Coté, 2009). In addition, the research concerning the sexualities of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender are marginalized from national heritage (Levin, 2010, as cited in Reading, 2014, p. 402).

Another dimension of heritage studies touch gender neutrality in heritage constructions: gender appears to be one of the most naturalized and un-problematized dimensions of identity in heritage discourse (Colella, 2018, p. 258). The rise of feminist studies and constructions of problematic masculinity has caused a quite infamous idea about gender: ″women are gendered, and men just are″ (Smith, 2008, pp. 160–161). Smith (2008) states that neutrality of gender should be reassessed, because the constructed gender identities have a variety of consequences what it comes to seeing women and men in their social roles, how they are looked at, valued and socially and historically explained (Smith, 2008, pp. 160–161).

In archaeology, feminist scholars have also pointed out an ungendered archeological past, and Margaret Ehrenberg (1989) states that role of women in prehistorical past has been overlooked. The criticism has pointed the known male leaders and unknown women in trading roles in the American context, and yet studies about Scandinavian Bronze Age archaeology have found a focus in male roles, where women were made invisible (Spencer-Wood, 2011, p. 8). On the contrary, the studies of Ehrenberg (1989) point out there exists archaeological evidence about women's significant roles in farming and power positions during the prehistory. For instance, a possibility of matriarchy in Minoan Crete is observed and a recognition of the Celtic women leader has shed a light to more diverse interpretations about the European prehistory (Ehrenberg, 1989). Also, the studies of Marija Gimbutas (as cited in Immonen, 2008, p. 415) about matriarchal Bronze Age Europe have disclosed an idea of a peaceful and balanced life of matriarchal societies. However, her studies have evoked lots of criticism, because of their simplicity and anachronist nature (Immonen, 2008, p. 415).

Colella (2018, p. 268) states that employing feminist epistemology and gender knowledge to heritage discourse is crucial for the change, and therefore she introduces a few experimental theories of Robert, Reilly, and Hein. For instance, Reilly's initiative encounters with hegemonic practices gives voice to "artists who are non-white, non-Euro-US, as well as women, feminist, and queer-identified" (Reilly, 2018, as cited in Colella, 2018, p. 268) and Hein's (2010, as cited in Colella, 2018, p. 264) ´modifications´ insist more egalitarian and inclusive museum practices through acknowledgments of following points: museum visitors should not be considered as neutral subjects and museums should not highlight the exceptional, which refers to the question of canonized past that has long been debated. At last, Hein suggests of de-emphasizing classifications and categorizations of museums, which tend to focus on national origin, chronology, and geography, and instead to make room for other alternative patterns of displaying unpredictable relations and intersections (Hein, 2010, as cited in Colella, 2018, p. 264).

Together with these acknowledgments, Spencer-Wood (2011) suggests taking feminist inclusive both/and -thought to heritage discussion: both/and -thinking means that for example, men can be both domestic and public, and women are both domestic and public. This way, more diverse intersectional identities can be modeled, which also recognizes changing constructions of womanhood that varies from time to time, group to group (Spencer-Wood, 2011, p. 21). Moreover, Spencer-Wood (2011) recommends of employing Butler's theories of gender to heritage studies: Butler's viewpoints of gender as produced and performed can offer a valuable perspective to interpretations of archaeology and prehistoric social systems through enabling more gender variability (e.g. Palmsköld & Rosenqvist, 2018; Perry & Joyce, 2001, 2005).

4   CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF NEWSPAPERS

This study explored heritage representations in newspaper texts, which particularly touched the archaeological exhibition ″Told by the Graves″ in the Mikkeli region in 1994. Qualitative research was conducted with an understanding of the post-structural paradigm that I employed to emphasize the recognition of power relations in social realities. According to post-structuralism, discourses are in the center of constructing social conventions and critical discourse perspective used in this study, there is no meaning without a power position, and therefore, culture is inseparable power/knowledge regime (Chouliaraki, 2008, pp. 679–678). The critical discourse analysis as the analysis method offered a way to dig deeper into the constructions of heritage, identity, and gender. The following chapters explain the methodological choices of this research.

4.1 Critical discourse analysis

The analysis method of the study was chosen after preliminary research and literature review. Recognition that cultural heritage is a choice, and that there always exists someone/something behind the definition and representation of cultural heritage evoked critical questions (Hieta et al., 2015, p. 312). The interest to find out more about that someone/something made me initiate tentative research in January 2019 with the same newspaper data with six (6) texts of 1994. That tentative research found out on angles of power related to subject positions and identity formations in heritage discourses. The research focused on cultural heritage only, where this present study emphasized gender representations in heritage making in order to widen the understanding.

Discourse analysis as a method has been well employed in critical studies concerning gender and sexuality (e.g. Aitchison, 2009; Foucault, 1981; Pollock, 2008; Smith, 2008) and it appeared to be suitable to my study as well. Overall, discourse analysis is a qualitative analysis method, which is often described as a loose theoretical framework, and therefore various focus points and methodological applications are possible (Jokinen, Juhila & Suoninen, 1993, p. 17). Fundamentally, the question is about language use, which is not reflecting truth beyond, but more importantly, to investigate language that creates and constructs versions of reality (Valtonen, 1998, p. 97). Research of mass media, particularly

newspapers with discourse analysis is relevant because the power of newspaper is particularly linguistic and discursive (Fairclough, 1997, pp. 10–11).

This study understands discourse as a concept of quite solid meaning systems, which enable a certain kind of understanding about social reality (Valtonen, 1998, pp. 97–98). Discourses are collections of texts and statements, which form their objects, and they are productive: discourses are both formed in social conventions and are forming the conventions (Fairclough, 1997, pp. 26–31). Fairclough (1997) highlights discourses' engagement in social change: discourses are not only sustaining and privileging certain social conventions but also, relationships between discourses limit and constitute relationships between people (Fairclough, 1997, 2003). Discourses are not representing social conventions as a whole but are an interlinked element of it and therefore, in order to find out what is going on socially, it can be explored through what is going on interdiscursively (Smith, 2006, p. 15).

The emphasis of analysis in the present study was to reveal and discuss dominant discourses in the context of newspapers about heritage exhibition. The dominance of some discourses is based on understanding that some discourses become more rooted in society, which can lead to shared and self-evident truths and mute other alternative truths (Jokinen & Juhila, 1993, pp. 75–77). Therefore, instead of focusing on the heterogeneity of discourses, the emphasis is on the homogeneity of social reality that is constructed through repetition, naturalization, and sameness in meaning systems (Jokinen & Juhila, 1993, p. 80). The reason why I decided to focus on the homogeneity of discourses is based on the previous literature about heritage and gender and to my understanding of the world: social realities are many times solid, stabilized and pierced and maintained through power relations, and agents of the discourses have not an equal amount of resources and power to use (Jokinen & Juhila, 1993, p. 86–87; Smith, 2006, pp. 14–16). Another dimension of the analysis was to understand how the dominant discourses operated through an investigation of how power relations inside the discourses construct an understanding of the world. To do this part of the analysis I paid attention to unequal resources of participants of the discourses and I explored following aspects: I sought a source of powerful speech, what can be said in the discourses and if access to the discourse is somehow limited (see Jokinen & Juhila, 1993, pp. 86–87).

After going through the data several times and while making the notes, I noticed archaeological heritage discussion in the newspapers was varying between many topics. So,

I started my analysis with investigating the topics of discussions: the texts talked about the exhibition ″Told by the Graves″, the ancient costumes, some specific objects, graves and cemeteries, the past's people, archaeology as a discipline, archaeology as an institutional practice and archaeology as a local practice. In addition, topics about archaeologists themselves, about local people, and the audience and the ancient Savo people were talked about. I categorized the topics with markings under the themes such as ″the ancient costume ″, ″the audience″, ″the past's people″ etc. I considered all these categorized themes of topics and their representations as part of a one big heritage discourse.

The next step in data analysis was to investigate the actual discourses. Therefore, I moved from the recognition of the categorized topics to the language use, and pondered, how these objects of speech were constructed? Since I focused on power relations, I particularly investigated repetition, homogenous and unquestioned truths, and naturalizations of statements and traced down what kind of discourses are dominant, which take space from other discourses to exist (Jokinen & Juhila, 1993, p. 76–77). I identified three dominant discourses: ″materiality″, ″locality″ and ″authority″. I formed the dominant discourses with the guidance of the previous literature of heritage and gender studies. Especially critical heritage studies and theories of Smith (2006, 2008) about Authorized heritage discourse (AHD) worked as a theoretical principle to identify the dominant discourses of ″materiality ″ and ″authority ″. The third dominant discourse of ″locality″ was more implicit and harder to define. However, its aspects were supported by the previous literature of Berking (2003), Graham et al., (2000), Inglehart and Baker (2000), and Lähdesmäki (2007) and therefore I considered it relevant.

After I had identified the dominant discourses, I aimed to reveal their way of operation in this particular heritage process and paid attention to power relations inside the discourses (see Jokinen & Juhila, 1993, p. 76). In this part of the analysis l looked at the ways what is said in the discourses, and how it is done. I also sought the source of powerful speech, and how it is in relation to other participants of the discourses (see Jokinen & Juhila, 1993, pp. 86–87). I found out these aspects were constructed in two ways and they were hierarchical: I revealed there was exclusion/inclusion and also sameness and commonness in their way of operation: the statements both invited certain identities and participants to the discourse, and

on the other hand left out some. The statements also formed a kind of alliance through the supportive speech of commonness inside the dominant discourses.

When I had figured the dominant discourses operate through struggles of differentiation, opposition, and alliances, I turned the gaze towards two interests of the current study: identity and gender. As discussed in the theory chapter, these two conceptions have been emergent in heritage discourse and their critical investigations have been studied by various scholars. There are various notions of exclusion and silencing of certain identities and gender in previous heritage and gender studies, which worked as a precondition for the analysis. Especially the conception of gender had an important role in this study since it evoked my interest in the whole subject in the beginning. I explored gender and identity, their formations, and organization as part of materiality, locality, and authority discourses. I asked, how identity and gender are formed in those discourses?

The last ponder of the study was forwarded towards deviations and contradictions in the discourses that formed gender understanding: I sought to recognize statements that challenged each other. Jokinen and Juhila (1993, pp. 101–105) have stated there exists a continuous struggle between power and resistance in discourses, and even though meaning systems of discourses can be stable and unambiguous, there always exists a chance for difference through contradiction, which can open up other interpretations. The same aspect appears in feminist epistemology of resistance and emancipation (Liljeström, 2004, p. 11–15), which guided me to ponder deconstruction of natural understanding and regulative norms (Liljeström, 2004, p. 11–13). Thus, one of the last parts of this study was devoted to contradictions that revealed crossing discursive directions and offered a chance of making a difference in gender formation.

4.2 Newspapers as data

Newspapers are part of journalistic mass communication and have characteristics of producing actual, truth-based facts for people (Kunelius, 2003, pp.17–22). Newspapers aim to produce facts and truths, which refer to a realistic understanding of the world: first, truth-based happenings take a place and then, journalists report them to the audience (Kunelius, 2003, pp. 17–21). This study had a retrospective approach because newspapers as secondary data reported about the past by looking into the year 1994. This retrospective gives a chance

to look back in time and observe possible future events and to compare social realities over time (Jennings, 2010, p. 75).

One important mission of journalism in society is to serve the audience (Jaakkola, 2013, p. 17). That means journalism represents the mass audience but is not trouble-free: critical questions of *whom* journalism represents when it claims to represent the mass audience are important to ask (Fairclough, 1997, p. 58). Journalism is also dependent of the information that society's other institutions' practices, and for instance, the way how journalism evaluates the world and its happenings have many times in line with national interest (Jaakkola 2013, pp. 16–17; Kunelius, 2003, pp. 23–25). Fairclough (1997, p. 58) argues that mass media is professionally and institutionally regulated, and those who are well represented many times have economic, political, or cultural power.

The archaeological exhibition gave an interesting context to the present research by bringing up archaeological knowledge that is not often represented in the media (Sliden, 2008 p. 488). The study consists of 12 printed newspaper texts published between January and September in 1994. The total amount of text was approximately 8 pages of broadsheet size papers (see Kluukeri, 5.1.2017). I left out the texts smaller than ½ page because their representations mostly considered the exhibition's informational details and did not go that deep into the topic. Other criteria of choosing those 12 texts for analyzing was the name of the exhibition ″Told by the Graves″ was mentioned somewhere in the text. I argue 12 texts were enough for my study to answer the research questions because discourse analysis as a method does not necessarily demand big amounts of data (Hirsjärvi, Remes & Sajavaara, 1997, p. 226).

