

Kossinna, the *Nordische Gedanke*, and Swedish Archaeology

Discourse and politics in German and Swedish archaeology 1900-1950¹

Per Cornell, Ulf Borelius, Dan Kresa & Thomas Backlund

This article looks at the relation between Swedish and German archaeology in the first half of the 20th century. In particular, the focus is on the question why Swedish prehistorians came to accept the archaeology of Gustaf Kossinna. The methodological inspiration principally comes from Carlo Ginzburg and his idea of clues. The empirical material mainly consists of books and journals. Newspapers and archives have also been used, but to a much lesser extent. Gustaf Kossinna was the dominant archaeologist in Germany in the early 20th century. The *Siedlungsarchäologie* was to a large extent his creation, and he was instrumental in making a spatial turn in archaeology. Kossinna was part of the *Nordische Gedanke* movement. Thus, the Nordic/Germanic blood, earth, and soil were paramount to Kossinnian archaeology. It was so important that Kossinna thought only Europe, in particular the Nordic region, which to him included parts of Germany, should be subjected to archaeological investigations. At the turn of the 20th century, Swedish archaeology was dominated by Oscar Montelius and his chronological typology. In the 1910s, however, his position was challenged by proponents of a more spatially oriented archaeology. Among the opponents were two young archaeologists, Nils Åberg and Sune Lindquist, who both had participated in the archaeological seminar organised by Knut Stjerna. In different ways, Åberg and Lindquist used Kossinna's archaeology in the struggle against the Montelian dominance.

Per Cornell, Inst för arkeologi och antikens kultur, Box 200, SE-405 30 Göteborg, Sweden.

Ulf Borelius, Inst för kultur, estetik och media/Centrum för kulturstudier; Box 200, SE-405 30 Göteborg, Sweden.

Dan Kresa, Topeliusgatan 4, SE-412 68 Göteborg, Sweden.

Thomas Backlund, Elinegårde, Bergstorp, SE-519 90 Horred, Sweden.

Key words: Kossinna, Montelius, Åberg, Lindquist, nation, *Nordische Gedanke*, Nazi Germany, Sweden

¹ It is difficult to translate *Nordische Gedanke* ("Nordic Thought"). The concept has to do with a general line of thought among various scholars, originating in the latter half of the 19th century, stressing the importance of Nordic culture and Nordic race. Among major non-German exponents we may mention Joseph Arthur Gobineau, Houston Chamberlain and Madison Grant. However, *Nordische Gedanke* was a particular, and very strong, German version of this general current. *Nordicism* is all too general a concept, and "Nordic Theory" does not reflect the full content of the German concept, something far beyond "theory". The difficulty in translation points at deeper dimensions of difference between British and German traditions of philosophy. In Swedish there is a close (but far from identical) translation of *Nordische Gedanke* in the expression *Den nordiska tanken*.

During the last 20 years the relation between archaeology, archaeological discourse, and politics has been continuously addressed within the discipline, in various ways. In this article we will try to illustrate some of the complexities involved. Our argument is preliminary, and the text is to a large extent explorative.²

The case discussed in this article is the relation between Sweden and Germany, and Swedish and German archaeology, in the first half of the 20th century. The main goal of the text is to point to the importance of addressing more in depth why Swedish prehistorians came to accept a certain kind of German archaeology and German archaeological method as a sort of general standard. In this article, we focus in particular on Gustaf Kossinna, a German scholar, and Oscar Montelius, a Swedish scholar, both of whom were dominant archaeologists formed in the 19th century, and on the Swedish archaeologists Nils Åberg and Sune Lindquist, who were products of the 20th century. The latter were chosen as study objects since they were instrumental in making German archaeological ideas popular in Sweden, and since they related to each other in interesting ways. There is a growing literature on the history of archaeology, and related fields, for the period in question, which we have benefited from (cf. e.g., Baudou 2002; Grünert 2002; Hagerman 2006). Concerning archaeology in Nazi Germany, several studies have demonstrated that certain archaeologists and certain archaeological organisations were involved in direct political and often illegal, or highly unethical, activities, including espionage, theft, medical experiments on prisoners, and so forth (cf. De Vries 2000; Heuss 1999; Kater 1974; Pringle 2006; Taylor 1993). We are, however, *not* particularly interested in “nailing” certain individuals for having committed this or that action, still less for having been adherents of this or that sort of thought.

Methodology and theoretical frame

The most important source for this short study is published material from the time period in question, mainly books and journals. To some extent we have also used newspapers, and even archives, but only in a few cases. There is, as we have already seen, great potential in various archives (not least the Bundesarchiv in Germany), but the more extensive use of these sources will remain for another study.

One important source of inspiration is Carlo Ginzburg and his idea of *clues*. Ginzburg argues that in some cases historians can build arguments from clues. Though they only *indicate* what may have happened, they are often a valid source, even for complex arguments. However, working on clues requires a special source-critical methodology and Ginzburg has elaborated on these issues in several studies (cf. Ginzburg 1986). Critical assessment of sources is not principally a means for

² Cornell and Kresa are archaeologists, Ulf Borelius is a sociologist, and Thomas Backlund an historian of ideas. Thanks to Alexander Gramsch, Tove Hjørungdal, Carl Holmberg, Kristian Kristiansen, Göran Aijmer, Karin Lundkvist, Anna Nilsson, Claes Theliander, and two anonymous reviewers for valuable suggestions. The authors remain, of course, responsible for the content of the article.

discarding sources, but a means of evaluating how they can best be used for particular purposes. We address the conscious, intentional content of a text, as well as elements that may be less explicitly stated or elements which the author either took for granted or was not fully conscious of, and we look for patterning in the distribution of such statements (cf. e.g., Foucault 1969).

THE NATION AND ARCHAEOLOGY

Questions of the nation and its imagined communities have been raised in recent debates (cf. Anderson 1983; Eriksen 1993), and various particular national projects have been analysed (cf. e.g., on Sweden and Germany Trägårdh 1996; Moore 1973; Smith 1991). What we wish to focus on is the close relation between the nation and archaeology. Archaeology often had a legitimising and glorifying function in the process of building and consolidating a nation (Diaz Andreu & Champion, (eds.) 1995). The purpose is to discuss, very briefly and without going into too many historical details, the connections between the nation and archaeology in Germany and Sweden.

There are several similarities between Germany and Sweden. But what matters here are the differences.

One important difference is, of course, the size of the population. More important to our study is, however, the difference in the historical development of the two nations. Germany (Deutschland) was strikingly different in 1820 as compared to 1920, both in terms of borders and political organisation, while Sweden (despite important changes) was less strikingly different in 1820 as compared to 1920. It is important at this point to stress a complication in translation. In the German language, *Deutschland* is the name of a country, while *Germanen* are the people of the Germanic-speaking countries. The English word "Germany" is thus a difficult word. Despite this problem, we have in general translated Deutschland as Germany.

