The evolution of Oscar Montelius

A critical historiographical analysis on his academic legacy, and the influences that shaped his later research

By Adam Andersson

Andersson, A., 2025. The evolution of Oscar Montelius: A critical historiographical analysis on his academic legacy, and the influences that shaped his later research. *Fornvännen* 120. Stockholm.

Through a critical historiographical analysis of Swedish archaeologist Oscar Montelius's evolving perspectives, this paper seeks to examine complex aspects of Montelius's research between 1910–1921 that has received little attention by scholars. Using a comparative approach that examines the similarities between Montelius later research and the German archaeologist Gustaf Kossinna, this paper reveals that towards the end of his life, Montelius started to increasingly adopt Kossinna's standpoints, resulting in Montelius moving away from his prior research. This alignment is shown through the examination of several papers written by Montelius during the stated period. Therefore, the aspiration of this analysis is to offer insights into the research that led to the discrediting of Kossinna's academic contributions, but which in comparison left Montelius's legacy mostly unblemished. Concurrently, this article delves into the substantial impact that Kossinna had on Montelius's scholarly endeavours, especially during the period between 1910 and 1921. Thus, the objective of this work is to improve our understanding of the complex legacy of Montelius and the influences that affected him whilst simultaneously highlighting parts of his research relating to nationalism, and racial biology that has not been given as much scrutiny.

Keywords: constructivism, cultural-historical paradigm, history of archaeology, Kossinna, Montelius

Adam Andersson, Tändsticksgatan 2, lgh 1508, SE-412 83 Göteborg
adam.andersson.2@gu.se

Introduction

In both Swedish and European archaeological history, Oscar Montelius (1843–1921) is viewed as an important and trailblazing figure. Montelius occupies a key role in the development of archaeology as a scholarly field and his contributions to the field have had a long shelf life, shaping our understanding of the ancient world in significant ways long after his death. His methodical and precise approach to archaeology provided the groundwork for contemporary archaeological procedures. His unwavering efforts resulted in the standardization of prehistoric Sweden's chronology, the introduction of the idea of typological sequences, and the pottery chronology, which gave archaeologists essential tools for dating objects and comprehending cultural trends. In addition to illuminating Sweden's rich prehistoric heritage, Montelius's outspokenness on Sweden's prehistory encouraged and fostered a sense of national belonging.

Montelius was a driving force behind the growth of European archaeology since his im-

pact extended beyond the limits of Scandinavia. His innovative work in developing a cross-cultural and comparative method for archaeological study contributed to laying the foundation for the globalization of the field. Montelius made a significant contribution to the knowledge of the interconnectedness of prehistoric Europe by spotting typological patterns and cultural linkages among European artifacts (cf. Montelius 1885). His study had a significant impact on the development of the continent's archaeological framework, allowing archaeologists to follow the spread of cultural elements and the development of societies through time and space (cf. Montelius 1899). There is therefore no denying that Montelius's impact on both Swedish and European archaeology is immeasurable. His dedication to systematic research, innovative methodologies, and the establishment of chronological frameworks revolutionized the way we study and appreciate the ancient world. His influence is emphasized by the sheer amount of reference and praise that his works would receive from other prominent archaeologists. Thus, it is no wonder that Montelius's legacy has endured the test of time, and why he is still revered as the founding father of Swedish archaeology. His influence was far reaching amongst his contemporaries, and those which were to come after.

Yet there are always two sides to a coin, and more sides to a man's legacy, especially one as significant as Montelius. A critical interrogation about Montelius can reveal aspects that have not yet been critically interrogated. Amongst these aspects are his connections to racial biology, nationalism, and the Indo-Germanic discussion, which have not yet been as critically analysed as his more renowned work. In comparison with scientists such as Gustaf Kossinna (1858–1931), Montelius and his late-career scholarship has not been questioned in the same level, despite being similar in nature. This is despite the fact that towards the end of his life, Montelius was by today's standards an outspoken ultra-nationalist with clear theoretical links to Kossinna, a man who would repeat talking points that resonated within the *Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei* (NSDAP) view of the past (Arnold 1990). This begs the question why Montelius is often considered as simply being a "man of his time" whilst Kossinna is critically questioned and framed as being stained by nationalism.

Therefore, the purpose of this paper is to discuss Montelius from a critical historiographical point of view. The paper will aspire to highlight a number of papers which were written by Montelius towards the end of his life and that align themselves with Kossinna's rhetoric, but which have not been heavily scrutinized or discredited. Naturally, it should be stated that it is not the purpose of this paper to tarnish his academic legacy, or to bring contemporary judgement onto a man who has been dead for over a century, rather it is the intention to revisit and discuss how we choose to remember a man who has been instrumental to our discipline, as well as understanding some of the influences that shaped his work.

Previous Research on Montelius and Kossinna

There has been a fair amount written surrounding Montelius, his academic achievements, and his legacy. Bo Gräslund at Uppsala University has provided a great deal of material on Montelius's scholarly achievements (cf. Gräslund 1974). Another of the prominent scholars that have contributed to the study of Montelius who is placing him in a greater historical context is the Swedish archaeologist Evert Baudou. His work *Oscar Montelius: Om tidens återkomst och kulturens vandringar* (2012) is well written and it provides a detailed overview of Montelius's life and his research. Baudou has also written works on the topic of Kossinna's relationship with Scandinavian archaeology, including Montelius himself (Baudou 2005, pp. 121–139). However, Baudou does not delve into any greater detail on all the specific papers mentioned in this article, and there is no real critical examination of Montelius's research. Rather, it is more of a presentation of what Montelius did during those years, and what the result was. Simultaneously, Baudou does not discuss how or why Kossinna's and Montelius's research has been treated differently, even if there existed similarities between the two. Bruce Trigger has likewise written about both scholars and their role in the broader history of archaeology. Yet, as is the case with

Baudou, there has been no aspiration to study the differentiating treatments of their legacies (cf. Trigger 2006). Moreover, Trigger does not go into any broader discussion on how Kossinna might have influenced Montelius, something which this paper will argue that he explicitly did.