Texts were published in following regional and local newspapers: Länsi-Savo (5), Itä-Savo (4), Mikkelin kaupunkilehti (2), and Savon Sanomat (1) (see Table 1). These papers were all published in the Mikkeli region. According to Syyrakki (personal communication, 23.4.2020), the whole circulation of Länsi-Savo was 28 081 pieces and Itä-Savo 23 502 in 1994. These two papers were the most used ones in this study. To give some idea about the development of newspaper circulation of these papers, the whole circulation of Länsi-Savo (printed and digital) was 16 826 pieces and Itä-Savo's 11 465 in 2018 (MediaAudit Finland, 2019, p. 2).

Table 1. The list of texts and articles used in the study.

Newspaper	Date	Title	Code
Länsi-Savo	27.1.1994	Kalmisto -näyttelyn esineet saatu valituiksi. Suomen ainoa riimukirjoitus nähdään kesällä Mikkelissä (*The objects in the cemetery exhibition have been selected. Finland's only runic writing will be seen in Mikkeli in the summer*)	LS1
Länsi-Savo	15.5.1994	Värikäs muinaispuku on juhla-asu (*The colorful ancient costume is a festive outfit*)	LS2
Mikkelin kaupunkilehti	15.5.1994	Arkeologi Hannu Poutiainen: Mikkelin alueella aihetta laajoihin muinaisjäännöstutkimuksiin (*Archaeologist Hannu Poutiainen: Extensive research on ancient remains in the Mikkeli area are appropriate*)	MKL3
Itä-Savo	18.5.1994	Savonlinnan museon ja Leena Lehtisen työ esimerkkinä muille: Elämäntehtävänä Etelä-Savon muinaisuus (*The work of the Savonlinna Museum and Leena Lehtinen as an example to others: The antiquity of South Savo as a life task*)	IS4
Mikkelin Kaupunkilehti	12.6.1994	Muinaispuku erilainen kuin Tuukkalan puku (*An ancient costume different from Tuukkala's costume*)	MKL5
Länsi-Savo	17.6.1994	Mikkelin historian upeat aarteet ensi kertaa esillä (*The magnificent treasures of Mikkeli's history are on display for the first time*)	LS6
Länsi-Savo	18.6.1994	Mikkelissä esillä rautakautisia löytöjä esittelevä näyttely. Arkeologia ei anna lopullisia vastauksia (*An exhibition presenting Iron Age findings is on display in Mikkeli. Archeology does not provide definitive answers*)	LS7
Savon Sanomat	18.6.1994	Mikkelin seudun uusi muinaispuku juhlistaa kalmistonäyttelyä (*The new ancient costume of the Mikkeli region celebrates the cemetery exhibition*)	SS8
Itä-Savo	27.6.1994	Kalmistot kertovat, kuinka Savo syntyi (*The cemeteries tell how Savo was born*)	IS9
Länsi-Savo	3.9.1994	Kalmisto -näyttelystä tuli Mikkelin koulujen suosikki (*The Kalmisto exhibition became a favorite of Mikkeli schools*)	LS10

Itä-Savo	18.9.1994	Kalmistojen kertomaa -näyttely avaa savolaisuuden historiaa. Mikkelin seutu oli idän ja lännen kohtauspaikka (*The exhibition Told By the Graves opens the history of Savoism. The Mikkeli region was a meeting place of East and West*)	IS11
Itä-Savo	19.9.1994	Maaherra suojelisi muinaismuistot ympäristöineen. Kalmisto-näyttely kesällä Helsinkiin (*The governor would protect ancient monuments and their surroundings. Cemetery exhibition in summer to Helsinki*)	IS12

Data collection started in September 2018 and final decisions about the sample data were made in May 2019. In May 2019 I started to focus on the year 1994, because of the observations I made during the data collection process and reading the data. I concluded the year 1994 was a meaningful year in Mikkeli in a sense of cultural heritage. It was a year of celebration of national culture ″Kansallisen kulttuurin juhlavuosi″ (see Tanner & Piela, 1994) and the large cross-regional and co-operative prehistorical exhibition ″Told by the Graves″ in Mikkeli and Savonlinna was part of this festive year events.

4.3 Ethical considerations

This study follows the responsible conduct of research (TENK, 2012) through systematic and trustworthy research practices. Throughout the research process from data collection to the conclusive words, I have followed the ethical practice of care, accuracy and practiced close reflexivity, being aware of my participation in constructing social realities (see Juhila & Suoninen, 1999, pp. 251–252). This acknowledgment made me critically reflect my language use and its produced meanings. This study is critical, and it has a political dimension, which means questioning existing and natural ″truths″ (see Liljeström, 2004, p. 21). I am positioned in feminist discourse, which defines me as a conductor of the study. This regards to the feminist methodology of emancipatory knowledge production and is based on acknowledging hierarchies, inequalities, patriarchies, and phallocentric assumptions in society (Liljeström, 2004, p. 11). Thereby, the study intents to discuss, unveil and unwrap gender hierarchies and asymmetry, and evoke discussion among the local heritage practitioners and the local people in the Mikkeli region (see Liljeström, 2004, p. 21).

5 FINDINGS

This chapter tells about the findings of critical discourse analysis of the newspaper data. The main question *Whose heritage is represented in the newspaper texts about the archaeological exhibition in the Mikkeli region in 1994?* is discussed through three supporting questions. I present translated quotations from the newspaper texts to support the findings. The quotations of the texts are marked with abbreviations *LS/IS/MKL/SS,* with the code of the newspaper.

5.1 Materiality discourse

Materiality and object-orientation were touched upon many discussions in the texts. The material heritage in this context means tangible heritage, that consisted of the objects, the material reconstructions of the ancient costumes, and the bodies of the deceased. I figured one important meaning of the material heritage discourse was to construct ideas about life on Iron age: daily life, dressing, jewelry, livelihoods and cultural influences, rural crafts, hunting and fishing, burial habits, beliefs, and influences of Christianity. Alongside these aspects, the material heritage provided interpretations of the Iron age people's heights, ″race″ and gender, social order, and warfare.

Moreover, the material objects as heritage were possessed, which refers to the physicality of heritage that makes it subjected to manage (Smith, 2006, pp. 2–4). The texts discussed prehistory that can be known through material objects and material reconstructions, which are possessed by the Suur-Savo museum and The Finnish Heritage Agency and knew through the heritage experts.

> The objects about the Iron Age Mikkeli region have hardly been seen. They have been lying in the basements of the Finnish Heritage Agency, which Pentti Nousiainen, the museum assistant of the Suur-Savo museum, and Leena Lehtinen, the archaeologist of the Savonlinna Regional Museum, have now hunted them. ″Yes, the system is terrible for putting together such an exhibition. Every object is behind two, three locks at the Finnish Heritage Agency.″ (LS1)

Many texts used descriptions such as ″precious″, ″old″ and ″one of kin″ in describing the material heritage. On the contrary, some material heritage was described as ″poor″ and

"young". There appeared to be a certain favor of age and aesthetics as values of material heritage, which is consistent with previous heritage literature regarding Authorized Heritage Discourse (Smith, 2006), which also significantly embeds those features. AHD is a marginalizing practice and it works through differentiation, as Smith (2006, pp. 35–36) has studied. The findings showed how the heritage negotiations bypassed young and poor as heritage representations.

> Finland's only runic inscription, a silver buckle has been found in Mikkeli. It will be seen next summer at the joint exhibition of the Suur-Savo Museum and the Savonlinna Provincial Museum. "It's precious! The first and so far only sure runes are from Mikkeli and not from Ostrobothnia, for example" says Leena Lehtinen, the archeologist of the region, another of the collectors of the exhibition. (LS1)

> Another significant discovery is the Visulahti cemetery, but this exhibition also reveals the differences between Mrs. Tuukkala's and Miss Visulahti's jewelry: in Visulahti the jewelry was much poorer and also younger, dating from the 1200s and 1300s. (LS6)

Yet, the materiality discourse described the region of Savo as peaceful, which was revealed through the objects found in the graves. From my point of view, the peacefulness refers to the idea of AHD, which embeds "history as good" as a favored representation of heritage (Smith, 2006, pp. 29–30). These findings also connect to the studies of Waterton (2005) who investigated manicured presentations of heritage sites. The manicure, "keeping sites neat and tidy", seemed to be embedded in these material heritage representations:

> "The region has been one of the central areas of Finland. People were not warlike, but they have been mainly herdsmen and farmers", says Lehtinen. (IS11)

> Women's jewelry designs are different in the West and East. Both western and eastern jewelry models have been found in the cemeteries of the Mikkeli region in a rather small area. (IS9)

Besides the peacefulness, material heritage representations had another characteristic of "between east and west", as it was described in the example above. Besides, the jewelry had both eastern and western designs, also weapons found in the graves pointed that out. Yet, the name of the exhibition itself "Kalmistojen kertomaa – rautakautinen Mikkeli idän ja lännen välissä" (Told by the Graves – Iron age Mikkeli between east and west) represented this in-betweenness of Mikkeli region.

5.1.1   Peaceful and in-between Savonian identities

Even though materiality appeared to be the dominant way to perceive heritage, it is necessary to move further from the physicality of heritage. Smith (2006, p. 54) has considered all heritage as intangible and as the previous literature has emphasized, material heritage is a physical representation to identity (Lowenthal, 1985, as cited in Smith, 2006, p. 48) and then embeds way more meanings than a pure tangibility (Smith, 2006). Thereby, these representations of the material past participate in providing a sense of belonging and communal membership through the exhibited objects (Douglas, 1997, pp. 151–152; Smith, 2006, p. 48). Hall (1997) has argued identity is formed through othering and difference, and it also happened in this context in my study. The way of building identity through difference came evident with material heritage representations of the objects and the ancient costume reconstructions. For example, the previous statement of the regional archeologist: ″It's precious! The first and so far only sure runes are from Mikkeli and not from Ostrobothnia″ (LS1) created this difference between Mikkeli and Ostrobothnia.

The material heritage discourse particularly made sense of Savonian identity, which appeared to be one of the main purposes to organize the exhibition. The focus on the rich and the old was favored as heritage, as symbolic representations to Savonian identity. Another feature connected to the Savonian identity was peaceful. The construction of the peaceful Savonian people was based on the statements regarding the prosperous and rich findings in the graves, and to the facts that the graves had almost no swords, but instead more necessities to animal husbandry and agriculture. Moreover, the feature of in-betweenness of the Savonian people came evident through material objects and jewelry, yet also from the physical features of the deceased: the ancient folks in Mikkeli region were interpreted to be from the east (karjalaisia) and west (hämäläisiä) or pre-Sámi.

> There is also an interpretation of the graves of the cemeteries that there were two populations of very different heights living in the Mikkeli region. The average height for men has been 175 cm, for women 157 cm. ″It may be that the long-dead were from Häme and the short were from Karelian or pre-Sámi backgrounds. In any case, it appears that a mixture of these demographic elements has given rise to the present form of Savo people.″ (LS7)

These representations of the deceased bodies opened an interesting identity negotiation about the origin of the Mikkeli region's people. According to the previous literature about national identities that are many times connected to heritage representations, these findings question

the internal homogeneity that national heritage seeks and broadens the identity debates over places and territories, without clear beginnings and endings (Graham et al., 2000, p. 56). The findings revealed diverse and heterogenous ingredients of Savonian identity, including multiple features of ″Karelian″, ″Häme″ and ″pre-Sámi″. This construction can work as a response to nationalistic acknowledgments and bring forth local formations of identity (Berking, 2003; Inglehart & Baker, 2000). Therefore, as the heritage discourses have the intention to create a sense of belonging (Smith, 2006, pp. 17–18), these findings imply identity as more dynamic and unclear, like a hybrid as Graham and Howard (2008, p. 7) has discussed.

5.1.2   Handsome and rich women

Besides the dominant discourse of materiality constructed Savonian identity, it also participated in making gender. In the materiality discourse gender construction was especially done in the texts about the ancient costumes. The discourse particularly highlighted women, and it happened through described names e.g. ″Woman of Tuukkala″ and ″miss Visulahti″. The costume was also associated with definitions of ″the ancient mistresses″, ″the Savonian mighty mistresses″ and ″Savonian mistress″. The focus on women was interesting since the women have been claimed to be the ones being ignored in authorized accounts of heritage discourse (Reading, 2014; Smith, 2006, p. 30).