Another important difference is the way the borders changed. After the Napoleonic wars, the kingdom of Sweden lost Finland, which had been an integrated part of the kingdom for centuries. However, only a few years later the Swedish king became the king of Norway as well, which in a sense became "new" possessions. In 1905, the Swedish *king* "lost" Norway, but the *Swedish* realm remained more or less the same. This "loss" of Norway did not come easily; several cultural movements were initiated in Sweden immediately after this event, and in this connection we must mention the creation of the archaeological journal *Fornvännen* (Friend of the Old) in 1906.

Germany had changed in more profound ways, with regard to its territorial extension. The formal state control over the territory had been considerably strengthened: in fact it had undergone a deep change. A large amount of small states ("kingdoms" etc.) had been united into one "nation", the German nation. The process whereby this unification was realised was complex and involved several steps. In 1815-1866 "Germany" was called Der Deutsche Bund. In 1867-

1871 it was the North German Bund, a “northern” alliance claiming their right to the concept of *Deutsch*. In 1871-1918 it was the *Deutsches Reich*, under an emperor, and by 1918 it was the *Deutsches Reich*, as a republic. The territorial extension varied considerably, as did the political organisation. The German Bund in the beginning of the 19th century was indeed a loose federation. Several of the monarchies, integrating the Bund, had monarchs which were also monarchs elsewhere. Just to mention some examples, the king of Hannover was king of Britain; Luxemburg was a personal union with the Netherlands; and Holstein shared its monarch with Denmark. Note that a part (approximately 1/3) of the Empire of Austria formed part of this Bund, and that only part of Prussia was a member.

The “Bismarck” era of Prussian expansion is well known, and the consequences were of great importance. In this process, Germany went from being an idea on paper to a reality, and with an expanding economy and educational system. This new entity was remarkably different from other European superpowers of the time. It had less international holdings, and the 18th-century Enlightenment was not a factor in the *history of the nation* (as was the case in France and Britain). Many historians and philosophers have discussed this. To pick two examples; Christian von Krockow (1990) has addressed some of the problems in a general book on the German 20th century; and the philosopher Plessner, himself a personal witness to the process, has developed an intricate argument on these differences, discussing “the retarded nation” (Plessner 1982).

The point we wish to make is simply that there are important particularities in the process of nation making in Germany as compared to France or Britain. Among the patterns that the latter have in common are a stronger continuity and a much more intensive global, mainly colonial, involvement. Further, the effect of the First World War in which Germany was “the Loser” was important in giving Germany a vulnerable position. The years after the war were also difficult, with an unstable political situation, with several violent uprisings and conflicts of different sorts, and a precarious economy (not least the unemployment and the hyperinflation). The post-First World War setting is of great importance in discussing the German archaeology of the first half of the 20th century.

For an archaeologist in Sweden it was necessary to elaborate means to articulate to a strong state involvement in archaeology, which was linked to royal projects and ideals. But the Swedish state was relatively stable, and was not involved directly in the First World War. The Swedish National Heritage Board has origins stretching back to the 17th century, when the king instituted to illustrate the antiquity and importance of the Swedish kingdom. The Board was an important entity in 19th-century archaeology. Arguing on nationhood had its point of departure in the Swedish kingdom, which was still (though considerably reformed) a “living” entity. Terms and concepts of the kingdom and of the Board had a long historical tradition. For an archaeologist in Germany in the 19th century, the situation was different. There were several monarchs and states to relate to, and various national

projects to relate to. To give one example, Mecklenburg tried to establish a national heritage tradition (cf. Rakow 1986, Hjørungdal 1997). No existing state gave sufficient instruments to make a common “German” archaeology, though there were some attempts at collaboration, notably in the creation of a central Germanisches Nationalmuseum, supported by a number of regional organisations.

Moving to the 20th century, the differences between Germany and Sweden were still rampant. In Sweden, the Board became even more important in the 20th century, and the institutions of the state exhibited continuity in several ways, though new political forces came to the foreground. *Making a national archaeology in Sweden was about illustrating and **maintaining** a nation, which was already “known” to a large extent.*

In Germany of 1900, the nation was still in a sense “in the making”; it had not acquired a definite form. Several German scholars asked for new types of history, which could serve the process of nationhood. To take just one example, the philosopher Wilhelm Windelband in a famous speech in 1894 asked for a new humanities, which should not look for the general and the repeated (as did the natural sciences, according to Windelband), but instead look for the singular, the unique. The message in this and other similar speeches was evident; it was asking for a new German history to be made. *Making a national archaeology in Germany was to partake in the **creation** of German nationhood.*

GUSTAF KOSSINNA

Gustaf Kossinna (1858-1931) had a deep impact on German archaeology, well before 1908, when he launched the journal *Mannus*, which came to be very influential (Grünert 2002; cf. Veit 2002: 42-45). Originally working on philology, he eventually came to study archaeology. The *Siedlungsarchäologie* was largely his creation. In a sense, Kossinna created the breakthrough of a spatial method; he was instrumental in making a “spatial turn” to archaeology. The word *Siedlung* had to do with geographical location, the place in which (in this case) a particular culture or a particular people (*Volk*) lived, or a particular tribe (*Stamme*) among a people. *Siedlung* should in this case be read as similar to *Heimat*. The question of *Heimat* is strongly linked, among many authors of Kossinna’s time to *Blut und Boden*, to blood and earth. The *Völkish* movement defended this strange blend of ideas, and played an important role in its diffusion (cf. Wijworra 2006). The issue of the earth, of the soil, is paramount, and should be interpreted in a very palpable way in Kossinna. There must be terrain, earth, soil, linked to any true people.

Kossinna plotted archaeological finds, particular types of objects (e.g., flint axes, or certain types of ceramics) on maps. These maps were generally of such a scale that large parts of Northern Europe (or even larger areas!) were included, and the amount of artefacts plotted was relatively small. Given some knowledge (or supposed knowledge) of chronology (often taken from Montelius), these maps were taken to indicate the origin and spread of a particular culture or “people”. A

certain artefact was often with no arguments taken to represent, say, “Germans” during the Stone Age.

Kossinna explicitly wrote that archaeology only had to do with Europe, and particularly the Nordic region, which in his perspective included parts of Germany. He *a priori* excluded other regions of the world as topics for archaeology (Kossinna 1911, 1928). This trait, i.e. that of exclusion, is a very important element in his way to think archaeology (and the world, it might be added). Kossinna wrote political pamphlets, notably at the end of the First World War, in which he used his archaeology for immediate political purposes. As an example of political intervention, we can mention the article on the region around the river Vistula (present-day Poland), which was, in Kossinna’s words, an old “Heimatboden” for Germans, and in his opinion visible in Neolithic ceramics. This article on the Heimat in “Weichsel” from 1919 has been reprinted on various occasions, for example in 1940 (Kossinna 1940).

Kossinna did not construct his method out of nothing. His approach had taken up many ideas, particularly on mapping, from geographers and others working in the Humboldtian tradition, and probably also from the *Kulturkreislehre*, an approach developed mainly by ethnographers, linguists, and historians of religion (cf. Arvidsson 2001; and for an archaeological application Menghin 1931, 1934). The only adherent to *Kulturkreislehre* with a true interest in the Nordic, which was of paramount importance to Kossinna, was, however, Leo Frobenius (e.g. 1936).