Similarly to Montelius, there has been a fair amount written on Kossinna, but not necessarily in a positive light. There are those who praise parts of his work such as the introduction of the concept of settlement archaeology (Scott 2007, pp. 289–294). He is likewise for better or for worse credited with being one of the first applicants of the culture-historical paradigm in archaeology. However, often his legacy is that of political misuses. In the same volume where Trigger describes Montelius, he describes Kossinna's writings, without mentioning their similarities, even though they clearly existed (Trigger 2006, p. 237). More recent research on the legacy of Kossinna has focused upon the political misuse of his scholarship (Burmeister 2023, pp. 48–50).

Aims, methodology, and theoretical framework

The aim of this paper is to perform a critical historiographical analysis of Montelius's changing perspectives by comparing parts of his earlier works with his later writings. The objective is to provide a nuanced view on the scholarly legacy that influenced one of Sweden's most famous archaeologists. Concurrently the goal is likewise to examine the effects that Kossinna held on his academic pursuits. The paper wants to highlight Montelius gradual alignment with Kossinna's view on the Aryan people.

The study's source material will mainly consist of written records that Montelius himself has written. The material has been selected since it shows the clear differences between Montelius's earlier and later research. Naturally there are more material out there, but a line must be drawn somewhere. The method of choice in this instance is an in-depth literature study of the written material. This literature study will primarily be based on methods that have been employed by Golinski and by those applying a theoretical framework based on constructivism.

This paper will utilize critical historiography and constructivist viewpoints as its theoretical framework. The framework of critical historiography can be characterized in this case as an examination of the history of historical scholarship. This method has been utilized in several academic fields to engage in critical discourse regarding the evolution and substance of the respective discipline (Burns 2005). In the field of archaeology, the same area of inquiry is conducted under the purview of the "history of archaeology". The examination of the disciplinary history of archaeology lacks a rigid set of principles, resulting in multiple potential starting points for this paper. It is rooted in and influenced by the contributions of various scholars, including Trigger, Gustafsson, Nordbladh & Schlanger, Murray, Jensen, Hjørungdal and Holmberg, and Andersson (cf. Trigger 2006; Gustafsson 2001; Nordbladh & Schlanger 2008; Murray 2008; Jensen 2012; Hjørungdal & Holmberg 2016; Andersson 2023). The writers have conducted research on the historical development of the archaeological discipline, and their diverse methodologies provide a solid basis for the theoretical framework of this study. However, while this study is influenced by other authors in the field of archaeology, it aims to distinguish itself by offering a unique contribution and generating novel insights through the utilization of its own distinct theoretical framework.

In addition to these points, there is significant value in adopting a constructivist theoretical framework as it enables the paper to delve deeper into the fundamental elements of the historical development of the archaeological discipline, and in this instance, the evolution of Montelius's scholarly contributions, and his legacy. However, to apply a constructivist framework, it is necessary to establish a precise definition of the word and understand its implications for this paper's conclusion. The paper strives to adhere to the principles outlined by Golinski in his publication titled *Making natural knowledge: Constructivism and the history of science* (2005). Hence, the study substantiates the core concept that scientific knowledge is a product of human agency, constructed using existing materials and cultural influences, rather than

being solely derived from a pre-existing and autonomous natural order (Golinski 2005, p. 6). The study fully concurs with Golinski's assertion that human society, encompassing all facets of existence, including the creation of human knowledge, is shaped by individuals. These individuals own distinct histories and prior experiences that imprint upon their produced knowledge. The content of this study aligns with the concept that all things, whether consciously or unconsciously, are created by humans, and that nothing is exempt from their influence. Subsequently, this view of the creation of knowledge extends to Montelius, and those which interpreted, and constructed, his legacy. This perspective applies to several domains beyond the production of knowledge, including institutions, norms, and other related areas (Golinski 2005, pp. 172–173). Furthermore, Golinski addresses another significant component that will serve as a fundamental basis for this paper, namely his perspective on narratives, which refers to the stories that scientists intentionally or unintentionally convey through their research (Golinski 2005, pp. 186–206).

Yet, it is important to engage in a discourse regarding the selection of these theoretical frameworks, as they may appear counterintuitive. Constructivism, as developed by scholars such as Golinski, aims to employ symmetry and maintain a completely unbiased stance towards the subject matter under examination. Constructivism can be conceptualized as a methodological or pragmatic approach rooted in relativism, which seeks to comprehensively examine human knowledge. Its primary objective is to address the challenges associated with the epistemic validity of knowledge, particularly in its social dimensions. This technique is specifically devised to circumvent debates on the criteria for distinguishing between sound scientific practices and those that are considered pseudoscientific. Individuals who embrace this epistemological framework are expected to cultivate a receptive attitude towards diverse manifestations of knowledge. The principle of symmetry, often known as 'the symmetry postulate', is often cited as a methodological tenet (Golinski 2005, p. 7).

At initial observation, this technique appears to be incongruous with critical historiography, as the latter is inherently designed to be non-neutral, but rather to adopt a critical stance towards its subject matter. However, it is precisely due to their inherent opposition that these two elements complement each other effectively, making them suitable for integration within the framework of this thesis. These two distinct theoretical frameworks can be effectively integrated and be of value to the study.

The research context that Montelius worked within

The research environment in which Montelius worked was characterized by a growing fascination in the systematization and categorization of material remains, as archaeology started to establish itself as a recognized scientific field. Around the late 19th and early 20th centuries, museums, universities, and scientific societies around Europe emerged as prominent hubs for archaeological study, and Montelius was highly integrated into this interconnected system. His endeavours to establish methodical chronological sequences of artifacts, notably through his groundbreaking typological approach, were in line with a wider intellectual movement that aimed to categorize human history into separate cultural and technological phases (Trigger 2006, pp. 236–237).