However, the focus on women in my data did not mean all women were invited to material heritage discourse. It appeared to be quite opposite. For example, the ancient costume was discussed distinctively in a statement considering the price of the costume: ″The cost of the first costume and jewelry was FIM 41,000. So, the ancient costume of Mikkeli hardly becomes the dress of every girl″ (SS8). Hence, gender representations valued certain women, and followed a certain meaning-making process: rich grave findings of jewelry and the high price of the costume equated certain class and age of women who were invited to the discourse. Therefore, ″girls″, as I interpreted them to be those who could not afford 41 000FM, were excluded from this heritage process. This intersectionality with aspects of gender, class, and age were evident as crossing differences in my findings (see Rossi, 2010, pp. 35–37) and are significant in a sense of the feminist epistemology of empowerment (see Liljeström, 2004). The discourse worked through exclusion within a category of women and

revealed a struggle that exists in that solidness (see Butler, 2008, pp. 238–239). Stiff gender categories should be taken into reconsideration in the context of heritage since these findings reveal the women are less solid and clear, but intersectional and complex.

Moreover, the differences between the categories of women and men also emerged. The "prosperous women of the past" were highlighted in the materiality discourse, where the representations of men were associated with livelihoods, tools, and weaponry, being more modest. Men's graves were told to be poorer without that many pieces of jewelry: "Men's clothing is more modest" (IS9), and instead they included tools regarding fishing, hunting and other: "There is only one fishing tackle found in the tomb of a man from Tuukkala, but instead, there are a huge number of arrowheads, spearheads, and work axes" (LS6). It can be asked whether this discourse suppressed men when the focus on material aspects of heritage gave more recognition and visibility to feminine features of beauty, jewelry, and crafts.

> The Iron Age deceased bodies were buried in festive clothing. Women's festive wear features an intricate chain device, which includes, among other things, decorative chain hanger. Also, different types of buckles, pearls, bird jewelry, and rings have been found in the tombs. The materials vary in bronze, iron, and later silver. (IS9)

According to my interpretation, the different social roles of men and women constructed in the texts segregated men from women with masculine features of war, weaponry, and hunting-fishing, where women where connected to rural crafts. I argue these findings are in line with previous literature about "anatomy is a destiny" of De Beauvoir, and biological determinism, where gender roles are something to put on the top of sex (Salomäki, 2011, pp. 226–227). The previous literature shows that biological determinism has been a common way to construct gender in heritage discourses (Perry & Joyce, 2005, Smith, 2006) and these findings seemed to repeat that.

The biological determinism also appeared in connection to the biological feature of the height of the deceased: the representations regarded men as taller than women: "Two groups of people of very different heights would have lived in the Mikkeli region. The average height for men is 175 cm, for women 157 cm" (LS7). However, it turned out not to be that straightforward. The statement talked about the average height of people and considered men taller than women, but another text disclosed that there were tall women too:

> The meeting between East and West is well visible in the Tuukkala cemetery.
> The tombs clearly have a population of two kinds of people. Tall men are up
> to 190 cm, women over 170 cm. (IS9)

From my point of view, these aspects do not support that straight distinctive category of sex where men's physical features always pass women but implicated that physical features are diverse, and they cross between sex categories (see Rossi, 2003). So, in a way, the two sexes do not exclude each other blindly, and biological determinism can be questioned with these findings.

5.2 Locality discourse

Another dominant discourse in newspaper texts was locality. However, it was more implicit and harder to define than the two other discourses, it was significant with its meanings, especially connected to identity constructions. I defined the locality discourse as the construction of heritage through its connection to the location, with other regions, and to the wider world. These constructions worked through differentiation and exclusions as discussed earlier in the findings, but also formed alliances and commonness with certain features.

The texts emphasized the local objects and local heritage sites. The objects which were locally found were certainly emphasized and valued in this discourse. For instance, the silver buckle with rune writing, characteristics of "the one of kin in Finland", was discovered in Tuukkala cemetery, Mikkeli, and got lots of attention in the texts. Besides the local objects, local heritage sites were highlighted with statements regarding Mikkeli regions central location in Iron age Finland. Moreover, the representations of the four main cemeteries supported the idea of territorial heritage (see Graham et al., 2000; Smith, 2006):

> The roots of Savo and Savonia are found in Mikkeli, in the surroundings of
> Savilahti. Savo's most important Iron Age cemeteries, ie Moisio Latokallio,
> Kyyhkylä, Tuukkala, and Visulahti, are all within a distance of about 15
> kilometers from Mikkeli. (IS9)
>
> Leena Lehtinen, who presented the exhibition, names magnificent silver
> buckles as truly valuable discoveries, which are a kind hallmark of the
> cemetery in the Mikkeli region. The most valuable buckle has got its
> showcase beside the entrance of the exhibition. It contains the only runic
> inscription in Finland so far that has been proven to be reliable. It has been
> found in Tuukkala. (LS6)

However, the locality discourse operated also through opposition to other geographical locations. For instance, I observed that Savonlinna and Mikkeli were represented in a differentiative way. They are different cities and located approximately 100km away from each other in Southern Savo region. The exhibition "Told by the Graves" was a big co-operative project between the Savonlinna Regional Museum and the Suur-Savo museum of Mikkeli (Runonen, 27.1.1994). Despite the co-operation, there seemed to exist a certain tension between them: Savonlinna was described in a way, which was less understanding of history. Also, political standpoints of the city were emphasized to be repulsive for the regional archaeologist who worked there:

> Sometimes you have to take a distance to Savonlinna, otherwise, you will get confused. I don't want to get tangled in Savonlinna's politics. My area is the whole county, so I have to stand above one city. (IS4)

> I hope that Savonlinna also understands the importance of the history of the province and the region. Ancient settlements could be exploited for tourism, for example. (IS4)

Although Savonlinna was somehow distanced from the heritage discourse, there were some wider geographical locations, which shared the sameness in heritage and were connected to Mikkeli region. The texts brought up sameness with certain cultures: a silver buckle with rune writing belonged to a Scandinavian woman and then connected the region with Scandinavian and Germanic people (see Moilanen, 2017). One text connected ancient Mikkeli people with ancient Egyptians:

> During the Iron Age, the Savonian worshiped natural gods and deceased spirits. To the deceased to be well beyond the Manala stream, one was given the necessary items, just as the ancient Egyptians. (IS9)

> A buckle has been found in Tuukkala, which belonged to one of the deceased women. It has the only sure runic inscription found in Finland. The buckle once belonged to a Scandinavian woman named Botwi. (IS11)

5.2.1 The locations of Savonian identity

These findings of locality discourse participated in constructing a certain perspective to Savonian identity through local characteristics, which had nationalistic tendencies. According to literature, the local features can be connected to nationalism: they can support national cohesion and community belonging (Lähdesmäki, 2007, p. 470) and it can be like a micro-level love of country, as Lähdesmäki (2007, p. 470) and Smith (2006, p. 22) have

stated. Nationalism highlights territorial belonging (Graham et al., 2000, p. 56), which can be observed through these findings: the locality discourse defined Savonian identity, which was placed in the territorial location of the Mikkeli region. Moreover, embedded nationalism of this finding is supported through the recognition that the year 1994 was a celebration year of national culture, and the time of voting for EU membership (Tanner & Piela, 1994). The exhibition was organized on the time of these events, and as Tanner and Piela (1994) disclose, the purpose of the celebration year was to strengthen Finnish identity, through local and national cultural features (see Halbwachs, 1992). The discourse constructed the idea of Savonian identity as part of the national identity of Finland to improve and evoke national cohesion and a sense of belonging.

Smith (2006, pp. 60–62) has argued nationalistic tendencies leave some community groups and identities outside of the discourse, which is consent with my findings: there were limitations of locations that were invited to heritage discourse. The distinctions between locations created tensions between regions within Southern Savo area and constructed ideas about the locations, which are connected and/or disconnected to Savonian identity. This finding revealed a struggle of unity and sameness of identities, which have been previously studied by Corsane (2005), Díaz-Andreu and Lucy (2005) and Hall (1997).

The findings are in line with the studies of Anderson (2006) about imagined communities, which are imagined because members of the nation ″will never meet or know each other, but that in the minds of each lives the image of their communion″ (Anderson, 2006, p. 6). I consider seeking of internal homogeneity (Graham et al., 2000, p. 56) was done through these locations or people of Scandinavia and Egypt when the differentiation was done in regional level between Mikkeli and Savonlinna (see Hall, 1997). It revealed the multidimensional identity constructions, which had boundaries within the nation and region, and on the other hand, were connected to the wider world and participated in the creation of a hybrid identity (Graham & Howard, 2008, p. 7).

5.2.2   Superior local women

The locality discourse embedded aspects of local characteristics, which also favored certain gendered understanding of women and men of Mikkeli region, and then participated in the creation of Savonian and national identities (see Anderson, 2006; Graham et al., 2000).

These identities had certain features, and they excluded others (see Said, 2003). Even a small example of the text, which emphasized the distinction of a group another woman was significant in a sense of creating national identities, a sense of belonging, and cohesion:

> Looking at the many details of the costume, the question arises as to whether the creation found in the tomb of Tuukkala might be a true costume of mighty Savonian mistress. Did they know such craftsmanship around Savilahti a thousand years ago, or are the remains of a costume found in the cemetery the cackle of another woman? (SS8)

Said (2003) has discussed the ″other″, which highlights territorial belonging and leaves the others in a lesser position, which can be discussed together with this finding. In my opinion, these so-called uninvited women, whose identities were yet never defined, got different treatment from the ones who were represented as part of Savonian identity, with characteristics i.e. skillful, neat and precise: ″Raija Kääriäinen and Päivi Virolainen admire how skillful the ancient mistresses have been. The work has been extremely neat and precise″ (LS2). As the previous studies have disclosed, the locality in heritage discourse brings on a part of the national heritage that works through characteristic features (Lähdesmäki, 2007, p. 470). Hence, these constructions participated in constructing both local and national identities and created ″appropriate″ gender of the Savonian and Finnish women (see Smith, 2008).

So, the characteristic features in the Mikkeli region included the representations of local women of skillful, neat, and precise. Also, I observed the discourse participated in creating the Savonian identity of women, with features both feminine and masculine, which emerged in distinction to men. When men were described with fewer associations, with barely masculine features of war, weaponry, and hunting-fishing, women got more diverse and dynamic gender roles in the discourse. These findings were supported by the previous studies of Rossi (2003) and Halberstam (1998) about women's masculinity. According to my interpretation, these features Savonian women's masculinity break the patterns of the heterosexual matrix (Butler, 2008) and heterosexual norms, and then participate in breaking the assumptions of solid and strict gender categories.

5.2.3   Ferocious boys

The finding, which connected to the intersectionality of gender has been previously discussed by e.g. Hill Collins (2000) and Rossi (2010) and it revealed interesting crossing

differences of gender and age in the locality discourse regarding the representations of the museum audience. I observed there was a distinction between the school children and the locals as the museum audience and found out the school children were discussed as a separated group from the locals. This, in my opinion, showed a matter of exclusion of age in the locality discourse.

> Nousiainen just wished the local people would have been more interested in the cemetery exhibition than needed. There is no room for blame for the activity of schoolchildren, but in the summer the exhibition audience is made up of tourists rather than locals. (LS10)

This intersection of age also connected to Smith's (2006) theories about AHD, which has an emphasis in educating the public: the public edification of the children was emergent in the data, as well as the museum assistant's superior role in assessing the activity of them and other audience. The representations of the children as the audience were hierarchically positioned in opposition to authorized knowledge of the heritage experts, which emphasized the expert knowledge in the heritage process and constructed a passive role for the visitors. Hodder's (1999, as cited in Smith, 2006) studies about "passing through" at heritage sites seem to be then connected with these findings.

Moreover, the exclusion happened also within the group of school children, in a representation of ferocious boys (hurjimmat pojankoltiaiset), which were represented in a way with a surprise what it came to the interest of these children towards the exhibition: "Even the wildest boys have toured the exhibition with enthusiasm and interest", says Antikainen" (LS10). I consider this statement carried a presumption seemed of the wild boys, who are not usually interested in a museum exhibition. Therefore, this finding related not only to the intersection of age but also to gender: gender representations of schoolboys as "wild", as connected activity and wildness repeated heteronormative gender roles and biological determinism (see Salomäki, 2011). The previous literature has emphasized normative values in gender representations in heritage discourse and this finding provided an interesting viewpoint to the intersectional understanding of gendered museum audience and exclusion that happens within those frameworks (see Colella, 2018; Jones & Pay, 1994; Lähdesmäki, 2007; Reading, 2014; Wilson, 2018).

5.3 Authority discourse

Authority was one of the strongest discourses of the texts together with materiality. Authority was manifested through scientific and disciplined heritage references, through institutional, legislative, and political agents and departments, through expert's language, titles, and terminology. All the texts included references, comments, and viewpoints of heritage experts or heritage ″supporters″, as I named them. I paid attention that none of the texts included viewpoints of the people or the audience groups. I considered authority discourse revealed the heritage expert's superior role in heritage making and then has its meaning significantly in AHD (Smith, 2006).