Further, the concept of “a people” was used by many scholars in the 19th century, including archaeologists, but it was a rather diffuse term. Often, when analysing stratigraphy, each major stratum was taken to indicate the presence of a new people, who took over a specific area from another people. Kossinna also made use of racist theory and racist “science”, which already existed at this time. The development of racial arguments in biology played an important role. Kossinna, and a major German biologist working on “race”, Eugen Fischer, shared many interests (cf. Gessler 2000; Fischer & Günther 1927). Fischer himself even ventured, at times, into archaeology, and Kossinna at times dwelled on human skulls and their alleged racial characteristics.

Kossinna, however, created a particular blend, which became the *Siedlungsarchäologie*. He did not like general ideas of human evolution. Instead, the particularities of Heimat, and the connection to earth, soil, and blood, should be stressed.

To illustrate Kossinna’s way to argue, we will briefly summarise his view on the origin of the Germans in an important book from 1928 (*Ursprung und Verbreitung der Germanen in vor- und frühgeschichtlicher Zeit*). The argument in this book summarises several previous studies by Kossinna, for example from 1909/10 and 1912 (1914). Kossinna devoted a large part of his 1928 study to arguments on racial characteristics, comparing the contemporary population to Stone Age skulls, and identifying, as he believed, various groups in Germany,

Friesland and the Nordic countries. He then continues with a discussion on archaeological material from the Later Stone Age, in which he dedicates his main efforts to ceramics and stone axes and, to some extent, various types of burials. His point of departure is the various “cultures” he believes to have identified in this archaeological material, and arguments concerning their chronological position. It must be said that it is often hard to see how he connects empirics to his prehistoric reconstructions. However, his scenario runs more or less as follows.

First, there is, in the north, a primitive hunter-gatherer population, which is replaced by an *Indogermanic* population, with a centre in Jutland (present-day Denmark) and Schleswig-Holstein, but eventually expanding into parts of southern and western Sweden and into Germany. This Indogerman population appears at the end of what we today call the Mesolithic period (the so-called Ertebölle phase), and they eventually start building megalithic monuments. In Kossinna’s archaeology, migrations are a main element, and according to Kossinna the Indogermans made several migratory movements in various waves, including far down in present-day Germany.

Then, there arrives from the far north an “Arctic Dobbertinner pre-Finn” culture, survivors of the old hunting-gathering population. This arctic population is particularly well adapted to cold climates, and they are very tough and good warriors. This population settles in Jutland and southern Scandinavia, and eventually mingles with the Indogermans of these areas. From this mix, the *Finno-Indogermans* emerge (1928:216), and come to dominate in southern Scandinavia and Denmark, while “pure” (previously migrated) Indogermans survived in Germany, for example in the region of Halle. The Finno-Indogermans used Boat Axes and Corded Ware ceramics, and buried their dead in individual burials of relatively simple construction (as compared to the megaliths). These Finno-Indogermans eventually migrate to Germany and there is a second mix, between Finno-Indogermans and pure Indogermans, in Germany. From this mix the Germans emerge, a culturally unified people, in 2000 BC, shortly before the beginning of the Bronze Age (Kossinna 1928:297).

The Germans, thus, were a mix created out of two distinct Nordic populations. Two observations should be made. One is that Kossinna believed certain particular cultural and racial mixes to be positive. However, in the case of the Germans there is a higher percentage of Indogermans, and a smaller element of the “pre-Finns”. The other observation – and this is a key point – is that Kossinna had a lot of hyperborean beliefs. He really did believe in a “*Nordische Gedanke*” (“Nordic Thought”), a particular sort of Nordicism. To summarise this kind of Nordicism, it simply stated that what is good comes from the north. According to Kossinna’s maps the “pre-Finns” lived in what are today areas of Norway, Sweden and Finland. It is interesting that he uses the term Finns. It is a complex term. Kossinna, of course, knew about the existence of Finland, as well as Finnmark in Norway. Kossinna makes a point of separating pre-Finns from the Finno-Ugrians, which

appeared later – another mix (more “negative” in Kossinna’s opinion). The use of the term “Finns” was certainly intentional.

It should be noted that Kossinna at some points lies close to recent debate in Scandinavian archaeology, for example in stressing the importance of the last phase of the Scandinavian Neolithic. It may also be mentioned that Kossinna uses some Swedish archaeologists in his 1928 book, among them Montelius, Almgren, Åberg and Niklasson.

The 1928 book by Kossinna certainly helped to stabilise his position. But it also carried political intentions, which are rather evident. The book opens with a photograph from 1915, in which Kossinna gives a lecture for General Field Marshall Hindenburg. In 1928, Hindenburg was Reichspräsident of Germany. The closing words of the book also relate to the Germany of the 1920s. Hindenburg is mentioned, and Kossinna speaks of the Germans of the Neolithic, characterised by beautiful weaponry (axes and daggers), as a “weapon-happy” and “weapon-proud” people (“ein waffen-frohes und waffenstoltzes Volk”; 1928:302). He even writes that, “Also today, only weapon-proud can our poor people get their lost freedom back” (“Nur Waffenstoltzes kann auch heute unserem armen Volke die verlorene Freiheit wiedergewinnen”; 1928:302). There is no doubt that, to Kossinna, archaeology is not only a reflection of, or a support for, a German national project, but also *a vital and constructive element in the making of that national project*. The case of Kossinna should be interesting in studying the ways of making a career in the academic field, as well as to see how a particular academic development may have a certain (although, of course, limited) general political influence.

We can also add that, by 1928, Kossinna was a member of the *Kampfbund für Deutsche Kultur* (cf. Grünert 2002), which was under the protection of Alfred Rosenberg, later minister of culture in the NSDAP government, and also the protector of the *Reichsbund für Deutsche Vorgeschichte*. A general observation on Kossinna is that he was very keen on stressing the role of *the Nordic*, and even, in a sense, at the expense of the southern parts of Germany, such as Bavaria.³ The true original land (*Boden*) of the Germans was in the north. The south was a later acquisition, and thus, no “*Urheimat*”. Kossinna could never have been wholeheartedly accepted in wide circles in Catholic Bavaria. There is rather something of a Prussian in Kossinna: in a sense he is a Prussian militaristic expansionist. In his view, the whole scenario of Nordic development took place in the North, and in a limited area (the Nordic countries, northern Germany, Friesland, the Baltic countries). There was no major “external” element. The Deutsch was Nordic Deutsch.

³ The importance of Nordicism and *Nordische Gedanke* in Nazi-German propaganda is, at first sight, rather strange. How come Bavarian or Austrian Nazis accepted this argument, which made their earthly “homelands” secondary in the official historical perspective? Bavaria was a stronghold for Nazism, so this point should be studied more in detail. *Nordische Gedanke* evidently contained some very important message in Bavaria and Austria as well.