Central to this effort was the aspiration to establish discipline over the huge quantities of material being unearthed. Archaeological excavations around Europe were producing substantial discoveries, including burial mounds, pottery, tools, and other objects, which necessitated meticulous categorization and dating. Montelius's typological methodology, which emphasised the methodical comparative analysis of things according to their shape and ornamentation, enabled him to construct a relative chronology for prehistoric Europe. This technique emerged as a fundamental principle of archaeological methodology, exerting a significant impact on subsequent generations of archaeologists (Montelius 1885).

The prevailing intellectual trends of that era were equally significant. The burgeoning

nationalism that emerged throughout Europe throughout the latter part of the 19th century had a substantial impact on the development of archaeological study. Archaeology emerged as a means for nations to construct national pride and identity by unearthing evidence of their ancient origins. In countries such as Sweden, where Montelius lived and worked, this desire to link contemporary nations to their historical histories was especially apparent, and this is something that Montelius later got involved within. He conducted study with the dual purpose of advancing scientific knowledge of prehistory and showcasing the extensive and culturally significant heritage of the Scandinavian people, something which all nations conducting historical research at the time was attempting to achieve (cf. Montelius 1917). This push to enhance the renown of the nation was taking deeper root because of the archaeological discipline's connection to nationalism. It should be noted and stressed that this was not by any means unique to Sweden, but rather this was the spirit of the period where archaeological research was often connected to the creation of narratives that benefited the nation-state.

Nationalism, its relationship with archaeology and Montelius

During the latter half of the nineteenth century and the early twentieth century, the field of archaeology underwent a significant transformation, aligning itself with many conceptual frameworks prevalent at the time. These frameworks included notions related to nation-states, evolution, racial biology, imperialism, and the prevailing belief in the superiority of certain civilizations over others. When considering the past, it is important to acknowledge that it possesses certain features that can be attributed to it. When these attributes are combined with the perspective that the past can be influenced by contemporary viewpoints, the conditions are set for a historical narrative that is shaped by modern perspectives. Therefore, in the aftermath of the Enlightenment, the Napoleonic Wars, and the rise of Nationalism there was an increased interest towards the past and by extension archaeology. Archaeology was viewed as a fundamental tool in the creation of a national identity because it was one way to unite a people with history.

An illustration of this link between archaeology and nationalism may be found in the renowned book by Benedict Anderson (1936–2015), *Imagined Communities Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. This fundamental literature not only throws light on the greater environment within which personalities such as Montelius and the field of archaeology around the late nineteenth and early twentieth century functioned, but it also offers vital insights into the link between nationalism and collective identity. These insights may be found in the text's discussion of the relationship between nationalism and collective identity (Anderson 1983, pp. 23, 175). The key tenet of Anderson's position is that nations are "imagined communities," which are established when members of a group have a collective feeling of belonging to one another and have a similar identity, despite the fact that the majority of those individuals would never meet one another in person. This is the basis of Anderson's argument. He maintains that the expansion of print capitalism, which made it possible for standardized information to be communicated and for common languages and cultural symbols to be formed, was a major contributing factor in the development of current nationalism (Anderson 1983, pp. 47–49).

Anthony D. Smith (1939–2016), a British academic, likewise made significant impact on the analysis of the origins of nationalism. He argued, agreeing with Anderson, that it originates from the notion of a collective past and shared historical experiences. In addition, the author delves into an examination of the correlation between nationalism and ethnicity inside his publication titled *The Ethnic Origins of Nations* (1986), which was released in the same year. Smith argues that ethnic groups feel compelled to assert their unique characteristics and enhance their feeling of independence, leading to the emergence of nationalism (Smith 1986, pp. 32–34). Smith's exploration of the relationship between nationalism and ethnicity is relevant to Montelius's era, since at the time archaeology was predominantly used to shape national identities. Montelius was

active during a time in history when notions of ethnicity and ethnic identity were closely tied to nationalist movements. Montelius's view on ethnicity, race and nationalism is put on full display in his work from 1918 and 1921 (Montelius 1918, pp. 749–756; Montelius 1921a, pp. 401–416).

In the book that he authored and released in 2005 titled *From Stonehenge to Las Vegas: Archaeology as Popular Culture*, Cornelius Holtorf discusses the topic of nationalism in relation to archaeology. Even though he does not focus explicitly on Montelius, he does explore the more general issue of how archaeology has been used to promote nationalist agendas and exclusive beliefs (cf. Holtorf 2005). Archaeologists, according to Holtorf's argument, should critically analyse the ways in which their field has been appropriated for racist or nationalist goals and try to promote a more inclusive and responsible practice of archaeology.

The works of these individuals demonstrate how important it is for contemporary archaeologists to recognize and critically evaluate the historical linkages between archaeology and nationalism, as well as the ethical consequences of these ties. Naturally, the era in which Montelius lived and worked differs immensely from the one in which we live now, and we should as archaeologists strive to not bring down contemporary judgement on the past. Montelius's contributions to archaeology were unquestionably significant, it is vital to engage in open and critical conversations concerning his role in nationalist and racial biological movements in the context of his period.

The differing treatments of Kossinna's and Montelius's legacies

Kossinna's archaeological studies frequently centred on the identification of correlations between prehistoric archaeological civilizations and contemporary ethnic groupings, exploring ethnic interpretations of archaeological evidence. Kossinna put out the proposition that prehistoric civilizations might be directly linked to certain contemporary ethnic groups, aligning with the prevailing nationalist ideology of the era. The objective of this method was to establish and strengthen the historical assertions and collective identities of certain nations, with a special focus on the history of the Aryans (cf. Kossinna 1911).