The references to research emphasized the authority. For instance, the exhibition was based on archaeological knowledge and research, and it was emphasized many times in the texts. The role of the archaeologists was significant, as it has been disclosed in previous literature too: the archaeology has had a status of intellectual aspiration through its privilege of stewardship over prehistoric sites and monuments (Smith, 2006). I counted that by number the regional archaeologist was one of the most emergent participants in the texts. Especially, when the texts discussed the ancient costumes the matter of conducted research for the reconstruction of the costume was stated many times. It was told that the research replaced the old drafts from the 1900s, and the comparison of old and new ancient costumes was made.

> A new ancient costume from the Mikkeli region has now been made for this exhibition, based on the research of Pirkko-Liisa Lehtosalo-Hilander, Doctor of Philosophy. It replaces the so-called Tuukkala costume that was previously based on sketches. It was made shortly after the discovery of the Tuukkala cemetery and no research was carried out for it. (LS6)

The social responsibility of the research was indicated through the discourse. The social responsibility of the archaeologist was emphasized, and the texts built a picture of the experts that worked for the people and the audience in the Mikkeli region. Thereby, the responsibility to educate the public (Smith, 2006) was embedded in the statements, which connected to the state of Mikkeli region's archaeological studies: the lack of archaeological research in the region was highlighted in many texts, and that was related to the locals' will to know about the past. According to my interpretation, there existed a collective need to know about the hidden past, and the archaeologists had a mission to fulfill that need. A good example of this was the representation of the regional archaeologist: ″The mission of life is

the ancient South Savo″ (IS4). However, this quite passionate mission brought along the pressure:

> According to Lehtinen, it is challenging to do an exhibition when you know it is desired and expected. It also has a lot of valuable items that make it very stunning. ″On the other hand, it has also created pressure, because, of course, this exhibition would like to give everything it can about the subject to the audience.″ (LS1)

The notable aspect of the discourse of authority was the language, which stressed the expert's knowledge about the past. The language included titles and terminologies specific to a certain field. For instance, the main authorities were always introduced with titles ″regional archaeologist″, ″museum assistant″, ″the governor″, ″docent″, ″bachelor of arts″ and so on. The certain terminology described the ancient costumes too, which included language specific to weaving and very detailed descriptions about the costume. Moreover, some archaeological terms, such as ″inventory″, and vague prehistorical periods shaped archaeological knowledge.

> The Iron Age in Finland lasted from 500 BC to 1300 AD. Mikkeli cemeteries date from the end of the first millennium to the beginning of the Middle Ages, ie 600-1300 AD. Cemeteries were sacred places with many customs. For example, you could not go to the cemetery at noon. There are about 80 ancient tombs in Mikkeli cemeteries. (IS9)

> Two pieces of fabric have been found under each shoulder buckle. According to research, the pieces are of a skirt that has been turned transversely and has a tubular selvage on both sides. (MKL5)

According to Smith (2006), AHD defines who has the right to speak about the past and gives authorities a rhetoric device of ″unknown past″, such as the chronologies of Iron age and the other terminological descriptions proved. These rhetorical devices positioned the non-experts outside the heritage making. The specific language use has a connection to theories of Bourdieu about cultural capital and Foucault's ideas of governmentality, discussed by Graham et al. (1991) and Smith (2006, p. 49). According to them, heritage is cultural capital, which is possessed by certain authorities and hence, also certain literature is demanded to understand the meanings of heritage (Graham, 2002; Smith, 2006). Heritage is fundamentally knowledge and it is used to direct populations and to solve social problems. (Graham, 2002; Smith, 2006, pp. 51–52). For instance, in this context, to ″cure″ the poor Savonian identity that is discussed more detailed further.

The authority discourse also connected to the wider networks of power to stress the expertise knowledge in the discourse. The Finnish Heritage agency as a national institution was described as the holder of the objects, and as a difficult ″system″. Difficult system meant hardships of conducting the exhibition, but it also implicated the hierarchical systems within the discipline of archaeology. Other accounts that connected to the networks of power were the statements about the administration of archaeology and its legislative reforms.

> ″Yes, the system is terrible for putting together such an exhibition. Every object is behind two, three locks at the Finnish Heritage Agency.″ (LS1)

> Kortesalmi thought in Savonlinna on Sunday that the ancient cemeteries of the region could still provide lots of new information. In his view, it should be possible to treat the sites as a whole, so that not only the discovery site but the entire environment should be protected. The governor thinks that from the archeological point of view, it is not irrelevant how the Finnish antiquities and environmental administration are organized. (IS12)

The findings approved that heritage is interconnected with society's various power relations, as Hieta et al. (2015, pp. 312–316) have discovered. Moreover, the aspect of money and lack of it emerged in statements, and constructed a certain meaning of money as part of the heritage process:

> This constant bombing has caused us now to get FIM 60,000 in inventory from the state. A couple of other provincial museums who had not applied for it received the same amount. (IS4)

The literature has discussed authority in heritage processes, and these findings are consent with the understanding of the archaeological heritage that has instrumental value as part of negotiations of politics, knowledge, laws, and institution's perspectives (see Hieta et al., 2015, pp. 312–316). As has been discussed earlier heritage is always someone's heritage, and these findings emphasize this archaeological exhibition was defined, understood, and performed through authorities' values and perspectives (e.g. Hieta et al., 2015).

5.3.1 Poor Savonian identity

The authority discourse constructed an idea that locals do not know their past and therefore they have a poor identity. That was reasoned through the arguments about the local prehistory that has not been exhibited anywhere in the region before, or ″at least in a hundred of years″. Somehow being Savonian, ″savolainen″, and adapting Savonian identity appeared

to be a needed basis for the Mikkeli people's identity. It was disclosed by the museum assistant and the "heritage supporter" Governor Kortesalmi.

> In the opening ceremony, Governor Kortesalmi reminded us that Savo and being Savonian are fundamental to the identity of our region, although even many of the region's representative people find their background and roots shameful. (IS12)

> Pentti Nousiainen says that the idea for the exhibition came from the fact that the knowledge of the prehistory of the Mikkeli region is rather poor because it is not on display anywhere. The purpose of this exhibition is to arouse interest in the exhibition and to reflect on the past of the Mikkeli people: were they already then Savonian. (LS1)

I consider these findings intertwine with Smith's (2006, p. 19) studies about the heritage expert's moral responsibility to educate the public with the idea of "pastoral care", which means teaching civil and national responsibilities to the public and providing national community ideals. In my study, this particularly concerned the ideals of Savonian identity. The social responsibility of the heritage experts and heritage supporter was to assist to construct better Savonian identity, which was relying on the expert knowledge about the material past. Moreover, as the governor Kortesalmi was an influential supporter of the heritage, his representation constructed an idea about the heritage that is also located in the elite's rooms. Smith (2006, p. 23) has argued that since the nineteenth century AHD has been embedded in the upper middle classes' experiences and understanding of heritage.

Although the authorized agents significantly possessed knowledge in this discourse, it was not that straightforward: their pastoral caring and edification of the public seemed to be contradictory with actual happenings. This finding came up in a statement of the museum assistant. In his speech, there existed disappointment and blame, as one of the latest texts about the exhibition in September 1994 discussed the locals who were defined as less interested in the exhibition: "However, Nousiainen wished that the local people would be more interested in the cemetery exhibition than they were" (LS10). I consider the museum assistant's assessment of the locals' behavior disengaged the locals from the heritage making and in identity construction in a significant way. Smith (2006, p. 49) has disclosed the authorized language hinders and disengages the non-experts from the heritage process and since there were no emergent participants of the people or locals in the texts, they were given a passive role in this process. The previous studies about passiveness have been well studied e.g. by Merriman (1991) and Smith (2006) and it has been connected to developments of

mass tourism (e.g. Malcolm-Davies, 2004; Watson et al., 2012). The texts do not provide access to the locals' statements regarding heritage, sense of belonging, emotions, and experiences at the museum. Only authorized constructions are made to represent the public. Smith (2006, pp. 44, 88) states the absence of people in heritage discourse do not tell a whole story of heritage and therefore, the discourse of authority is a marginalizing practice, which constrains community participation and creates a top-down relationship between the expert, site and the local as a visitor, as Smith (2006) and Urry (1990) have discussed.

5.3.2 Expertise and hardworking women

Gender representations in the dominant discourse of authority intersected with occupations and class and deepened the understanding of this heritage process. These crossing differences made the discourse even more complex and diverse. As it has been already pointed out in authority discourse, many of the texts used scientific references to explain and interpret the archeological heritage and knowledge. The ancient costume was highlighted to be a result of the academic research and was accomplished by certain researchers, which were both represented as women. The titles of ″Ph.D.″ and ″Bachelor of arts″ emphasized the matter of expertise. Also, the costume makers; the weaving and sewing experts, were represented as women. These expertise women, their research, and their heritage making significantly participated in this heritage process, although the previous literature has discussed the commonness of masculine workplaces in the field of heritage (see Smith, 2008, pp. 162–164) and therefore brings new insights to that issue. Moreover, this finding reveals the specific part of expertise that was in the hands of women: crafts.

> The production of the costume has been supervised by Docent Pirkko-Liisa Lehtosalo-Hilander, an expert in the ancient history of Etelä-Savo. The analyzes of prehistoric textiles were performed by Jaana Riikonen and handicraft itself was made by weaving consultant Raija Kääriäinen and sewing consultant Päivi Virolainen. (SS8)

This intersection of occupation and gender repeated heteronormative gender because women were related to roles connected to handicrafts (see Burman & Turbin, 2002; Ebeling, 2018; Grahn, 2006). As the previous literature has pointed out, in museum and heritage places stereotypical narratives of women have been common (Reading, 2014; Smith, 2008, p. 162) and this finding seemed to repeat that. Moreover, I found out the authority discourse built an idea of ancient women as superior towards the present time's experts of weaving and sewing. These aspects revealed the hierarchy in this heritage process: the ancient mistresses and their

work was appreciated by the weaving and sewing experts, which had to study history to make the ancient costume: ″For the costume makers of today, the ancient costume has meant a challenging and interesting job that has provided a great deal of history ″ (LS2).

> The costume made at the Mikkeli Handicraft Center this spring is based on research data and is a model sample of craftmanship. The costume of the Iron Age Mistress is based on findings gathered from the tombs and shows the ingenuity and sense of beauty, but above all, the product development that sought to be functional. (SS8)

This brings up AHD, which is highlighting a thought of ″history is good″ and public edification (Smith, 2006). The sewing and weaving experts were represented as ″the students of the past″: they were positioned more as audience and public, rather than the other heritage experts, which were the ones who ″knew″. This also brings up the hierarchy between the heritage experts. I interpreted the construction of the past's women was described as hardworking, detailed, and functional, who yet understood the beauty and had technical skills. These qualifications challenged the sewing and weaving experts of the present, who had to learn new skills to perform the costume reconstruction: ″We've had to experiment with different ways of working than we currently use and put our skills to the test″ (LS2).

However, there was a heritage expert who was associated with superior features: the regional archaeologist. Her representations further built the idea about a woman who is an ambitious worker, hardworking, and deeply devoted to the work. Her devotion was recognized internationally too:

> In the opinion of Leena Lehtinen, the credit given by the Finnish Department of the International Council of Museums recognizes all the basic work done in museums throughout the country. (IS4)

> Leena Lehtinen is lively and impulsive. She speaks breathlessly fast, says things plainly and clearly. Archeology and studying the past of South Savo are much more than work for Lehtinen. (IS4)

These findings told me the aspect of power was associated with certain women representations and through certain heritage experts. Moreover, the statement that even highlighted the power of women (in the past) came from the museum assistant, as a male, who gave this statement: ″It may be that the Iron Age community was matriarchal, female-dominated. Women are much more dressed up, Nousiainen says″ (IS9). This disclosure has a certain emphasis in this heritage discourse. This statement was positioned in the authorized male subject, which approved women as ruling in the past's society and then gave masculine

features to women. Masculinity refers to a certain kind of social gender, in roles, behavior, and mental features, which has been mainly connected to men (Rossi, 2003, p. 61). The masculine features of hardworking, skillful, and power to rule the community are embedded in women in this discourse. Therefore, in this context, masculinity does not mean that only the male sex, but also females have those characteristics (Halberstam, 1998; Rossi, 2003). Also, in the previous archeological studies of Ehrenberg (1989) and Gimbutas (as cited in Immonen, 2008, p. 415), the significant power positions of women in European prehistory have been found. This finding of women's masculinity battled against biological determinism that has been debated in feminist studies and then broadens the boundaries of heterosexual norms (see Butler, 2008; Salomäki, 2011). However, I see that statement also worked as a suppressive disclosure, because the interpretation highlighted women's beauty and dressing as a reason behind the power, being simplistic. As the previous literature has acknowledged suppression of women in heritage discourse (e.g. Smith, 2006, 2008; Spencer-Wood, 2011), through these findings it should be critically assessed whether this statement of the museum assistant is giving power to women, or suppressing them.