Nordische Gedanke

The idea of a *Nordische Gedanke* was common in the German-speaking countries at this time, and of course not only in archaeology. It became an important element in Nazi ideology. Many scholars adhered to various brands of *Nordische Gedanke*. Particularly extreme adherents of the *Nordische Gedanke* were Hans F. K. Günther (1891-1968), an influential race theorist in Germany, Hermann Wirth (1885-1981), a scholar from the Netherlands who was popular in Nazi circles, particularly in the first half of the 1930s, and the art historian Josef Strzygowski (1862-1941), working in Vienna, Austria. Günther (1922; cf. Fischer & Günther 1927) believed the Nordic race to be above all others, while Wirth (1931), and Strzygowski (cf. 1937, 1940) spoke of a Nordic *Ur-Kultur* in the Arctic (cf. Lutzhöft 1971, for an elaborate discussion on *Nordische Gedanke*, and Dahl 2006 for some comments). At another level, scholars like Walter Wüst (1901-1993), the specialist on “Aryan civilisation”, who came to be particularly influential in the Nazi period, worked within the *Nordische Gedanke*, and accepted much of Kossinna’s argument, but was also interested in wider worlds, including Iran and India (Wüst 1942; cf. Arvidsson 2000 pp. 199-207, Nordenborg Myhre 2001, and for an example of the political implication Berkhoff 2004: 35-48, *passim*).

The *Nordische Gedanke* was not a coherent field; but what unified several thinkers at the time, particularly in German-speaking countries, was the idea of a pure original Nordic race and culture, which had been created without “external” elements and which subsisted by their own capacity. Of major importance was the idea that the Nordic people were *chosen*, that they had to fulfil their historical destiny. Any major external influence was thus negative, and a threat to the authentic Nordic spirit, and indeed envisioned as a physical threat to the Nordic race. In the field of *Nordische Gedanke* it became important to discuss racial hygiene and ways of avoiding foreign cultural influence.

Kossinna belonged to the movement of *Nordische Gedanke*. His discussion on the creation of the Germans intended at demonstrating that the whole process took place in the North. The inclusion of “arctic” blood in the German was also important. Kossinna is a major figure in the field of *Nordische Gedanke*, and his influence should not be forgotten.

THE RECEPTION OF KOSSINNA’S METHODOLOGY IN SWEDEN

The Swedish archaeology about 1900

The leading figure in the late 19th century and early 20th century Swedish archaeology was Oscar Montelius (1843-1921). Montelius and Swedish archaeology in general was, in the 19th century, a vital field, and played a role in the development of international discussion. But Oscar Montelius was also influenced by British tradition, and explicitly referred to Lubbock, Darwin, and other British scholars (cf. Arwill-Nordbladh 1998). For him, the typological chronology, as a method, was evidently a question of evolution, and he calls it natural history and even “Darwinian” (1884, 1899b). It is probable that Lubbock, however, played a

larger role than Darwin in Montelius' general arguments on prehistory (for a discussion on Montelius and Darwin cf. Gräslund 1974, pp. 207-216). Montelius also used diffusion as a major concept, and British ideas of an Indo-European origin, as for example when discussing megalithic tombs (1899b). Like British Imperial archaeology Montelius was also interested in archaeology from all parts of the globe: he did not limit his interest to the North (Cornell 1997). The British influence on Montelius is interesting, and forces us to make a short excursus.

If we compare Kossinna to John Lubbock, a major Victorian evolutionist and archaeologist, the difference is striking. Lubbock envisions British society as consisting of different segments, which are virtually non-related. Some of these are civilized, while the lowest classes are "mere savages" (Lubbock 1872). Various evolutionary stages are thus present in England during Queen Victoria. There is no unified people. What unifies to Lubbock is probably the condition of being subject to the Queen, of being part of the British Empire. There is no need for a vision of "one unified people", as in Kossinna's archaeology. British scholars in the late 19th century were, of course, not a homogeneous group. But evolution and diffusion were popular perspectives, which seem to have fitted the Empire. There were also racial theorists, with rather extreme positions. But it was Kossinna who came to elaborate a strong *archaeological* argument on the homogeneous people, with a defined geographical homeland, a Nordic homeland.

While Montelius was influenced by Britain in the 19th century, he eventually came to look more on Germany than Britain. Why he did so is beyond the scope of this article. We can see, however, how he publicly works for Germany, at least from 1913, when he is instrumental in founding a Swedish-German Association (Svensk-Tyska föreningen). His texts from the last years of his life also fit better and better into a Kossinnian argument, though there are differences. In 1919 Montelius accepts the Kossinnian idea of the origin of the Germans, but not of the origin of the Indogermans. Finally, in a speech in Berlin in 1921, he goes very far, insisting that Swedes and Germans are one people, a provocative statement even at that point in time, at least from a Swedish perspective (Deutsch-Schwedische Blätter 1921).

At the turn of the century, 1900, Swedish archaeology was in transformation. Montelius himself was re-evaluating some of his ideas. But there were also new currents, particularly around Knut Stjerna and Oscar Almgren, looking for new approaches and interested in spatial distribution and myths (cf. Baudou 1997, 2004, Gräslund 2006). At the archaeology seminars organised in Uppsala by Stjerna, new ideas crystallised. It was thus a good time for a new generation to initiate their careers. There were several new actors who, in various ways, oriented their work in Kossinna's tradition, and many of them kept their German contacts during the Nazi period. Some of these explicitly pointed to the inadequacies or limitations of the strict Montelian typological approach. There are several interesting aspects to work on here, but we will only mention two young and aggressive

career-seeking men, Nils Åberg and Sune Lindquist, and only a few of their Kossinna-related studies.

Nils Åberg

Nils Åberg (1888-1957) defended his doctoral thesis in Uppsala in 1912. In 1949, very late in his career, he became Professor of Archaeology, in Stockholm. Åberg cannot be said to have had a very successful career, particularly not in the institutional sense. But he is well known for a work that mainly consists of illustrations, called the “Prehistoric Culture Circles of Europe” (1936a), as well as some other publications. The book on Culture Circles was studied by generations of Swedish archaeologists. His main interests were the Iron Age and, to some extent, the Neolithic. Though he did organise some excavations, most of his scholarly work is based on studies in museums and on the bibliography. Åberg had a wide network of contacts in Europe prior to the Second World War.

The Later Stone Age

One of Åberg’s favourite fields of research was the Later Stone Age. His dissertation, published in Swedish, concerns what he termed “the younger Stone Age” in the Nordic countries and Western Europe (Åberg 1912). It is a relatively short text, covering approximately 90 pages with seven illustrated plates. The study is based on typological studies (in the Montelian methodological tradition) and on artefact distribution (in the map-plotting tradition used by the Kossinnians). The main subject of the study is the role of the area corresponding to the Nordic countries during the Later Stone Age. One of his arguments concerns the megalithic burials. While Montelius had proposed that the megalithic tradition had its origin in the Orient (1899b), Åberg believed the tradition had its origin in the Nordic countries. In his opinion, it is only in the Nordic countries that we can discern a sequence of forms in megalithic monuments. In other countries, the megalithic tradition was “imported” and there is no discernable sequence. Another argument has to do with the flint-using tradition of the Nordic countries, which, according to Åberg is a particularly fine flint technology, qualitatively above most other such technologies. These Nordic flint-users exported the megalithic tradition to France, by means of emigration. But when this emigration stopped, there was degeneration in France in the flint-using culture.