Kossinna's scholarly contributions held significant sway in Germany, where he became closely linked to the emergence of German nationalism in the latter part of the 19th century and the early part of the 20th century. The study conducted by Kossinna was employed to bolster the notion of an extensive and uninterrupted Germanic lineage, a concept that had significant importance within German nationalist narratives. This phenomenon facilitated the cultivation of a perception of historical continuity and distinctiveness within the German populace (cf. Kossinna 1940). The utilization of archaeology to serve nationalist objectives may be observed via Kossinna's ethnocentric interpretations, which were in accordance with the prevailing nationalist movements of his day (Sklenář 1983, pp. 147–148). The utilization of his work served to advance and validate nationalist objectives, encompassing territorial assertions and the affirmation of national supremacy. This exemplifies the way archaeology, when employed by researchers such as Kossinna, might be utilized as a tool to further nationalist belief. Kossinna's theories surrounding the Indo-German would become a bedrock in the NSDAP's historical narrative (Arnold 1990, pp. 464–467; Cornell 2017).

It is no wonder why the archaeological community has shown a great amount of disapproval and scepticism regarding the nationalistic interpretations of archaeology that Kossinna proposed. According to the findings of contemporary archaeological study, the linkages between ancient cultures and contemporary ethnic groups have been shown to be a great deal more complex than Kossinna hypothesized them to be. Kossinna's arguments are frequently seen as being out of date and lacking in validity in accordance with the procedures and principles that are now utilized in archaeological research (cf. Cornell et al. 2008; Andersson 2023).

In comparison, Montelius's patriotic beliefs and the influence those beliefs had on his archaeological work are barely mentioned. His contributions to typology and chronology are

still highly esteemed, and they constitute the basis of archaeological study in the subject area. In staple works on the history of the archaeological discipline, see Bruce Trigger's *A history of archaeological thought* (2006).

Another example of this cherry picking of Montelius's writings is the section dedicated to him in the text *The great archaeologists* (Fagan 2014). The text is a collection of several influential archaeologists, and it only mentions his contributions to chronologies, and typologies (Fagan 2014, pp. 31–33). Naturally there is only so much you write in a few short pages, yet it serves as an even greater indicator of what the discipline wants to highlight. When given the chance to summarize Montelius academic achievements, no attention is given to his works on the Indo-Germanic and Germanic peoples.

These examples raise questions on why archaeologists who write the history of our discipline have chosen to ignore Montelius's later writings and solely focus on the parts without much controversy. His nationalistic and ethnological sentiments are known and visible in his writings, but they are not necessarily shunned or frowned upon, but simply viewed as part of the era, and mostly ignored. The evaluation of his work usually takes into consideration the historical time in which it was made, overlooking the work he later produced. That is why his works on the subject of the Indo-German and Germanic people tends to be overlooked in lieu of highlighting those aspects of his research that are more palatable. Montelius is for the most part described as a man who did not subscribe to racial interpretations. Yet, as this paper argue, there are indicators that Montelius towards the end of his life held clear racial and ethnological convictions. These convictions are especially visible when observing his scientific view on Sweden's link to Germanic and Aryan people, something which he himself state in one of his last works before his death (Montelius 1921a, p. 405).

> A couple of years ago, I became convinced that we could express ourselves with greater certainty than had previously been possible about our Germanic ancestors and their descent, as well as about one of the large branches of the Aryan family tree (Montelius 1921a, p. 405. Author's translation).

Even if Montelius went as far as to accept Kossinna's theories and align parts of his own research with it, the treatment of Montelius's legacy differs immensely in comparison with that of Kossinna. Kossinna was tainted by the strong nationalist views he expressed throughout his career. As a result of this, Kossinna became an example of how archaeology may be used to serve political purposes (Arnold 2006, pp. 10–12). Because he was affiliated with nationalist ideals, the appreciation of his work has been substantially lessened. It is easy to draw the line between many of the aspects discussed by scholars such as Anderson, Smith, and Holtorf, on how archaeology, and nationalism, can be used by political forces.

In comparison to Kossinna, this part of Montelius's research has simply been ignored and left alone. There has been no outspoken debunk of his papers revolving around the blood purity of the Swedish population or his advocations for an Aryan connection. Thus, it is possible to argue that the handling of Montelius's legacy demonstrates a greater degree of restrain and respect. Writers such as Trigger focus on those parts that are easier to defend. His contributions to the development of archaeological typologies and chronologies are his primary legacy, even though his nationalistic standpoints are acknowledged, they tend to be ignored. The academic world acknowledges and places significant emphasis on the long-lasting influence that his efforts has had in the field of archaeology, and therefore chooses to overlook that which may put a stain upon the reputation of the father of the typological method.

Early Research and his famous typological methodology (1869–1900)

Gustaf Oscar Augustin Montelius was born in 1843, in Stockholm's Maria Magdalena parish. He was the son of Oscar Augustin Montelius and Klara Norin. His father held the position of hovrättsråd (judge of appeal), and their family could be considered part of the upper echelons

of Swedish society, even if they were not extraordinarily wealthy. Due to his family's position, Montelius was able to pursue his interest for the ancient past. Montelius gained an early interest in history because of his upbringing in this intellectually stimulating atmosphere. Additionally, it should be mentioned that another reason that might explain Montelius's keen interest towards prehistory was his father's friendship with the national antiquarian Bror Emil Hildebrand (1806–1884). The relationship with B. E. Hildebrand did not only provide a stimulating environment for the young Montelius, but it also brought with it connections that others did not possess. Montelius had been given a recommendation letter from B. E. Hildebrand to meet the Danish archaeologist C. J. Thomsen (1788–1865). Montelius would form a lifelong friendship with Hans Hildebrand (1842–1913), the son of B. E. Montelius enrolled at Uppsala University in 1861. He finished his doctorate at Uppsala in 1869. Montelius would in 1877 be granted a position within the Kungliga Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademien (KVHAA). In 1888 he was granted the title of professor with a connection to the KVHAA (Rydh 1937, p. 88).