Besides the gender intersected with occupation and gave masculinity features to certain women, connections to money, institutions, and politics constructed gender intersecting with class. As has been discussed in previous literature, AHD has been part of the social and political elite's control, and their influence on heritage legislation has been influential (Smith, 2006, 2008).

> The South Savo Ancient Remnant Inventory has received support from Mikkeli County. Governor Kortesalmi attaches great importance to inventory. ″This is very important for the identity of the province. The people have not known the prehistory of the province. Knowing your past is important. ″ (IS4)

The constructions of political power and elite were embedded in the representations of the governor of Mikkeli and his role as a supporter in this heritage process was significant and he was an influential male participant in this discourse. Therefore, it can be argued that AHD again emerged in this context, by bringing up the long-rooted definition of gentleman's heritage into the picture (see Lowenthal, 1992, as cited in Smith, 2008).

6   SUGGESTIONS FOR MAKING GENDER DIFFERENTLY

I want to give a few thoughts considering gender representations as part of the heritage process and to ponder how they could be reproduced. As these findings disclose, gender as part of the heritage process is diverse, layered, and intersectional (see Rossi, 2010, pp. 35–37; Wilson, 2018, pp. 3–4). There exists a variety of chances for making gender differently, and I especially see the approaches of Butler (2008) fertile in this context: her theorization about imaginative gender categories and critiques towards biological determinism and pre-discursive subjects offer a perspective to further investigation of gender as part of the heritage processes (see Butler, 2008, pp. 237–238, 242–243).

I would like to raise up a few examples from the data to emphasize these chances for making a difference. For instance, the heterosexual and normalizing order of gender was emergent in the text of the past's people's heights, which can be reassessed. The representations offered a normative understanding of physical features where men are taller than women, but however, when looking into texts more carefully, there was a contradiction that can offer another perspective (see: Jokinen & Juhila, 1993, pp. 101–105). In the contradictory statement, women were represented as tall as men. This creates the struggle between binaries, and challenges biological determinism: the natural understanding of men's physical superiority can be resisted, since the idea of the past (and present), where to exist both tall women and men can be stated and then repeated differently. Stiff gender categories can be transformed into more diverse and flexible.

Spencer-Wood (2011) suggests taking this kind of both/and -thinking into the discussion because it can involve a variety of gendered roles and provide intersectional identities. Overall, I see Spencer-Wood's (2011) thought useful in a sense of understanding the past and gender in a more diverse way. Another finding, which was repeated in many dominant discourses was the aspect of history's goodness. This thought that is embedded in AHD (Smith, 2006) had a certain power in almost all of the discourses: it touched the superiority of the past's woman in comparison to the present women, it colored the past as peaceful, and represented the past's people as not war-alike. I argue these representations were rather simplistic, and they can be criticized. As the previous studies have disclosed, the past has its other side as well: there exists 'difficult heritage', which includes e.g. violence and sexual violence as part of history (Cote, 2009; Logan & Reeves, 2009; Reading, 2014). Yet, the

concept of 'dissonant heritage' (Ashworth & Turnbridge, 1996, as cited in Smith, 2006) can be included in these notions, which highlights the dilemmas and tensions of heritage places: the consensus of heritage interpretations are not always possible. I consider this critical attention should be included in the gender making in heritage processes, and therefore suggest of representing the past's people, both women, and men, as peaceful and war-alike, and to consider the present people as equally "good" and "bad" as the past's people.

Another finding, which offers a chance for making a difference is the nature of archaeology as interpretive. There was one text, which emphasized this matter: According to the museum assistant Pentti Nousiainen, one of the most important keywords in "archeology is interpretation" (LS7). Although this statement was only once mentioned this clearly, recognizing the condition of interpretation about the past can provide a serious chance for variety, as the archaeologist Ehrenberg (1989) has disclosed in her notions of gender representations in prehistorical societies. The authorized knowledge was a big discourse in my findings, but if this knowledge is considered as interpretation, not as truths, more doors could be opened for diverse interpretations about gender. The findings imply that the archaeological research embeds material heritage as a basis for gender roles, which were many times biologically determined. For instance, men are connected to hunting, fishing and war, and women with crafts and beauty. These matters can be reinterpreted: how about both women and men could be associated with these features? How many chances for different Savonian identities this could evoke?

At last, I agree with Collella (2018) that to achieve variety in gender representations feminist epistemology should be applied to heritage discourse more closely, where for instance, Hein (2010, as cited in Colella, 2018) offers important standpoints for further considerations. First, reconsideration of the museum audience not as neutral subjects, or passive, should be interpreted. The passiveness emerged in my findings too and disengaged the locals from the heritage making. Yet, the gendered exclusion that happened in these representations excluded ferocious boys of a certain age from the heritage making. I see this construction created an idea of archaeological heritage that is more meaningful to older than to young ones. Therefore, instead of giving a passive role to the locals and audience, acknowledging experiences, emotions, and remembrance that happen at the museum could reveal more engagement, deeper agency, and inclusion (see Smith, 2006). At last, de-emphasizing

classifications and categorizations in museums, which tend to focus on the origin, chronology, and geography, as Hein (2010, as cited in Colella, 2018) has observed, could be reassessed with the findings of this study. The findings revealed how material heritage was bounded in certain territorial locations, which struggled at regional, national, and global levels and created tensions of nationalism, imagined communities, and territorial identities. This exclusion marginalized and silenced e.g. ″another woman″, which was discussed in the chapter of locality discourse. Therefore, to de-emphasize the classifications of museums, in other words, to ″display unpredictable″ (Hein, 2010, as cited in Colella, 2018), I would suggest of looking at to the ″another″, to understand more about the exclusion that happens in the museum representations, and yet, to understand historical marginals, whose role in big narratives of the past are defaced.

7   DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study started with my ponderings about identity: I was eager to feel a sense of belonging in my hometown Mikkeli, for the reasons still unknown to me. This feeling was evoked through the Iron age woman whom I was gazed upon in the Suur-Savo museum in 2018. That woman was a costume reconstruction, which is exhibited behind the glass vitrine. However, for me, her presence embedded more than just a material reconstruction of textiles, designs, and complicated jewelry. Looking at her almost made my roots to grow from my feet, or I thought it did. However, the time has passed, and now in 2020, my need to feel a sense of belonging towards my hometown has evolved towards a more complex understanding of the roots and heritage, thanks to this master's thesis process.

The complexity of heritage appeared in the findings as this study sought to understand more about heritage through certain perspectives. The study is based on the viewpoints of heritage that is something someone has decided to be significant and important. Many times, as the previous studies disclose, those decisions have been in the hands of authorities, elites, and gentlemen (Hovi, 2017, pp. 65–68; Smith, 2006). Therefore, heritage has to do with power relations and have evoked many criticisms that it comes to community participation and democratization. Heritage also significantly touches identity when heritage negotiations enable and limit identity formations (Corsane, 2005; Díaz-Andreu & Lucy, 2005; Hall, 1997; Smith 2006, 2008). Smith (2006) has found out certain identities are absent in authorized heritage discourse (AHD), for instance, women's, indigenous peoples and gay, lesbian, and transgender stories have been overlooked (Smith, 2006).

The Iron age woman behind the glass vitrine made me take a gender perspective to understand the connection between heritage, identities, and finally, gender as an important part of the heritage process. I aimed to understand how dominant discourses operate, and how they practice inclusion and exclusion of identities and genders in newspaper texts. This study has focused on the Mikkeli region, Southern East Finland. The region has been unpopular within studies of heritage in Finnish academia, not to mention gender perspective, which has been quite absent in Finnish heritage studies overall. Hence this study wanted to increase knowledge in the region and wider to fill the research gap. The study sought the answer to the research question: Whose heritage is represented in the newspaper texts about the archaeological exhibition in the Mikkeli region in 1994?

I revealed three main dominant discourses: ″materiality″, ″locality″ and ″authority″, which dominance was emphasized through repetition and naturalization of the statements, and they were connected to the previous studies on critical heritage studies and feminist perspectives. The construction of materiality discourse was based on previous literature about Authorized Heritage Discourse (AHD) by Smith (2006) and studies of Graham (2002) and Graham et al. (2000, 2005). I found the discourse constructed heritage with embedded AHD, particularly focusing on the materiality of objects as the basis of archaeological heritage, which was possessed and knew through heritage experts. When I sought to understand how the dominant discourse of materiality construct Savonian identity, I found associations with age, richness, beauty, peaceful, and in-betweenness emerged. Many of these dimensions are supported again by AHD (Smith, 2006). Yet, as identity is formed through differentiation, these findings excluded ″young″ and ″poor″ as associations to identity (see Hall, 1997). On the other hand, the finding of the in-betweenness of Savonian people's origins was interesting since it built a more diverse and heterogonous Savonian identity connecting to ″Häme″, ″Karelian″ and ″Pre-Sami″ features. I argue it can work towards more inclusive identity politics in the Mikkeli region and challenges national identities (see Anderson, 2006; Graham et al., 2000, p. 56).

The materiality discourse constructed gender representations in a way that was consent with the previous literature about heteronormative assumptions in heritage sites, museums, and galleries (e.g. Reading, 2014; Smith, 2008). The past's women were associated with crafts and beauty, and men with war, weaponry, hunting, fishing, and modesty. Also, physically men were represented to be taller than women, which referred to biological determinism (see Salomäki, 2011). These findings showed quite narrow and stereotypical formations of gender. The materiality discourse had more emphasis in women than in men, which touched the ancient costume reconstructions and invited women to heritage process, and in a way, challenged the previous studies about women's absence and invisibility in histories narratives (e.g. Reading, 2014; Smith, 2006, 2008). However, only certain women were made visible, and therefore, those associated with old, rich, and beauty were invited to heritage making.

The dominant discourse of locality was not that strong than the two others but significant with its meaning and way of operation. The locality discourse was particularly supported by

previous studies of Graham et al. (2000) and Lähdesmäki (2007) about heritage and nationalism. The discourse worked through geographical locations and constructed representations of homogeneity with certain locations, and on the other hand, drove out some. This inclusion and exclusion happened to be quite diverse and built heritage with features of unclear of its borders and hybridity (see Duncan & Duncan, 2004; Graham & Howard, 2008). The locality discourse formed Savonian identity through differentiation to other geographical locations: certainly, local was favored as identity and was attached to certain places.

When the materiality discourse favored beauty, certain class, and age, this discourse favored the locality in women. Thereby, the local women were built in distinction to another (see Douglas, 1997; Graham & Howard, 2008; Said, 2003). The discourse favored Savonian mistresses' craftmanship, where the other's skills supposedly would have been ″just cackle″. This finding certainly has a significant meaning in building national and local identities through difference. Yet, the locality discourse constructed the intersection of age and gender in museum audience representations. The school children were treated as a separate group from the locals, and it brought forward the AHD's emphasis on educating the public (Smith, 2006). The representation of ferocious boys showed how gender and age intersect and embed heteronormative gender roles, where male sex is associated with activeness (see Rossi, 2003; Salomäki, 2011). The exclusion of age in this heritage making seems to be significant in this study, since also previously in the findings there where ″girls″ that were not invited to the heritage process.

At last, the authority discourse was repeated and naturalized with expert's knowledge and language, scientific references, politics, and money. The discourse highlighted the role of the experts in this heritage process and absented the public, audience, and locals, which had not any statements in my data. Savonian identity got a characteristic of ″poor″, which was defined by the statements of the heritage experts or the heritage supporter as a political agent. This authorized definition of the locals' identity embeds power relations, where hierarchy between the experts and locals is revealed. If we investigate this with an idea of democracy in heritage processes, this finding hinders the goals of equality and shows how the Savonian identity and its meanings is in the hands of the experts.

The authority discourse formed gender representations with masculine features of women through expertise and occupations. The masculinity of women, which has been previously studied by Halberstam (1998) and Rossi (2003) opens heritage discourse to more diverse gender representations and opposes the biological determinism since also women can get masculine features. These findings challenge some previous studies about the suppression of women's histories (Reading, 2014; Smith, 2008). The discourse also built an idea of the past's women superiority and embeds again the thought of the past as good and edification of the public as important parts of AHD (Smith, 2006). Yet, it draws a picture of hierarchies within the category of the heritage experts, through giving a role of students of the past to some. Elitist and gentlemen's influence in representations about the past emerge and connect to the intersection of gender and class.