In order to develop the argument, Åberg introduces in his text the concept “Indogermans”. In doing so, he refers to several authors including Kossinna (1909-1910), de Lapouge (1899, a sort of follower of the French racial theorist Gobineau), Ripley (1900) and others. The argument, in a very rough summary, is that Europe ever since the Palaeolithic has been the home of a special race. After the Ice Age, with the advent of the Campignien-Ertebölle culture (in the Mesolithic) this race appears along the coastal areas from Sweden to Southern France. But the “original homeland” of the Indogermans (*urhem*, original home in Swedish, similar to but not identical to *Urheimat* in German) was the Nordic countries, in particular Jutland

in Denmark. From the Mesolithic up to and through the Megalithic age, the Nordic countries are the centre of the Indogermanic culture.

Åberg also discusses the Bell Beaker “culture”, for which he identifies the oldest dates on the Iberian Peninsula. There are thus, according to Åberg, two main cultures, which in some limited extent establish contact. One is the Nordic Indogermanic, and the other (which appears much later) is the Bell Beaker culture. In England, the Bell Beakers were strong and traded with the Nordic countries. Copper and bronze were exported from England, while amber and “battle-axes” were exported from the Nordic region. Åberg’s book ends with a small comment on the relation between the Nordic tradition and the southeast, to eastern Germany, Poland and even Russia. Åberg agrees with Kossinna in this case, arguing that Nordic people emigrated to the southeast during the Neolithic. Thus, the argument is that the old European race created Indogermanic culture in the Nordic countries, and that there were, from the Nordic region, only trade relations with England, but emigration to the east.

Åberg does develop these arguments in later studies. He modifies some points, but above all tries to defend his old position. In 1918, he agrees with Kossinna, stating that, “It is, to a certain degree, correct to look at that area from the Netherlands in the West to Bukowina, East Galizia, Podolia and the inner Russia in the East as one great North-European Culture Area” (1918:212)⁴. This was written in 1918; had it been published in 1943, it would have been hard-core propaganda. Apart from discussing the megalithic people, Åberg also addresses another problem, that of the “Boat Axe” tradition. In 1937, he agrees with Kossinna in defining the “Boat Axe” as representing an old Nordic culture, and celebrates Kossinna’s genius (1937a:92-93). In 1949 (88-92), Åberg discards the idea of finding the origin of the Boat Axe people in southern Russia, as argued by e.g. Gordon Childe, and, in another form, by Johannes Brøndsted. As mentioned above, Kossinna saw the “Boat Axe people” as a mix of Indogermans and an arctic pre-Finn people. Åberg prefers to identify a “Swedish” origin for the “Swedish Boat Axe” tradition (1937a, 1949:53, and cf. 1918:66-67 – a boat axe is a sort of “battle axe”). Thus, to summarise, Åberg goes along with Kossinna in locating the origin of the “Boat Axe” in the Nordic sphere, but resists the idea of the name “pre-Finns”.

As can be understood from the summary given here, Åberg is very close to Kossinna, both in method and in the general idea of the Indogermans, but also in the idea of a rather autochthonous Nordic development. Kossinna started to develop the details of his argument in studies published in 1909/1910, and Åberg explicitly quotes these studies in his 1912 dissertation. On the other hand, it is difficult to say whether Åberg actually played a role in refining Kossinna’s argument. It may

⁴ Original: Es ist somit in gewissen Grade berechtigt, das Gebiet von den Niederlanden im Westen bis zur Bukowina, Ostgalizien, Podolien und dem inneren Russland im Osten als ein grosses nordeuropäisches Kulturgebiet zu betrachten.

be so, but in order to determine this, a detailed reading of Åberg and Kossinna is necessary. What is notable is that Åberg declines to follow Kossinna on one point, by not embracing the idea of some sort of “pre-Finn” migration during the Neolithic.

Åberg on scientific method and theory

Having summarised Åberg’s way of addressing archaeological cases, we will shortly address his thoughts on method and theory. In a study in Swedish from 1951 called “Creative Fantasy” (*Skapande Fantasi*) Åberg refers to Fichte as his favourite philosopher. The study on fantasy has interesting parts, and is mainly devoted to two topics. One is the role of intuition. Åberg believes intuition to be a main element in the archaeological research process. He even refers to Bergson and his “vitalism” (today in a sort of renaissance, through the work of Deleuze). It is not very clear, however, in what way Åberg believed his discussing intuition could have any operative significance for archaeology. The second major topic is the relation between the lower class and the upper class. Åberg argues that it is necessary for society to have social classes. But there must be a certain interrelation between them, and a certain (slow) social movement between them. Åberg even criticises Karl Marx fiercely in this section, but he only refers to one minor work by Marx. The ideas exposed here are similar to Åberg’s discussion on the relation between old Rome and the Germans (1921). He describes the latter as “primitive but strong” (1921:269), and states that modern Europe was created when Rome and the Germans were forged together into one unit (1921:270; this being a rather non-Kossinnian idea).

Turning back to “Creative Fantasy”, Åberg argues that chronological typology (the Montelian method) is a key archaeological method. Making archaeology is a question of power, of taking control over the evidence. Åberg uses various metaphors. One is the alcoholic ruse. Another, even more drastic, is that making archaeological analysis is “like the lover who goes down over his maid” (1951:25). Making science is not, in general, for women because they do not have sufficient will to power. It is interesting to note that these ideas did not appear suddenly in 1950. In a short obituary for Hans Hahne, Åberg (1936b) states that the researcher should by “means of power instinctively attack” the empirical material. He also speaks of different types of researchers, and wishes to see a balance in criticism. An all too critical approach is destructive. He writes that, “The negative view on authority ends in chaos and scientific sterility” (Åberg 1936b:23).⁵

Many of these assertions are certainly strange to us today. The date of the publication of “Creative Fantasy” is also somewhat strange. We have searched for contemporaneous reviews of this work, but have still found none. The use of some German philosophers, which had been popular in Nazi rhetoric, is also

⁵ Original: Die negative Einstellung zur Autorität mündet hier in Chaos und Wissenschaftliche Sterilität.

notable. Åberg himself tells us he wrote his text first and only then consulted philosophers (1951:32). The text calls our attention in the sense that several important currents in 1951 are virtually absent in his text, not even criticised.

Åberg and Kossinna

Kossinna played a major role in the archaeology of Åberg. Kossinna's Siedlungsarchäologie is of great importance: indeed, we venture to state that Åberg is, above all, a Kossinnist when it comes to method and strategy for research, and also when choosing his topics. Montelius is also of great importance, and Åberg cannot be imagined without typology. But the problems Åberg discusses relate, above all, to the spatial distribution of different subdivisions among the Germanic peoples (cf. e.g., Åberg 1919). He also speaks of origins and homelands, and discusses how particular peoples came to occupy certain areas, and about their relative role in a "general cultural development". In the case of the Later Stone Age, the Indogermans were the major carriers of high culture. He also talks of Indogermanic migrations to the southeast, to Russia and Poland, which follows Kossinna's argument insisting on the role of the German culture in these areas. Discussing the Iron Age in Sweden, Åberg gives a special role to the Masurgermans (on the continent) in the creation of the so-called Style II (1953). It should be kept in mind that the Masurgermans were a hot topic in interrelations between Germany and Poland. In this connection, Åberg also speaks of a "Nordic Sea Germanic Circle" in the Migration Period, which is a concept fitting the Kossinnian spatial method.