Montelius's doctoral thesis which focused on the Swedish Iron Age was titled *Från jernåldern* (1869). Montelius dedicated the text to his old friend B. E. Hildebrand, and in its first pages he announces himself as a devoted disciple of him. This dedication is another of the great admiration and influence that B. E. Hildebrand must have had on Montelius (cf. Montelius 1869). The text has a valuable discussion on the issue of the start of the Iron Age in the Nordic countries but does not yet clearly demonstrate his abilities as a scholar. By examining rune inscription, he made the deduction that it is probably made by a people with Germanic origin. His usage of inscription to make the Germanic connection is of interest since it differs from contemporary methodologies. His friend H. Hildebrand finished his own doctoral thesis titled *Svenska folket under hednatiden: Ethnografisk afhandling* (1866), and he applied a theoretical framework based on ethnological studies. His thesis became an early example of the cultural-historical archaeology that would dominate the archaeological discipline (Baudou 2012, p. 76). Thus, Montelius's choice of attempting to base his work in other fields such as the study of inscription is noteworthy, and it highlights that he was not yet fully applying theories that came from the ethnological discipline, even though there were obvious signs that he would continue down a path that based itself on diffusionism theories.

It should be noted that since archaeology was not yet an acknowledged discipline this doctoral dissertation was done in history. Montelius still showed signs of what he would pursue for the rest of his academic career. It was during his time at Uppsala that he would get introduced to the teachings of Charles Darwin (1809–1882) and his famous text *On the Origins of Species* (1859). The concept of evolution would hold an immense impact on Montelius and his work going forward. The notion that artifacts changed, evolved, and improved over time is something of a cornerstone in many of the typologies that he later created (Danielsson 1967; Baudou 2012, pp. 70–71).

His work influenced the archaeological discipline, as well as the view of the past, and especially influential were the chronologies and typologies that he ended up creating. Amongst the first examples of this typological approach can be observed when Montelius together with the future national antiquarian H. Hildebrand in 1871 travelled to an international archaeology congress Bologna. At this congress, both presented their theories surrounding the concept of typology, and what it might add to the discussion of chronology (Rydh 1937, pp. 42–44). There were as previously mentioned a few archaeologists that had already delved into the concept of chronologies, such as the two Danish archaeologists Christian Jürgensen Thomsen and Jens Jacob Worsaae (1821–1885). Worsaae would in his works argue for the stylistic differences between Bronze Age and Iron Age artifacts, something that would be important for Montelius's future work (cf. Worsaae 1843). Montelius shared an interest in chronologies with the two, and he agreed with Thomsen's theory that the prehistory could be divided into a Three-Age-System (Trigger 2006, p. 224). It is possible that the meeting between Thomsen and Montelius when

he was young affected his theoretical approach later in life. Nevertheless, Montelius sought to advance the field by improving the typological methods that had been used by Thomsen, and he did so by creating standardized classifications on a larger scale. In the past, Scandinavian archaeologists such as Thomsen had access only to a limited number of artifacts, which did not allow for any substantial conclusions. In comparison Montelius not only had access to large assemblages of artifacts in Sweden, but he also ventured out in Europe to examine collections in other countries (Trigger 2006, p. 224).

Yet, credit should be given to Thomsen, since to some extent Montelius continued the work of his Danish counterpart. Montelius applied a similar technique to that of Thomsen when observing the collected material. This meant that he primarily focused on artifacts that had been collected from closed finds, such as hoards, graves, and closed spaces. He was aware that in order to understand which artifacts belonged to which historical period, and which artifacts occurred together, you must be certain that they were excavated from the same closed find (Trigger 2006, p. 225). Furthermore, this approach allowed him to observe which artifacts overlapped, and which were common together. Montelius usage of seriation is what ultimately allowed him to create typologies that highlighted the evolution of artifacts over time. This is something that he delves into and exemplifies in detail within his text *Om tidsbestämning inom bronsåldern med särskildt afseende på Skandinavien* (1885). By the mid-1880s Montelius had managed to create a thorough chronology of the Scandinavian Bronze Age using his methodology (cf. Montelius 1885).

Nevertheless, Montelius was aware that it would be difficult to get any exact dating on his typologies, unless he was able to somehow connect the artifacts with other ancient civilisations such as those of Rome and Egypt (Rydh 1937, pp. 72–73). These civilisations had written records and could therefore be dated. This was a luxury that the Scandinavian Bronze Age did not possess. It was Montelius's belief that if items from civilisations that could be dated with written sources were found in closed Scandinavian contexts, then they must have coexisted with one another, and it would be possible to date the Bronze age by connecting them with the Mediterranean. Eventually this link would come in the form of Mycenaean Greek pottery found in an Egyptian context. This find allowed archaeologists to date the Myceanaen period to around the 1500 B.C. Cylindrical faience beads that were presumed to have arrived from Egypt through the Mycenaeans civilisation were then later found throughout Europe. The discovery of these beads did not only allow archaeologists to date various European Bronze Age groups, but it indicated that the further a region was from the Near East, the less developed it was. This correlation between development and distance was made since there was less technologically advanced material the further one got from the Near East. Thus, according to Montelius his chronology proved that Europe in comparison with the Near East was less innovative during the Bronze Age (Trigger 2006, p. 227).

Montelius became a proponent of the *ex oriente lux* school of thought. The emphasis of this theory was the notion that many cultural breakthroughs and advancements began in the ancient Near East and later spread to other regions of the world. This is something that is especially highlighted in his work from 1899 that discusses the relationship between the Orient and Europe (cf. Montelius 1899, pp. 1–2). He would continue to develop these ideas whilst continuing to advance the typological method and its applications both within a European context, and that of an oriental one (Montelius 1903, pp. 10–11).