As Smith (2006) has discussed the elite's heritage, the findings indicate the heritage is done by certain people, for certain people, for certain women and men, who represent certain class, age, and aesthetic values, as the critical heritage studies have found out too (e.g. Coté, 2009; Reading, 2014; Smith, 2006, 2008). The findings of the study are in line with those notions and showed the authorized heritage in practice in the representations of the newspapers. However, there were also chances of diversity in gender making, which was enabled through contradictions. The contradictions of the texts showed possible ways to reproduce gender differently and how natural understanding of gender can be resisted and challenged. Challenging the "history's goodness", which itself seemed to reproduce certain sexualities and gender stereotypes, should be critically investigated further. In the end, the interpretive nature of (archaeological) knowledge can set the tone for a more holistic understanding of gender and identities, in the past, present, and future.

This study has its limitations. It had a focus on 12 local and regional newspaper texts published in the 1994 Mikkeli region, so making any generalizations to the present time or other regions in Finland cannot be done without care. Moreover, although the amount of data for discourse analysis was enough (Hirsjärvi et al., 1997, p. 226), a bigger number of texts or another kind of texts probably would have revealed e.g. the public's perspectives to the heritage process, which were significantly lacking in this study. Moreover, this study did not use forms of texts like opinions, nor it did not include pictures of the articles. My initial idea was to involve pictures to the analysis, but due to time constraints and lack of my familiarization of visual representation studies, I decided to leave them out. The study was

critical, and it employed post-structural and feminist standpoints, and through those lenses, I formed my understanding of the topics. Other perspectives would have come up with different outcomes. My perspectives included the understanding of power relations in discourses, and acknowledgment of suppression directed the study towards the emancipation of historical marginals (Immonen, 2001, p. 19; Liljeström, 2004, p. 11). Surprisingly, the thought about the historical marginals changed during the thesis work: I started with the idea "women are suppressed in heritage discourse", as I symbolically saw the Iron age lady left in the shadows in the Suur-Savo museum. I ended this journey with a more diverse understanding of gender as part of thi museum exhibition representations.

Further study suggestions are many. As I have emphasized above, the visual studies of imaginaries of newspaper texts would bring up more depth understanding of heritage making in mass media. Yet, focus on journalism and its connection to national heritage making should be furtherly studied since the previous literature has found out journalism is following national interests (Jaakkola, 2013, pp. 16–17; Kunelius, 2003, pp. 23–25). My findings regarding nationalism and heritage were little and left lots of room to further studies. Another focus for the future's studies could be the public's texts and statements about heritage since this study found them absent. Other forms of media, such as blogs and social media could be relevant as data. This study aimed to participate to fill the gap of the gender perspective in Finnish academia regarding heritage studies, but still, further studies about intersectional matters of masculinities and femininities considering heritage representations, heritage visitors, and heritage experts should be continued to achieve more community participation and equality in heritage making (see Colella, 2018; Grahn, 2012; Reading, 2014).

REFERENCES

Aali, H. (2017). *Merovingian Queenship in Early Nineteenth-Century French Historiography.* (Academic dissertation. University of Turku, Annales Universitatis Turkuensis 429 B.)

Aarnipuu, P. (2008). *Turun linna kerrottuna ja kertovana tilana*. University of Helsinki. Retrieved April 20, 2020 from http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-951-746-983-8

Ahl-Waris, E. (2010). *Historiebruk kring Nådendal och den kommemorativa anatomin av klostrets minnesplats.* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Helsinki.) http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-952-10-6674-0

Aitchison, C.C. (2005). Feminist and gender perspectives in tourism studies. The social-cultural nexus of critical and cultural theories. *Tourist Studies 5,* 207–224. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468797605070330

Aitchison, C. (2009). Gender and Tourism discourses: advancing the gender project in tourism studies. In T., Jamal & M., Robinson, (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Tourism Studies* (pp. 631–644). London: SAGE Publications.

Ajankohtaista museoissa (2020). Retrieved April 12, 2020, from https://www.mikkeli.fi/sisalto/palvelut/kulttuuri-ja-kirjasto/mikkelin-kaupungin-museot/ajankohtaista-museoissa#Korona

Anderson, B. (2006). *Imagined communities*. London: Verso

Arwill-Nordbladh, E. (2008). Twelve Timely Tales: On Biographies of Pioneering Women Archaeologists. *Reviews in Anthropology 37,* 136–168. https://doi.org/10.1080/00938150802038984

Astuvansalmi ensimmäisenä suomalaiskohteena Euroopan neuvoston kalliotaidereittiin (2019). Retrieved April 12, 2020, from https://www.mikkeli.fi/uutiset/astuvansalmi-ensimmaisena-suomalaiskohteena-euroopan-neuvoston-kalliotaidereittiin

Axelsson, B. & Ludvigsson, D. (2018). Johanna, Moa and I'm every lesbian: gender, sexuality and class in Norrköping's industrial landscape. In W. Grahn & R.J. Wilson (Eds.), *Gender and Heritage: Performance, Place and Politics (*pp. 17–30). London: Routledge.

Berking, H. (2003). ´Ethnicity is everywhere´: On Globalization and the Transformation of Cultural Identity. *Current Sociology 51*, 248–264. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392103051003006

Bergsdóttir, A. & Hafsteinssons, S.B. (2018). The fleshyness of absence: the matter of absence in a feminist museology. In W. Grahn & R.J. Wilson (Eds.) *Gender and Heritage: Performance, Place and Politics* (pp. 99–112). London: Routledge.

Billig, M. (1995). *Banal Nationalism*. London: SAGE Publications.

Blake, J. (2018). Gender and intangible heritage: illustrating the inter-disciplinary character of international law. In W. Grahn & R.J. Wilson (Eds.), *Gender and Heritage: Performance, Place and Politics* (pp. 207–220). London: Routledge.

Bordo, S. (1993). *Unbearable weight: feminism, Western culture, and the body*. University of California Press.

Brett, D. (1996). *The Construction of Heritage*. Cork University Press.

Burman, B. & Turbin, C. (2002). Introduction: Material Strategies Engendered. *Gender & History 14*, 371–381. Retrieved April 22, 2020, from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/1468-0424.00273?casa_token=rpNaiDxcBscAAAAA%3AsLsg1S_NPDQZ0f3VoftdRbzvMMflV3zexCPGvqnVv3gPAsRw7454yme1UClsq5mlguiz6uznRlbR

Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter: on the discursive limits of ´Sex´*. New York: Routledge

Butler, J. (1997). Excerpt from *Gender Trouble*. In D. Tietjens Meyers (ed.), *Feminist Social Thought: A reader* (pp. 113–128), New York: Routledge.

Butler, J. (2008). *Hankala sukupuoli. Feminismi ja identiteetin kumous*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Chouliaraki, L. (2008). Discourse analysis. In T. Bennet & J. Frow (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Cultural Analysis* (pp. 674–696). London: Sage publications.

Clopot, C. & Nic Craith, M. (2018). Gender, heritage and changing traditions: Russian Old Believers in Romania. In W. Grahn & R. J Wilson. (Eds.), *Gender and Heritage: Performance, Place and Politics* (pp. 30–44). London: Routledge.

Colella, S. (2018). ´´Not a mere tangential outbreak´´: gender, feminism and cultural heritage. *Il Capitale Culturale. Studies on the Value of Cultural Heritage 18,* 251–275. http://dx.doi.org/10.13138/2039-2362/1897

Corsane, G. (2005). Issues in heritage, museums and galleries: a brief introduction. In G. Corsane (ed.) *Heritage, museums and galleries*. *An introductory reader* (pp. 1–14). London: Routledge.

Council of Europe (2005). Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society. Retrieved April 9, 2020, from https://www.coe.int/en/web/conventions/full-list/-/conventions/rms/0900001680083746

Coté, J. (2009). Postcolonial shame. Heritage and the forgotten pain of civilian women internees in Java. In W. Logan & K. Reeves (Eds.), *Places of Pain and Shame: Dealing with ´Difficult heritage´* (pp. 128–143). London: Routledge.

Crang, M. (1996). Magic kingdom or a quixotic quest for authenticity? *Annals of Tourism research 23(2),* 415–431. https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(95)00070-4

Crang, M. & Tollia-Kelly, D.P. (2010). Nation, race and affect: Senses and sensibilities at national heritage sites. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space 42*, 2315–2331. https://doi.org/10.1068/a4346

Crouch, D. (2003). Spacing, performing, and becoming: Tangles in the mundane. *Environment and planning A: Economy and Space 35(11),* 1945–1960. https://doi.org/10.1068/a3585

Crouch, D. & Parker, G. (2003). Digging up utopia? Space, practice and land use heritage. *Geoforum 34(3),* 395–408. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0016-7185(02)00080-5

Beauvoir, S. (1980). *Toinen sukupuoli.* Jyväskylä: Gummerus.

Díaz-Andreu, M. (2001). Guest editor's introduction. Nationalism and archaeology. *Nations and Nationalism 7(4),* 429–440. https://doi.org/10.1111/1469-8219.00025

Díaz-Andreu, M. & Lucy, S. (2005). Introduction. In M. Díaz-Andreu, S. Lucy, S. Babic & D.N. Edwards (Eds.), *The Archaeology of identity. Approaches to gender, age, status, ethnicity and religion* (pp. 1–160).

Douglas, N. (1997). Political structures, Social interaction and identity changes in Northern Ireland. In B. Graham (ed.), *In Search of Ireland: A cultural geography* (pp. 151–173). London: Routledge.

Duncan, J.S. & Duncan, N.G. (2004). Culture unbound. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space 36(3)*, 391–403. https://doi.org/10.1068/a3654

Ebeling, S. (2018) Naturing gender and gendering nature in museums. W. Grahn & R.J. Wilson (Eds.), *Gender and Heritage: Performance, Place and Politics* (pp. 61–78). London: Routledge.

Engelstad, E. (2007). Much more than Gender. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory 14*, 217–234. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10816-007-9035-3

Enqvist, J. (2014). THE NEW HERITAGE: A MISSING LINK BETWEEN FINNISH ARCHAEOLOGY AND CONTEMPORARY SOCIETY. *Fennoscandia archaeologica XXXI* (pp. 101–123).

Enqvist, J. (2016). *Suojellut muistot: Arkeologisen perinnön kieli, käsitteet ja ideologia.* (Academic dissertation, University of Helsinki.)

Fairclough, N. (1997). *Miten media puhuu.* Tampere: Vastapaino.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse. Textual analysis for social research.* London: Routledge

Finnish Heritage Agency. Archaeological cultural heritage. Retrieved May 7, 2019, from https://www.museovirasto.fi/en/cultural-environment/archaeological-cultural-heritage

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge*. London: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1981). *The history of sexuality: Vol 1, An introduction*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Försti, T. (2013). *Vauhtikausi. Autoilun sukupuoli 1920 -luvun Suomessa.* (Academic dissertation. University of Turku, Annales Universitatis Turkuensis 371 C.)

Golding, V. (2018). Exploring identities through feminist pedagogy. W. Grahn & R.J. Wilson (Eds.), *Gender and Heritage: Performance, Place and Politics* (pp.129–147). London: Routledge.

Gorman-Murray, A. & McKinnon, S. (2018). 'Does it matter?' Relocating fragments of queer heritage in post-earthquake Christchurch. W. Grahn & R.J Wilson (Eds.), *Gender and Heritage: Performance, Place and Politics* (pp. 239–252). London: Routledge.

Graham, B. (2002). Heritage as Knowledge: Capital or Culture? *Urban Studies 39(5–6),* 1003–1017. https://doi.org/10.1080/00420980220128426

Graham, B., Ashworth, G.J. & Turnbridge, J.E. (2000). *A geography of heritage. Power, culture and economy.* London: Arnold.

Graham, B., Ashworth, G.J. & Turnbridge, J.E. (2005). The uses and abuses of heritage. In G. Corsane (ed.) *Heritage, Museums and Galleries. An introductory reader* (pp. 28–40). London: Routledge.

Graham, B., Gordon, C. & Miller, P. (1991). *The Foucault effect: studies in governmentality*. University of Chicago Press.

Graham, B. & Howard, P. (eds.) (2008). *The Ashgate Research Companion to Heritage and Identity*. England: ASHGATE.

Grahn, W. (2006). ´´Känn dig själf´´ Genus, historiekonstruktion och kulturhistoriska museirepresentationer. *Linköping Studies in Arts and Science 364.* Linköpings universitet.