Apart from applying Kossinna's methods, Åberg became a personal friend to Kossinna. In the 1920s, Kossinna even recommended Åberg for a status position in German archaeology (Grünert 2002). This was remarkable, in particular coming from Kossinna, who was so bent on favouring Germany and the Deutsch. Kossinna really considered Åberg to be an important and gifted scholar. Åberg, however, finally declined this offer. Up to 1931 Åberg, however, contributed frequently with large texts to *Mannus*, the journal founded by Kossinna. In 1932 Åberg also wrote a friendly obituary for Kossinna, applauding his contributions to archaeology and his methods. Åberg actually celebrated Kossinna on more than one occasion. A somewhat extreme celebration is found in Åberg's 1949 book. The celebration covers almost one page in total and is heavy rhetoric, and we will only quote a short passage: "We thus mean /.../ that old Kossinna shall rest quietly in his grave and let time pass, to work, slowly and safely, as time usually does, to his own advantage, the success of his ideas and the glory of his reputation" (1949:112).⁶

The links between Åberg and Kossinna were strong. Åberg must be considered a prominent Kossinnian scholar, and he also played a vital role in introducing Kossinna's methods, and Kossinna's ideas in general, to Swedish archaeology. At the same time, Åberg disliked Herman Wirth, and almost describes him in terms

⁶ Original: Mena, sålunda, /.../, att den gamle Kossinna skall kunna vila lugnt i sin grav och låta tiden ha sin

of a lunatic. However, it should also be noted that Åberg was friendly with other German archaeologists, working close to the NSDAP. In particular he knew Hans Hahne, and Åberg even wrote a laudatory obituary for him (1936b). Hahne, and the archaeological museum in Halle, where he was the director up to his death in 1936, published several studies in Kossinna's tradition, and celebrated publicly the Nazi regime (cf. Hahne 1936, 1937; Schultz 1937). The Halle museum had a tradition of Swedish contacts dating back at least to the First World War (cf. Gillberg 2001).

Sune Lindquist

Sune Lindquist (1887-1976) defended a doctoral thesis in 1915 on what we would call more or less historical archaeology, and eventually (1927) he became professor of archaeology in Uppsala, Sweden. Lindquist had a very successful academic career. Not only was he appointed head of the Department of Archaeology in Uppsala at a relatively young age, his students and close colleagues also were to have dominant positions in the academic archaeology up to at least 1965.⁷ He mainly worked on the Iron Age in Sweden, and is well known for organising the excavations of the famous boat burials at Valsgärde, Uppland, and for his work on the picture stones of Gotland (1941-42). He was also very interested in the monuments at Old Uppsala. Lindquist wrote several popular books on archaeology, while Åberg refused to publish such books.

Lindquist and the Stone Age

Lindquist did not make any in-depth studies on Stone Age problems. But he does refer to such problems on various occasions. In his popular books (1935, 1944) he speaks about the arrival of Indo-European warriors to Sweden in the Neolithic (linked to the boat axes). The "people of the Boat Axes", also associated with earth burials, came, according to Lindquist, from southwest Finland (1935:172, cf. 1944). In his typical rhetoric he writes that "this great culture, and even to some extent wave of people, came in loads with its strongest waves". *Lindquist here lies very close to Kossinna, but does not mention him.* Contrary to Åberg, Lindquist accepts Kossinna's idea of a "Finn" connection, interpreting it as Finland. Further, Lindquist's vision lies very close to that of Hans Reinerth, who was very close to Kossinna, and became his most ardent follower. Reinerth follows Kossinna closely in the chapter on "Urgermanen" in the multi-volume publication *Prehistory of Germanic Tribes (Vorgeschichte der Deutschen Stämme*⁸), published in 1940 by the Association for German Prehistory and the NSDAP Section for Prehistory (cf. e.g., the map on p. 3, which can be compared to Kossinna 1928:226). The

gång, att verka, långsamt och säkert, såsom tiden plägar göra, till hans egen förmån, hans idéers framgång och hans ryktes glans.

⁷ In 1957, Arwidsson was professor in Stockholm, Arbman in Lund, and Stenberger in Uppsala. All were ex-students or close colleagues to Lindquist.

1940 publication opens with a celebration to Kossinna. It is interesting to note that Åberg was extremely reluctant to accept the “Finn” argument, while Reinerth, and in his own way even Lindquist, embraced it. Lindquist, in a sense, embraced the “spirit” of Kossinna’s argument, but neither Åberg nor Lindquist reproduces Kossinna’s argument directly. In 1944, Lindquist suggested the Boat Axe invaders arrived in chariots, which contemporary caricaturists of a daily newspaper made fun of (*Dagens Nyheter* 11/7 1945).

In general terms, Lindquist speaks of the importance of war and battle in prehistory, and is also interested in race and blood. He sees much of continuity in the Nordic countries, and believes direct continuity from the Neolithic exists in Sweden in the 1940s (1944). There is a strong touch of 1930s Swedish ethnology over Lindquist’s popular books. He believed different cultures co-existed, even over long time periods, and that some of them arrived as invaders.⁹

Lindquist and Kossinna

There is an evident influence from Kossinna and Kossinnism in Lindquist’s writings. The methodology proposed by Lindquist has a marked and heavy Kossinnism and has, at times, even an anti-Montelian stance. Lindquist is much interested in the spatial dimension, culture circles and peoples. In several articles (cf. 1913, 1919), he explicitly refers to limitations and inadequacies in the Montelian typological chronology. The spatial dimension must first be analysed and the cultural borders established before the typological method can even be considered. It is also typical that he spoke of a “Vendel culture” in the Iron Age, while most archaeologists spoke of a Vendel period (1926). It could be argued that the core of Lindquist archaeology is a certain Kossinnism, even if it is blended with particular elements of what we could call Swedish traditions (mainly traditions from the province of Uppland). Like Åberg, Lindquist stresses continental traditions. However, in some sense, the idea of homeland or heimat is stronger in Lindquist.

Lindquist seems, on the other hand, to have had a much less direct and personal relation to Kossinna than did Åberg. In general terms, Lindquist had a much less elaborated European network than Åberg. From 1935 however, Lindquist was engaged on several occasions to participate in different events in Germany. It seems that his most important contact in Germany was Hans Reinerth (an ardent pro-Kossinnist). As we have seen, Lindquist lies very close to Reinerth (albeit not reproducing either Kossinna or Reinerth directly) in the discussion on the origin of the “Boat Axes”. Several Swedish archaeologists were reluctant to see a “Finn” influence on Sweden in prehistory, notably Almgren, Ekholm and Åberg (and this probably had to do with the fact that Finland had been a Swedish possession

⁸ Note the difficulty in translating the words German and Deutsch from German.