Later Research and its evident link to nationalism and race (1910–1921)

The text Montelius wrote in 1885, which sought to date the Bronze Age across Europe, not just Scandinavia, went on to become one of his most famous works. The Swedish archaeologist Hanna Rydh (1891–1964) who spoke and met with Montelius, asserts that Kossinna purportedly contended and said that after this text was published, all of Europe's archaeologists were disciples of Montelius (Rydh 1937, pp. 89–90). The compliment expressed by Kossinna serves as an example of the reciprocal esteem shared between the two individuals. The following quote

is taken from one of Montelius's texts where he references Kossinna's work, and where he considers him a "Högt förtjänt" which translates to 'highly merited researcher'.

> A highly merited researcher has stated in this text that – the original Indo-European population center is rather to be located in southern Sweden and on the Danish islands than in the Baltic Sea (1911, p. 175). That I cannot share this opinion, which is flattering to us, is evident from the following (Montelius 1921a, p. 404. Author's translation).

The quote exemplifies the language Montelius chose when referencing Kossinna's work and it serves as an indicator for the respect he held towards his academic achievements. Montelius was not entirely convinced of Kossinna's theories surrounding the location of the ancestral homeland of the Indo-Germanic people, but he still bought into the ethnical aspects of his writings, and the notion of continuity between past and present populations. It is possible that the early demonstration of respect from Kossinna towards Montelius might have motivated Montelius to develop a heightened interest in the racial origins of prehistoric Scandinavians. Naturally, there had always been an element of cultural-historical archaeology to his writings, but there appear to have been a shift as he grew older. These later writings on the topic of the Indo-German and its connection with Scandinavia grew more frequent, and it was evident that it became something that Montelius held a passion for. Montelius posited that the individuals who ultimately settled in Scandinavia had a Germanic lineage (Montelius 1917, p. 412). Montelius believed in the historical continuity between the Germanic population that settled in Scandinavia and the contemporary inhabitants of the region, something he would continue to express throughout his later works. This Germanic connection was not entirely new to him, and it was something that he had previously expressed a belief within his doctoral thesis on the Iron Age (cf. Montelius 1869). However, as previously mentioned, he had made this correlation through the observation of runic inscriptions, more so than ethnology and/or blood lineages. His newfound outspokenness towards continuity may have facilitated his increased interaction with German researchers, including Kossinna, who held similar perspectives on a people's connection with their supposed native soil (Baudou 2012, p. 359).

The examples below are taken from three works written by Montelius between 1917–1921, shortly before his death in 1921. These examples are meant to exemplify Montelius's racial views both towards ancient Scandinavian populations and their link to contemporary people. These examples show how Montelius linked his work together with Kossinna's theories surrounding the Aryan people. These specific examples are meant to show how Montelius gradually became more convinced by Kossinna's view of the Indo-Germans and Aryans, and it is possible to see the influence that the German held on Montelius's writings.

In his work *Germanernas hem* (1917) Montelius mentions the blood purity of the Scandinavian people. He even goes as far as to claim that the inhabitants of the Scandinavia peninsula (Sweden/Norway) have some of the purest Germanic blood in the entire world since it has not been mixed with other races. It is difficult to deny that such language does not carry with it a racial undertone. He also argues that contemporary south-Germans are purer Germans than those of their north-German counterparts, since they have not been mixed as much with other races, especially Slavs, as north-Germans have.

> Looking at the blood, not the mind, the majority of the southern Germans are much purer Germans than the majority of the northern Germans. Many people even today find a greater similarity between us Swedes and the southern Germans than between us and the people of northern Germany (Montelius 1917, p. 752. Author's translation).

Later on the same page he applies the same rhetoric and framework when arguing for the racial and blood purity of the Scandinavian people.

> In Scandinavia, too, migrations certainly entailed changes, but of a more passing character. The great emigration temporarily deprived or almost drained many areas of their population. But no Slavs were able to intrude here. As time passed, the gaps left by the emigrants were filled by peoples of the same blood as the other inhabitants of the country. For this reason, the Scandinavian countries, not least large regions on the Scandinavian Peninsula, are in our days inhabited by peoples whose Germanic blood is purer than anywhere else in the world (Montelius 1917, p. 412. Author's translation).

In his *Germanernas förfäder* (1918) Montelius discusses the ancestors of the Germanic people and where their ancestral homeland might be. There is a section in this paper where he discusses the first migration into Scandinavia, and he draws the conclusion that those who migrated into Scandinavia after the withdrawal of the ice was of a highly developed race, at least in comparison to those which inhabited the region before. He references the shape of the skulls of the inhabitants he studies and applies racial attributes based on this. The doliocefal (Long Skulls) were the race that finally settled in Sweden and whose descendants now live there (Montelius 1918, p. 752).

> It did probably not take long before people followed, and Scandinavia got their first inhabitants. Do we know anything about them? Yes, we know that they must have been of the same race as those that lived in central-Europe. German and French scholars agree that it was a doliocefal race, the one known under the name the Cro-Magnon race. First by the end of the palaeolithic period, thus long after the time in question, do the brakycefaler appear in middle Europe. From the south-east do they appear to have made their way to the North Sea, and from there did the dolikocefala race migrate into two different regions: Scandinavia and Western-France. Therefore, it must have been people of the Cro-Magnon race, that migrated into Sweden, and the other Scandinavian countries, when the disappearance of the ice made it possible to settle there. The Cro-Magnon race distinguish itself not merely by its dolikosefali, but likewise by its countless traits that confirms that it was a highly developed race in comparison with the people of the previous era (Montelius 1918, p. 752. Author's translation).