Grahn, W. (2018). The politics of heritage: How to achieve change. In W. Grahn & R.J Wilson (Eds.), *Gender and Heritage: Performance, Place and Politics* (pp. 256–268). London: Routledge.

Grundberg, M. (2012). Theorizing Gender in Heritage Studies. Retrieved September 18, 2019, from https://www.science.gu.se/digitalAssets/1367/1367109_p203-grundberg-women-history-or-gender-integration-.pdf

Halberstam, J. (1998). *Female masculinity*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Halbwachs, M. (1992). *On collective memory*. University of Chicago Press.

Hall, S. (ed.) (1997). *Representation. Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. London: Sage Publications.

Harmanen, S. (6.11.2019). Suur-Savon museo suljetaan toistaiseksi – Syynä Mikkelin kaupungin YT-neuvottelut. Retrieved November 9, 2019, from https://lansi-savo.fi/uutiset/lahella/6fa56406-4caf-4f27-8c9f-fef0761c4a94

Harvey, D.C. (2001). Heritage pasts and heritage presents: Temporality, meaning and the scope of heritage studies. *International Journal of Heritage studies7(4),* 319–338. https://doi.org/10.1080/13581650120105534

Heikel, A.O. (1889). *Tuukkalan löytö*.

Heinonen, J. & Lahti, M. (2001). *Museologian perusteet*. Suomen museoliiton julkaisuja.

Hieta, H., Hovi, T. & Ruotsala, H. (2015). Kulttuuriperintö. In J. Kouri (ed.), *Askel kulttuurien tutkimukseen* (pp. 311–341). University of Turku.

Hill Collins, P. (2000). *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness and Politics of Empowerment*. London: Routledge.

Hirsjärvi, S., Remes, P. & Sajavaara, P. (1997). *Tutki ja kirjoita*. Helsinki: Tammi.

Hodges, A. & Watson, S. (2000). Community-based Heritage Management: a case study and agenda for research. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, *6(3),* 231–243. https://doi.org/10.1080/13527250050148214

Hovi, T. (2017). Kulttuurimatkailu. J. Edelheim & H. Ilola (Eds.) *Matkailututkimuksen avainkäsitteet* (pp. 64–69). Rovaniemi: Lapland University Press.

Huurre, M. (2004). *9000 vuotta Suomen esihistoriaa*. Helsinki: Otava.

Immonen, V. (2008). Identiteetti, etnisyys ja sukupuoli. In P. Halinen, V. Immonen, M. Lavento, T. Mikkola, A. Siiriäinen & P. Uino (Eds.) *Johdatus arkeologiaan* (pp. 410–418). Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Inglehart, R. & Baker, W. (2000). Modernization, Cultural change and the persistence of traditional values. *American sociological review 65*, 19–51. Retrieved April 27, 2020, from www.jstor.org/stable/2657288

Jaakkola, M. (2013). *Hyvä journalismi. Käytännön opas kirjoittajalle.* Kansanvalistusseura.

Jennings, G. (2010). *Tourism research*. Wiley Australia Tourism Series.

Jokinen, A. (2000). *Panssaroitu maskuliinisuus. Mies, väkivalta ja kulttuuri*. Tampere University Press.

Jokinen, A., Juhila, K. & Suoninen, E. (1993). Diskursiivinen maailma. Teoreettiset lähtökohdat ja analyyttiset käsitteet. In A. Jokinen, K. Juhila & E. Suoninen (Eds.) *Diskurssianalyysin aakkoset* (pp. 17–47). Tampere: Vastapaino.

Jokinen, A. & Juhila, K. (1993). Valtasuhteiden analysoiminen. In A. Jokinen, K. Juhila & E. Suoninen (Eds.) *Diskurssianalyysin aakkoset* (pp. 75–108). Tampere: Vastapaino.

Jones, S. & Pay, S. (1994). The legacy of Eve. In P. Gathercole & D. Lowenthal, D. (Eds.) *The Politics of the Past* (pp. 160–169). London: Routledge.

Juhila, K. & Suoninen, E. (1999). Kymmenen kysymystä diskurssianalyysistä. In A. Jokinen, K. Juhila & E. Suoninen (Eds.) *Diskurssianalyysi liikkeessä* (pp. 233–252). Tampere: Vastapaino.

Juvonen, T. (2016). Irtiottoja sukupuolen luonnollisuudesta. In M. Husso & R. Heiskala (Eds.) *Sukupuolikysymys* (pp. 33–53). Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Juvonen, T., Rossi, L-M. & Saresma, T. (2010). Kuinka sukupuolta voi tutkia? In T. Saresma, L-M. Rossi & T. Juvonen (Eds.), *Käsikirja sukupuoleen* (pp. 9–20). Tampere: Vastapaino.

Kankkunen. P. (2012). Mikkeli Tuukkala. Keskiaikaisen kalmistoalueen tarkastus. Retrieved May 8, 2019, from https://www.kyppi.fi/palveluikkuna/raportti/read/asp/hae_liite.aspx?id=116048&ttyyppi=pdf&kansio_id=491

Kantola, J. (2010). Sukupuoli ja valta. In T. Saresma, L-M. Rossi & T. Juvonen (Eds.), *Käsikirja sukupuoleen* (pp. 78–91). Tampere: Vastapaino.

Kivilaakso, A. (2017). *Suojelevat sanat. Puu-Käpylän kaavoituskiista esimerkkinä vaikuttavasta kulttuuriympäristön asiantuntijaviestinnästä.* (Academic dissertation. University ofTurku, Annales Universitatis Turkuensis 435 C.)

Kluukeri, I. (5.1.2017). Suuri lehtikoko on harvinaisuus – vain 2 sanomalehteä pitää kiinni vanhasta. Retrieved April 23, 2020, from https://yle.fi/uutiset/3-9388401

Kosut, M. (2016). Nature in the Museum. In R.C.Hoogland (ed.), *Gender: Nature* (pp. 283–296). MacMillian.

Kulttuuriperintövuosi 2018. Retrieved April 20, 2020, from http://www.kulttuuriperintovuosi2018.fi/fi/mista-on-kyse/kulttuuriperintovuosi-2018

Kuokkanen, T. (2016). *Vaatetuksen luokka ja sukupuoli 1600-1800-lukujen Oulussa. Historiallisen ajan arkeologinen näkökulma.* (Academic dissertation. University of Oulu, Acta Universitatis Ouluensis 137 B.)

Kupiainen, M. (2019). *Osaamisen sukupuoli. Miten asiantuntijuus rakentuu sukupuolta ja osaamista koskevissa diskursseissa.* (Academic dissertation. University of Turku, Annales Universitatis Turkuensis 472 C.)

Kurvinen, H. (2013). ´´En mä oo mies enkä nainen. Mä oon toimittaja´´. Sukupuoli ja suomalainen toimittajakunta 1960- ja 1970 -luvulla. (Academic dissertation. University of Oulu, Acta Universitatis Ouluensis 113 B.)

Kunelius, R. (2003). Viestinnän vallassa. Johdatus joukkoviestinnän kysymyksiin. Helsinki: WSOY.

Kyyhkylä. Retrieved June 6, 2019, from https://www.kyppi.fi/palveluikkuna/mjreki/read/asp/r_kohde_det.aspx?KOHDE_ID=1000002316

Lariat, J. (2018). Impasse or productive intersection? Learning to 'mess with genies' in collaborative heritage research relationships. In W. Grahn & R.J. Wilson (Eds.), Gender and Heritage: Performance, Place and Politics (pp. 148–166). London: Routledge.

Latokallio. Retrieved June 6, 2019, from https://www.kyppi.fi/palveluikkuna/mjreki/read/asp/r_kohde_det.aspx?KOHDE_ID=491010012

Lehtinen, L. (1989). Opas Etelä-Savon esihistoriaan. Savonlinnan maakuntamuseo.

Lehtinen, L. (1993). Kuusi vuotta museoarkeologiaa Etelä-Savossa. In H. Vallisaari (ed.), OSMA, Suomen museoliiton juhlakirja 1993 (pp. 61–85). Suomen museoliitto.

Lehtinen, L. (1994). Kalmistotutkimus, mitä se on? In L. Lehtinen & P. Nousiainen (Eds.), Kalmistojen kertomaa – rautakautinen Mikkelin seutu Idän ja Lännen välissä. Savonlinnan maakuntamuseo.

Lehtosalo-Hilander, P-L. (1984). Ancient Finnish Costumes. Helsinki: The Finnish Archaeology society.

Liljeström, M. (2004). Feministinen metodologia – mitä se on? In M. Liljeström (ed.) Feministinen tietäminen. Keskusteluja metodologiasta (pp. 9–21). Tampere: Vastapaino.

Logan, W. & Reeves, K. (eds.) (2009). Places of Pain and Shame: Dealing with ´Difficult Heritage´. London: Routledge.

Lähdesmäki, T. (2007). Kuohahdus Suomen Kansan sydämestä. Henkilömonumentti diskursiivisena ilmiönä 1900-luvun lopun Suomessa. (Doctoral thesis. Nykykulttuurin tutkimuskeskuksen julkaisuja 94, University of Jyväskylä.)

Lähdesmäki, U. (2018). Muinaisjäännös ympäristön muutoksessa. Modernin alueidenkäytön vaikutuksia Pirkanmaan muinaisjäännöskantaan. (Academic dissertation. Historian, kulttuurin ja taiteiden tutkimuksen laitos, University of Turku.)

Macdonald, S.J. (2003). Museums, national, postnational and transcultural identities. *Museum and society 1(1),*1–16. Retrieved April 21, 2020, from https://journals.le.ac.uk/ojs1/index.php/mas/article/view/3/50

Machin, R. (2008). Gender representation in natural history galleries at the Manchester museum. *Museum and Society 6(1),* 54–67. Retrieved September 11, 2019, from https://journals.le.ac.uk/ojs1/index.php/mas/article/view/112/127

Malcom-Davies, J. (2004). Borrowed Robes: The Educational Value of Costumed Interpretation at Historic Sites. *International Journal of Heritage Studies 10(3)*, 277–293. https://doi.org/10.1080/1352725042000234451

McLean, F. (2008). Museums and the Representations of Identity. In B. Graham & P. Howard (Eds.), *The Ashgate Research Companion to Heritage and Identity* (pp. 283–298). England: Ashgate.

MediaAudit Finland (2019). LT ja JT tarkastustilasto 2018. Retrieved January 17, 2020, from http://mediaauditfinland.fi/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/LT-tilasto-2018.pdf

Merriman, N. (ed.) (2004). *Public archaeology*. London: Routledge.

Meskell, L. (2002). Intersections of identity and politics in archaeology. *Annual Review of Anthropology 31*, 279–301. Retrieved November 4, 2019, from www.jstor.org/stable/4132881

Mikkola, E. (2009). Mikkeli, Tuukkala. Varhaiskeskiaikaisen ruumiskalmiston kaivaus 18.8.–8.10.2009. Retrieved May 8, 2019 from https://www.kyppi.fi/palveluikkuna/mjhanke/read/asp/hae_liite.aspx?id=114477&ttyyppi=pdf&kansio_id=491

Modarress-Sadehgi, M. (2018). *Muinaisesineestä kauppahyödykkeeksi: arkeologia, kulttuuriperintö ja kolonialistiset tutkimuskäytänteet.* (Academic dissertation. University of Oulu, Acta Universitatis Ouluensis 158 B.)

Moi, T. (1999). *What is a woman? and other essays*. Oxford university Press.

Moilainen, U. (2017). Riimukirjoitus Mikkelin Tuukkalan hopeasoljessa. Retrieved April 2, 2020, from https://kalmistopiiri.fi/2017/12/07/riimukirjoitus-mikkelin-tuukkalan-hopeasoljessa/

Munjeri, D. (2004). Tangible and Intangible Heritage: from difference to convergence. *Museum International 56(1-2),* 12–20. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1350-0775.2004.00453.x

Museoiden menestys jatkuu (2019). *Museo*, 1/2019.

Museovirasto (2001). Mikkeli, Tuukkala. Retrieved May 8, 2019, from https://www.kyppi.fi/palveluikkuna/mjreki/read/asp/r_kohde_det.aspx?KOHDE_ID=491010007

Museovirasto (2019). Museoiden suosio on pysynyt huippulukemissa. Retrieved April 12, 2020, from https://www.museovirasto.fi/fi/ajankohtaista/museoiden-suosio-huippulukemissa

Nesbitt, C. & Tolia-Kelly, D.P. (2009). Hadrian's Wall: embodied archaeologies of the linear monument. *Journal of Social Archeology 9(3*), 368–390. Retrieved October 2, 2019, from https://doi-org.ezproxy.ulapland.fi/10.1177/1469605309338428

Newman, A. & McLean, F. (1998). Heritage builds communities: The application of heritage resources to the problems of social exclusion. *International Journal of Heritage studies 4(3-4),* 143–153. https://doi.org/10.1080/13527259808722232

Nuryanti, W. (1996). Heritage and Postmodern tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research 23(2),* 249–260. https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(95)00062-3

Paasonen, S. (2010). Sukupuoli ja representaatio. In T. Saresma, L-M., Rossi & T. Juvonen (Eds.), *Käsikirja sukupuoleen* (pp. 39–48). Tampere: Vastapaino.