⁹ Åberg nor Lindquist mainly worked on the Iron Age. Only occasionally they touched Stone Age problems. Cf. Petterson 2005 for wider references on the Stone Age debate in Scandinavia.

up to the end of the Napoleonic wars). Lindquist thus adopts an unorthodox view in relation to the Swedish scene on this point, but what must be termed an official position in relation to German archaeology at the time.

Lindquist's contacts with Reinerth did not cease with the end of the Second World War. Lindquist even tried to interfere and organise a campaign to get Reinerth out of an internment camp of the allies (letter to Arbman 26/9 1947, LUHM archive). Reinerth was released in 1948, but we do not know whether Lindquist's intervention played a role or not. It must be mentioned that by 1948 the networks of Reinerth in Germany were virtually dead.

Lindquist gave popular talks in Germany in 1940 and 1941 (cf. e.g., Hülle 1940). Some of these talks were summarised in *Völkischer Beobachter*, the main Nazi newspaper. In particular, he spoke about the Vendel culture (30/1 1940, Schwedische Vikingkultur, 2/2 1940, Die funde von Valsgårde). His ideas of a German influence on the Vendel culture were certainly popular. The German newspaper states that Lindquist's talks were important for the war effort. In an interview in a Swedish newspaper Lindquist states that German science is pertinent and objective ("saklighet", a difficult word to translate, cf. Sydsvenska Dagbladet 13/2 1940). Further, he stresses that archaeology is heavily supported by the Nazi regime, and that archaeology itself is "flowering" under Hitler's regime.

Åberg, Lindquist and politics

Åberg and Lindquist were not friends. They often opposed each other. The battle for the chair of Professor in Uppsala, which Åberg lost, was an important issue. Åberg even published a critical note (1927) on the process of electing professor. Further, when Åberg sought to become professor at the University in Lund, Lindquist was chosen to evaluate the candidates. He did not fare well with Åberg, who published a second note of protest (1937b). Further, Åberg and Lindquist often publicly criticised each other in the archaeological debate (cf. Åberg 1922, Lindquist 1922).

Moving to politics: what, then, was the political position of these men, and how did they articulate it? We can start with Åberg. He does participate in various meetings in Germany at least up to 1937. During the Second World War he does not support the German war, especially after the occupation of Norway and Denmark. He even publishes (in 1941) some material in an anti-Nazi journal called "Nordic Freedom" (*Nordens Frihet*). In this article he addresses the right of small nations to independence. Åberg also, after the Second World War (1951:237), discussed Hitler as a "genius" in his "Creative Fantasy", but criticised the politics of Hitler.

Turning to Lindquist, he intensified his connections with Germany after the Nazi seize of power, the Machtübername. As mentioned above, he also made tours in 1940 and 1941 to give lectures. Lindquist also published in Reinerth's journal *Germanen-Erbe* (1940). As Evert Baudou (2002) has demonstrated,

Lindquist in his personal correspondence even defended the German occupation of Norway and Denmark. Of great importance is also the fact that Lindquist had a student, Eric Oxenstierna, who lived and worked in Germany during the Second World War. Oxenstierna started working with Reinerth (cf. Ströbel 1941), and later, for economic reasons, he switched over to the SS-Ahnenerbe, where he stayed on the payroll until March 1945. Oxenstierna worked on the “Urheimat” of the western Goths, and the fruits of his work in Germany was published twice (the same text), first in Germany in the beginning of 1945, and then in Sweden in 1948. It should be noted that Lindquist seems not to approve of Oxenstierna’s connection to the SS-Ahnenerbe. Whether this was a question of conscious political choice or merely a question of friendship to Reinerth, or both, remains an open question.

CONCLUSION: DISCOURSE, POLITICS, AND SWEDISH-GERMAN CONTACTS

The importance of science in the political sphere is evident in the construction of Nazi Germany. This counts not least for archaeology (cf. e.g., Hassmann 2002). The problem of the role of science in the political sphere must be addressed. The political articulation of scientific arguments and the role of collectives of scientists and individual scientists in the political process must be studied in detail. Georg Kossack (1999) simply tried to downplay the role of Nazi politics on archaeology, arguing that the few years this government was in charge allowed for no deeper impact on the discipline. This argument seems hard to sustain in light of recent research. Despite the short period, the enormous investments in archaeology and the heavy rhetoric had a tremendous impact. But there are other, more subtle ways of trying to downplay the importance of Nazism on archaeology. Heiko Steuer discussed the role political words and terms played on science in interesting ways (2001a:27-31). But, at the same time he argued (1997, 2001b) that while some German archaeologists were Nazis, this is not a problem for scientific debate, since a Nazi engagement only in a superficial way affected the archaeology of the professional scholar. Similar ideas often appear in the debate. But neither is this a satisfactory argument. For example, as in the case of Kossinna or Reinerth, discussed above, the immediate political implications in texts written *as archaeology* are evident. Further, the relation archaeology-politics is not merely a question of explicit party politics. It could even be argued that Kossinna’s methodology contained certain calls to social action.

Thus, there is no simple way of “escaping” the political content in archaeology. But it would likewise be a mistake to see all archaeology always as politics, and only that. It is rather a question of archaeology being something else, not politics, which gives it strength, a great potential, as political argument. Archaeology may turn out politics, but is not always political.

Let us formulate a tentative hypothesis. If we look at Swedish prehistoric archaeology in general for the period in question, Kossinnism evidently became

the major methodological and theoretical frame. It can be argued that Kossinna was so generally accepted, that it almost became a sort of methodological “paradigm”, of which the actors were not entirely conscious. Kossinna’s method became “the way archaeology is done”.

The methodology of Kossinna elaborated both on Humboldtianism, general ideas on the existence of peoples, and racism (Gobineau and others), which were elements of a much more general discourse, in Foucault’s sense. Kossinnism was part, thus, of this greater discourse, and this discourse was not limited to archaeology but was shared by ethnology, ethnography and other disciplines. But this discourse was also a significant element in politics, in several countries. It was used by politicians as much as archaeologists.

However, Kossinna created a particular mix, in which *blood and earth* played a special role, and which was elaborated through the *exclusion* of large geographical areas. One of the main elements, however, is that he expressed this in *Nordische Gedanke*, an idea which was, as it appears in Kossinna, much more from Germany (it was “Deutsch”) than from the Nordic countries. This idea as such was far from an invention by Kossinna; it was in a sense yet another popular discourse at this time. But he moulded it in a special form, and gave it a clear-cut archaeological format. It seems to have attracted several Nordic scholars, even though they had certain reservations about particular aspects of Kossinna’s prehistoric reconstruction. Thus, Kossinna created a particular archaeological discourse, which was linked to broader, more general discourses, or rather benefited from these broader discourses.

In the creation of this discourse on the *Nordische Gedanke*, various factors and various actors intervened. A more general social, economic and political process played a major role, but there was also important participation from philosophers, novelists, and scientists. But what concerns us in particular is that also archaeologists *participated actively, in making the particular discourse* discussed in this article, *both* in conscious and unconscious ways. Kossinna evidently had conscious ideas, clearly linked to politics, while several other actors had less clear ideas on the connections.