There are clear racial aspects to his writings in his text the *De ariska folkens hem* (1921a) and throughout the text, Montelius discusses the heritage of various people. There are two examples which highlight his view on the ancestral Swedish population and their bloody purity to the same Aryan race/people that Kossinna discusses in his writings. There is a clear national sentiment to aspects of this paper.

> We are thus entitled to say: Our ancestors have lived here in Sweden for 15,000 years. When they arrived, what is now called Sweden was uninhabited. We possess a country that we have not taken from any other people. We Swedes have "made" our country ourselves, developed land and roads. Such acts of taking possession are exceptionally noble! Those which migrated to the north so long ago were not Germans, but they were the ancestors to the Germans (Montelius 1921a, p. 408. Author's translation).

Later in the same text he writes:

> Contemporary Sweden cannot claim to be part of the ancestral homeland of the Aryan, but it is an important part of the ancestral homeland of the Germanic people. And we Swedes like the rest of Scandinavians are the purest descendants of the Cro-Magnon race from which the Aryans originate from (Montelius 1921a, p. 418. Author's translation).

This final quote can be viewed as the culmination of Montelius gradual acceptance of Kossin-

na's view on Sweden's link to his Aryan people. He went from arguing a strictly Germanic blood in 1917 to accepting that contemporary Swedes are amongst the purest blood descendants of the same race from which the Aryans originated from in 1921. It is difficult to deny that Montelius was convinced by Kossinna's writings since he accepted some of his core viewpoints. As indicated by these quotes, Montelius held a strong view surrounding historical continuity, blood, and ethnology of both the past and present Swedish population. In 1921 this view culminated in Montelius having a small role in legitimizing and contributing to the foundation of the Swedish Institute for Racial Biology. Montelius would in 1921 write a piece in cooperation with several racial biologists, most notably Herman Lundborg (1868–1943), the Institute of Racial Biology's first director. He wrote the first paper within the larger work *The Swedish Nation in word and picture* (1921), a jubilee book published in cooperation with experts commissioned by the Swedish society for Race-Hygiene. The text itself was directly funded by advocators for the implementation of a Swedish Institute of Racial Biology, and Montelius's participation can be considered as lending aid to legitimize such organisation (cf. Lundborg & Runnström 1921). His contribution was *The immigration of our forefathers to the North* (1921) and it could in some ways be viewed as the conclusion of his previous research on Sweden's Germanic and racial historical background. He reuses much of the same rhetoric as in his previous works.

> The people who immigrated to the north, after the end of the Glacial Period, cannot be called Teutons, but they were the forefathers of the Teutonic (Nordic) Race (Montelius 1921b, p. 10. Author's translation).

Later in the same text he writes:

> Right up to the present time the dolichocephalic race on the Scandinavian peninsula remained almost pure (Montelius 1921b, p. 10. Author's translation).

Thus, there is no denying that towards the end of his life Montelius focused much of his research on the ethnical and racial background of the Swedish population, and that he held some connection with proponents for the implementation of an Institute of Racial Biology. It is debatable and possible that the influence that Kossinna had over Montelius guided him towards such a view of the world. However, that which is not debatable is that Montelius when given the opportunity to argue against racial biology as a concept, he deliberately chose not to do so. The truth is that he did the exact opposite and he lent both himself, his prestige and his renown to help create the Swedish Institute for Racial Biology. This choice of his goes against the argument that he was merely acting in the spirit of this period, since not every academic or individual went out of their way to help justify the creation of such an organization. An example of somebody who was outspoken against this sort of science was Torsten Fogelqvist (1880–1941). Fogelqvist was a publicist, a member of the Swedish Academy as well as an honorary doctor at Uppsala University and he wrote critically of both Lundborg and the Swedish Institute for Racial Biology (cf. Lundkvist 2005). Naturally, it goes without saying that at the time the study of races was a far more accepted topic than it is today, but even so it was not an entirely clear-cut discussion.

Conclusion

The paper argues that Montelius gradually became more aligned with Kossinna's rhetoric surrounding past Germanic populations and it highlights that both men shared viewpoints and theories. This gradual alignment occurred towards the end of Montelius's life, and he became more convinced as the years passed by. By comparing Montelius's earlier research towards the end of the nineteenth century with the research he conducted during the last years of his life, there exists a stark contrast. His research became more interested with Sweden's Germanic heritage, rather than anything else. Simultaneously, where Kossinna's legacy has been utterly tarnished because of similar theories, Montelius's legacy has been left mostly untouched. It is es-

sential to recognize that the legacy of Montelius is not without intricacies and that in conjunction with his significant contributions to the area of archaeology, Montelius espoused nationalistic perspectives and there is no denying that he participated in the realm of racial biology, a discipline that is presently generally discredited as a pseudoscience founded upon prejudiced ideologies. It is not often mentioned that Montelius co-authored scientific pieces at the request of the Swedish society for Race-Hygiene (cf. Lundborg & Runnström 1921; Montelius 1921b). It is easy to disregard his contributions as simply being from that era, but there is no denying that Montelius deliberately chose to participate, and he made his stance clear. His contribution to this text likewise highlights how archaeology could be used in order to justify racial biology, something that is not necessarily all that was discussed. Yet, even if Montelius did dabble in such sciences, there are some indicators that the archaeological discipline chooses to focus on Montelius's more palatable achievements about typologies while mitigating his nationalistic and racial viewpoints (cf. Trigger 2006; Fagan 31–33). It is likewise possible that the continued influence of Kossinna helped to shape Montelius's views of the past in regard to such questions, since his rhetoric aligned more with his as time went by.

Nevertheless, it should be stated that the study dutifully recognizes the notable achievements of Montelius in the fields of typologies and chronologies, and the role that he played in establishing Swedish archaeology. Yet, by adopting a critical historiographical lens towards Montelius's legacy, it becomes possible to delve into a more nuanced and truthful discourse regarding his archaeological achievements and the influences that formed his academic pursuits.