Palmsköld, A. & Rosenqvist, J. (2018). Handicrafting gender. Craft, performativity and cultural heritage. In W. Grahn & R.J. Wilson (Eds.), *Gender and Heritage: Performance, Place and Politics* (pp. 44–60). London: Routledge.

Palonen, O. (ed.) (2011). *Muistilla on kolme ulottuvuutta. Kulttuuriperinnön digitaalinen tuottaminen ja tallentaminen.* Mikkeli University of Applied Sciences.

Perry, E.M. & Joyce, R.A. (2001). Providing Past for ´´Bodies that matter´´: Judith Butler's impact on the Archaeology of Gender. *International Journal of Sexuality and Gender Studies 6 (1/2),* 63–64. https://link-springer-com.ezproxy.ulapland.fi/article/10.1023%2FA%3A1010142023744

Perry, E.M. & Joyce, R.A. (2005). Past performance: The archaeology of gender as influenced by the work of Judith Butler. In W.J. Blumenfeld & M.S. Breen (Eds.), *Butler Matters: Judith Butler's impact of feminist and queer studies.* London: Routledge.

Pihlman, S. (2015). Kulttuuriperintö-käsitteen käytöstä ja kehityksestä. In J. Kouri (ed.)*, Askel kulttuurien tutkimukseen* (pp. 312–313). University of Turku.

Piispanen, S. (2009). *Kansanomainen moraali. Tutkimus savolaisista ja pohjalaisista uskomustarinoista*. (Academic dissertation. University of Helsinki.)

Piludu, V.M. (2019). *The Forestland's Guests. Mythical landscapes, Personhood and Gender in the Finno-Karelian Bear Ceremonialism.* (Academic dissertation. University of Helsinki.)

Pollock, G. (2008). Feminism and Culture: Theoretical Perspectives. In T. Bennett & J. Frow, J. (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Cultural Analysis* (pp. 249–270). London: SAGE Publications.

Porvari, R. (14.3.2020). Mikkelin kaupunki sulkee museot, kirjastot, uimahallit... – Kaupunginjohtaja Halonen: "Näillä toimilla pyritään välttämään vapaa-ajan kohtaamisia". Retrieved April 12, 2020 from https://lansi-savo.fi/uutiset/lahella/2a7a9c20-db15-4054-bd61-48b19e29b592

Prokhovnik, R. (1999). *Rational woman: A Feminist Critique of Dichotomy*. London: Routledge.

Pulkkinen, T. (2000). Judith Butler – sukupuolen suorittamisen teoreetikko. In A. Anttonen, K. Lempiäinen & M. Liljeström (Eds.), *Feministejä – aikamme ajattelijoita.* Tampere: Vastapaino.

Puntanen, P. & Hangasmaa, L. (2013). *Mikkelin seudun kulttuuriperintöohjelma. Kivikaudesta digiaikaan!* Mikkelin kaupunki.

Puustinen, L., Ruoho, I. & Mäkelä, A. (2006). Feministisen mediatutkimuksen näkökulmat. In A. Mäkelä, L. Puustinen & I. Ruoho (Eds.), *Sukupuolishow: Johdatus feministiseen tutkimukseen* (pp. 15–44). Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Reading, A. (2010). Gender and the right to memory. *Media Development 2,* 11–14.

Reading, A. (2014). Making feminist work: Gender and Heritage. In E. Waterton & S. Watson (Eds.) *The Palgrave Handbook of Contemporary Heritage Research* (pp. 397–413). Macmillan.

Reilly, M. (2015). Taking the measure of sexism: Facts, Figures and Fixes. Retrieved December 6, 2019, from https://www.artnews.com/art-news/news/taking-the-measure-of-sexism-facts-figures-and-fixes-4111/

Rekonen, P. (2013). *Raha, aika, itsekuri. Modernin maailman synty paikallisena ilmiönä Modernisaatio Savossa ja Etelä-Pohjanmaalla vuosina 1870-1917.* (Academic dissertation. University of Tampere, Acta Universatatis Tamperensis 1864.)

Rinta-Tassi, M. (2.1.2020). ''Superonnistuminen'', ''fantastinen vuosi'' – suomalaiset jonottavat nyt museoihin, ja museokortti rikkoo ennätyksiä. Retrieved April 12, 2020, from https://yle.fi/uutiset/3-11140148

Rossi, L-M. (2003). *Heterotehdas: televisiomainonta sukupuolituotantona*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Rossi, L-M. (2010). Sukupuoli ja seksuaalisuus, erosta eroihin. In T. Saresma, L-M. Rossi & T. Juvonen (Eds.) *Käsikirja sukupuoleen* (pp. 21–38). Tampere: Vastapaino.

Runonen, C. (27.1.1994). Kalmisto-näyttelyn esineet saatu valituksi. Suomen ainoa riimukirjoitus nähdään kesällä Mikkelissä. *Länsi-Savo.*

Said, E. (2003). *Orientalism: western conceptions of the orient*. London: Penguin.

Salomäki, V-M. (2011). *Biologisen sukupuolen rakentaminen. Ruumis ja sosiaalinen sukupuoli antiikista nykypäivään.* (Academic dissertation. University of Turku, Annales Universitatis Turkuensis 306 C.)

Savonlinnan maakuntamuseo (1994). Savonlinnan maakuntamuseo toimintakertomus 1994.

Seppänen, J. (2005). *Visuaalinen kulttuuri: Teoriaa ja metodeja mediakuvan tulkitsijalle*. Tampere: Vastapaino.

Sayner, J. & Mason, R. (2018). Gendering 'the other Germany': resistance and residual narratives on Stauffenbergstraße, Berlin. In W. Grahn & R. J. Wilson (Eds.), *Gender and Heritage: Performance, Place and Politics* (pp. 185–206). London: Routledge.

Scott, A. (2018). It's a man's world. Or is it? The 'Pilgrim Fathers', religion, patriarchy, nationalism and tourism. In W. Grahn & R. J. Wilson (Eds.), *Gender and Heritage: Performance, Place and Politics* (pp. 81–98). London: Routledge.

Setlhabi, K.G. (2018). Taller than the rest: The Three Dikgosi Monument, masculinity reloaded. In W. Grahn & R. J. Wilson (Eds.), *Gender and Heritage: Performance, Place and Politics* (pp. 113–128). London: Routledge.

Sliden, M. (2008). Arkeologian popularisointi. In P. Halinen, V. Immonen, M. Lavento, T. Mikkola, A. Siiriäinen & P. Uino (Eds.) *Johdatus arkeologiaan* (pp. 485–489). Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Smith, L., Clarke, A. & Alcock, A. (1992). Teaching cultural tourism: some comments from the classroom. *Australian Archaeology 34*, 43–47. https://doi.org/10.1080/03122417.1992.11681451

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

Smith, L. (2008). Heritage, gender and identity. In B. Graham & P. Howard (Eds.), *The Ashgate research companion to Heritage and Identity* (pp. 159–178). England: Ashgate.

Spencer-Wood, S.M. (2011). Introduction: Feminist theories and archaeology. *Journal of the World Archaeological Congress 7(1),* 1–33. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11759-011-9169-5

Stefano, M.L. (2018). Women of Steel at the Sparrows Point Steel Mill, Baltimore, USA. In W. Grahn & R.J. Wilson (Eds.), *Gender and Heritage: Performance, Place and Politics* (pp. 221–238). London: Routledge.

Su, Y-W. & Lin, H-L. (2013). Analysis of international tourist arrivals worldwide: The role of world heritage sites. *Tourism Management 40,* 46–58. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2013.04.005

Suomen perustuslaki 1999/ 731.
https://www.finlex.fi/fi/laki/alkup/1999/19990731?search%5Btype%5D=pika&search%5Bpika%5D=731%2F1999

Tanner, M. & Piela, U. (1994). Kotiseutuliitto 100 vuotta. Kansallisen kulttuurin juhlavuosi 1994. Juhlavuoden kalenteri.

Teemavuoden tavoitteet. Kulttuuriperinnön eurooppalainen teemavuosi 2018. Retrieved April 21, 2020, from http://www.kulttuuriperintovuosi2018.fi/fi/mista-on-kyse/tavoitteet

TENK (2012). Responsible conduct of research and procedures of handling allegations of misconduct in Finland.

Thedéen, S. (2012). Box brooches beyond the Border. Female Viking age identities of intersectionality. In I-M. Back Danielsson & S. Thedéen (Eds.), *To Tender Gender. The Pasts and Futures of Gender research in archaeology* (pp. 61–82). Stockholm University.

Timothy, D.J. (2011). *Cultural heritage and tourism. An introduction*. Channel View Publications.

Tolia-Kelly, D.P. (2004). Landscape, race and memory: biographical mapping of the routes of British Asian landscape values. *Landscape Research, 29(3),* 277–292. https://doi.org/10.1080/0142639042000248924

Tolia-Kelly, D.P. (2007). Fear in paradise: the affective registers of the English Lake District landscape re-visited. *Senses and Society 2(3*), 329–352. https://doi.org/10.2752/174589307X233576

Toropainen, V.P. (2016). *Päättäväiset porvarskat. Turun johtavan porvariston naisten toimijuus vuosina 1623-1670.* (Academic dissertation. University of Turku, Annales Universitatis Turkuensis 419 C.)

Tuomi-Nikula, O., Haanpää, R. & Kivilaakso, A. (2013). *Mitä on kulttuuriperintö?* Helsinki: Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seura.

UNESCO (2014). Gender Equality, Heritage and Creativity. Retrieved September 20, 2019, from http://uis.unesco.org/sites/default/files/documents/gender-equality-heritage-and-creativity-2014-en_1.pdf

Urry, J. (1990). *The Tourist gaze: leisure and travel in contemporary society*. London: Sage.

Vahtikari, T. (2013). *World Heritage Cities between Permanence and Change: International Construction of `Outstanding Universal Value´ and Local Perceptions at Old Rauma from the 1970s to the 2000s*. Tampere University. Retrieved March 20, 2020, from http://urn.fi/URN:NBN:fi:uta-201301281015

Valtonen, S. (1998). Hyvä, paha media. Diskurssianalyysi kriittisen mediatutkimuksen menetelmänä. In A. Kantola, I. Moring & E. Väliverronen (Eds.), *Media analyysi. Tekstistä tulkintaan* (pp. 93–121). University of Helsinki.

Visulahti Kalmisto (2001). Retrieved June 6, 2019, from https://www.kyppi.fi/palveluikkuna/mjreki/read/asp/r_kohde_det.aspx?KOHDE_ID=491010003

Waitt, G. (2000). Consuming Heritage. Perceived historical authenticity. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *27(4),* 835–862. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(99)00115-2

Waterton, E. (2005). Whose sense of place? Reconciling Archaeological Perspectives with Community Values: Cultural Landscapes in England. *International Journal of Heritage Studies 11(4)*, 309–325. https://doi.org/10.1080/13527250500235591

Watson, S., Waterton, E. & Smith, L. (2012). Moments, instances and experiences. In L. Smith, E. Waterton & S. Watson (Eds.), *The Cultural Moment in Tourism* (pp. 1–16). London: Routledge.

Wilson, R. J. (2018). The tyranny of the normal and the importance of being liminal. in W. Grahn & R.J. Wilson (Eds.), *Gender and heritage: Performance, Place and Politics* (pp. 3–14). London: Routledge.

Young, I. M. (2002). *Inclusion and democracy*. Oxford University Press.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

During this journey, my supervisor José-Carlos García-Rosell from the University of Lapland/MTI has guided and supported me with his constructive comments. I am also grateful for Leena-Maija Rossi from the University of Helsinki for her viewpoints regarding the gender aspect of this study. My sincerest thanks to both of you.

I want to express my gratitude to the Suur-Savo museum in Mikkeli for the inspiration! My kindest regards to the museum personnel for giving me access to the archives and information. I want especially to thank Maire for spreading enthusiasm and knowledge regarding the Mikkeli ancient costume, which captured my attention in the first place.

I am very grateful to Noora, Tanya, Tiina, and Tuulia for the support and encouragement during this process. You lighten the days of otherwise quite lonely work.