Acknowledgements
I wish to give a massive thank you to my partner Ebba for her invaluable support. I would likewise want to extend a huge thank you to Stefan Aguirre Quiroga for looking over the language and helping me throughout the process, and to the comments given to me by the reviewers.

References

Anderson, B., 1983. *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London.
Andersson, A., 2023. Re-Considering Processual and Post-Processual Archaeology: Can a Historical Approach Help Nuance the Usage of ADNA and Archaeogenetics. *Archaeologia Lituana* 23:34–52.
Arnold, B., 1990. The past as propaganda: Totalitarian archaeology in Nazi Germany. *Antiquity* 64 (244):464–478.
– 2006. Arierdämmerung': Race and archaeology in Nazi Germany. *World Archaeology*, vol. 38/1:8–31.
Baudou, E., 2005. Kossinna meets the Nordic Archaeologists. *Current Swedish Archaeology*, vol. 13(1):121–139.
– 2012. *Oscar Montelius: Om tidens återkomst och kulturens vandringar*. Stockholm.
Burmeister, S., 2023. Gustaf Kossinna's nationalistic agenda as Trojan horse in the archaeological concept of culture. *CAS Working Paper Series* 14(2):48–59.
Burns, R. N. (ed.), 2006. *Historiography*. London/New York.
Childe, V. G. 1925. *The dawn of European civilization*. London.
– 1930. *The Bronze Age*. Cambridge.
– 1950. *Prehistoric migrations in Europe*. Oslo.
– 1958. *The prehistory of European society*. Harmondsworth.
Cornell, P., 2017. *How prehistory becomes crucial for bordermaking* Oxford.
Cornell, P., Borelius, U., Kresa, D., & Backlund, T., 2008. Kossinna, the Nordische Gedanke, and Swedish Archaeology: Discourse and politics in German and Swedish archaeology 1900–1950. *Current Swedish Archaeology* 16(1):37–59.
Danielsson, U., 1967. Darwinismens inträngande i Sverige. *Lychnos* 1965/1966:261–334.
Darwin, C., 1859. *On the origin of species*. London.
Fagan, B. M. (ed.), 2014. *The great archaeologists*. London.
Gimbutas, M., 1971. Proto-Indo-European Culture: The Kurgan Culture during the Fifth, Fourth, and Third Millennia B.C. Cardona, G., Hoenigswald, H. M. & Senn, A. (eds.). *Indo-European and Indo-Europeans: Papers presented at the third Indo-European conference at the University of Pennsylvania*. Philadelphia.
Golinski, J., 2005. *Making natural knowledge: Constructivism and the history of ccience, with a new preface*. Chicago Pess.
Gräslund, B., 1974. Relativ datering: Om kronologisk metod i nordisk arkeologi. *Tor* 16:7–248. Uppsala.
Gustafsson, A., 2001. *Arkeologihistoria som historia och som arkeologi: Studier i arkeologins egenhistorier*. Göteborg.

Hildebrand, H., 1866. *Svenska folket under hednatiden: Ethnografisk afhandling*. Stockholm.
Holmberg, C. & Hjørungdal, T., 2016. Archaeology and history as companion disciplines: Co-analysing Georg Sarauw's work on the Mullerup Excavation at the start of the 1900s. *Lund Archaeological Review* 21:7–20.
Holtorf, C., 2005. *From Stonehenge to Las Vegas: Archaeology as popular culture*. Walnut Creek.
Jensen, O. (ed.), 2012. *Histories of archaeological practices. Reflections on methods, Strategies and social organization in past fieldwork*. Stockholm.
Kossinna, G., 1911. *Die Herkunft der Germanen*. Leipzig.
– 1940. *Das Weichselland, ein uralter Heimatboden der Germanen*. Leipzig.
Lundborg, H. & Runnström, J., 1921. *The Swedish nation in word and picture*. Stockholm.
Lundkvist, I., 2005. *Kulturprosten: Torsten Fogelqvist som DN-publicist och folkbildare*. Stockholm.
Montelius, O., 1869. *Från jernåldern* 1. Stockholm.
– 1885. *Om tidsbestämning inom bronsåldern med särskildt afseende på Skandinavien*. Stockholm.
– 1899. *Der Orient und Europa: Einfluss der Orientalischen Cultur auf Europa bis zur Mitte der letzen Jahrtausends v. Chr*. Stockholm.
– 1903. *Die Typolgoische Methode: Die älteren Kulturperioden im Orient und in Europa*, vol. I. Stockholm.
– 1917. Germanernas hem. *Nordisk Tidskrift* 1917: 401–416.
– 1918. Germanernas förfäder. *Geologiska Föreningen i Stockholm Förhandlingar* 40(5):749–756.
– 1921a. De ariska folkens hem, *Nordisk Tidskrift* 1921:401–418.
– 1921b. The immigration of our forefathers to the north. Lundborg, H. & Runnström, J. (eds.). *The Swedish nation in word and picture*. Stockholm.
Murray, T., 2008. *Histories of archaeology: A reader in the history of archaeology*. Oxford.
Nordbladh, J. & Schlanger, N., 2008. *Archives, ancestors, practices: Archaeology in the light of its history*. Oxford/New York.
Rydh, H., 1937. *Oscar Montelius: En vägröjare genom årtusenden*. Stockholm.
Scott, T., 2007. From Kossinna to Complexity: Excavating 'Germanic Antiquity'. *Journal of the Australian Early Medieval Association* 3:289–305.
Sklenář, K., 1983. *Archaeology in Central Europe: The first 500 years*. Leicester.
Smith, A. D., 1986. *The ethnic origins of nations*. Oxford.
Trigger, B., 2006. *A History of archaeological thought*. 2nd ed. New York.
Worsaae, J. J. A., 1843. *Danmarks oldtid oplust ved oldsager og gravhøie*. Kjøbenhavn.