The Kossinnian discourse won, however, so wide acceptance that even some archaeologists working on partially anti-Kossinnistic proposals adopted the Kossinnian methodology. There are several such examples. It goes for the British archaeologist Gordon Childe and the Danish archaeologist Johannes Brøndsted, and it also applies to some Polish archaeology after the Second World War, which simply changed the “centre” from “German” to “Slav” (cf. Konrad Jazdzewski’s famous *Atlas to the Prehistory of the Slavs*, 1948).

However, also those more immediately following Kossinna made varied choices on methodological connections in archaeology and on general political questions, as we have seen in the case of Åberg and Lindquist. There is no simple scheme to apply here. While, in general terms, Kossinnism was linked to a Germanic revival, and even to an idea of a violent Germanic revival, the way this was understood

varied among scholars. Adherents of Kossinna could have, to a certain extent, varied ideas of the past and the present. One interesting point is the relation between Åberg and Lindquist. Both evidently worked in a Kossinnian frame, but they articulated it in different ways. They were, in a sense, enemies on the Swedish archaeological scene, and they made different political choices during the Second World War. Further, neither Lindquist nor Åberg were “pure” Kossinnists.

The particular world (and we borrow this term from Badiou 2006), the particular social constellation, in which a scholar was active, is of paramount importance. Thus, Kossinna had to be partially transformed to fit in Sweden, but at the same time he was generally accepted, much more so than in most countries of the world at this time. The success of Kossinnism in Swedish archaeology is all the more surprising considering that Swedish art history in this period was much more open to other currents, expressed in the German language, notably Max Weber and Karl Mannheim (cf. Paulsson 1943). Further, the discipline of history chose yet another road (cf. Gunneriusson 2002; Odén 1975; Torstendahl & Nybom 1988). Swedish archaeology could have, theoretically, ended up elsewhere. It was not, by 1912, necessary to choose Kossinna as the great future. Even in the German-speaking countries there were other currents. We end up asking ourselves: why Kossinna? Was it simply a fascination for the role archaeology eventually acquired in Germany? Or was it the idea of a unified people? Or was it the attraction of the *Nordische Gedanke* as European destiny? Or what? We leave this question open.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, Benedict, 1983, *Imagined communities*. London.
- Arvidsson, Stefan, 2000, *Ariska idoler*. Stockholm/Stehag.
- 2001, ‘I skuggan av kors och hakkors’. *Myter om det nordiska* (Raudvere, Andrén & Jennbert eds.), Lund. Pp. 91-110.
- Arwill-Nordbladh, Elisabeth, 1998. *Genuskonstruktioner i Nordisk vikingatid: förr och nu*. GOTARC B:9, Göteborg.
- Badiou, Alain, 2006. *Logiques des mondes: L'être et l'événement*, 2. Paris.
- Baudou, Evert, 1997, *Gunnar Hallström. Arkeolog i världskrigens epok*. Stockholm.
- 2002. ‘Åberg, Montelius och Kossinna’. *Fornvännen*. Vol. 97. Pp. 178-190.
- 2004, *Den Nordiska arkeologin*. Stockholm.
- Berkhoff, Karel, 2004, *Harvest of despair. Life and death in Ukraine under Nazi rule*. Cambridge (Mass.) & London.
- Cornell, Per, 1997. ‘Oskar Montelius och den svenska amerikanistiken’. *Till Gunborg. Arkeologiska samtal* (Åkerlund, Bergh, Nordbladh & Taffinder eds.), Stockholm Archaeological reports, 33. Stockholm. Pp. 549-553.
- Dahl, Göran, 2006, *Radikalare än Hitler*. Stockholm.
- De Vries, Willem, 2000. *Kunstraub in Westen 1940-1945. Alfred Rosenberg und der “Sonderstab Musik”*. Frankfurt am Main.
- Deutsch-Schwedische Blätter, Deutsch-Schwedischen Vereinigung*, 1921. no 1-2. Pp. 31-33.
- Diaz-Andreu, Margarita & Timothy Champion, eds, 1995, *Nationalism and archaeology in Europe*, London.
- Eriksen, Thomas Hylland, 1993. *Ethnicity and nationalism*. New York.

- Foucault, Michel, 1969. *L'archéologie du savoir*. Paris.
- Fischer, Eugen & Hans F. K. Günther, 1927. *Deutsche Köpfe nordischer Rasse*. München.
- Frobenius, Leo, 1936, *Das Urbild : Cicerone zur vorgeschichtlichen Reichsbildergalerie* Frankfurt am Main.
- Gessler, Bernhard, 2000. *Eugen Fischer (1874 - 1967): Leben und Werk des Freiburger Anatomen, Anthropologen und Rassenhygienikers bis 1927*. GOTARC B:18. Frankfurt am Main.
- Gillberg, Åsa, 2001, *En plats i historien. Nils Niklassons liv och arbete.*, Institutionen för arkeologi, Göteborg university.
- Ginzburg, Carlo, 1986. *Miti, emblemi, spie: morfologia e storia*. Torino.
- Grünert, Heinz, 2002. *Gustaf Kossinna (1858-1931): vom Germanisten zum Prähistoriker: ein Wissenschaftler im Kaiserreich und in der Weimarer Republik*. Rahden/Westf..
- Gräslund, Bo, 2006, 'Academic archaeology in Sweden up to 1930'. *Die Anfänge der ur- und frühgeschichtlichen Archäologie als akademisches Fach (1890-1930)* (Callmer, Meyer, Struwe, Theune eds.). Berliner Archäologische Forschungen, 2. Rahden (Westfalen). , Pp. 179-184.
- 1974, *Relativ Datering*. Tor, Uppsala.
- Gunneriusson, Håkan, 2002, *Det historiska fältet: svensk historievetenskap från 1920-tal till 1957*. Uppsala.
- Günther, Hans Friedrich Karl, 1922, *Rassenkunde des deutschen Volkes*. München.
- Hagerman, Maja, 2006. *Det rena landet: om konsten att uppfinna sina förfäder*. Stockholm.
- Hahne, Hans, 1936, *Volkheit und gegenstand von Forschung und Lehre und Mittel zur Erziehung zum heroischen Volkbewusstsein. Festrede (1934)*. Hallische Universitätsreden. Halle (Saale).
- 1937. *Deutsche Vorzeit. Rassen, Völker, und kulturen*. Bielefeld & Leipzig.
- Hassmann, Henning, 2002, 'Archaeology in the "Third Reich"'. *Archaeology, Ideology and Society* (Härke ed.), Frankfurt am Main., Pp. 67-142.
- Heuss, Anja, 1999. *Kunst- und Kulturgutraub: eine vergleichende Studie zur Besatzungspolitik der Nationalsozialisten in Frankreich und der Sowjetunion*. Heidelberg.
- Hjörungdal, Tove, 1997, 'Engendering antiquities'. *Vom Knochenmann zur Menschenfrau* (Karlisch, Kästner, Mertens eds.). Berlin. Pp. 36-48.
- Hülle, Werner, 1940. 'Arbeitsbericht des Reichsbundes für Deutsche Vorgeschichte', 1 Januar-15 Juni 1940, *Mannus*, vol 32, Leipzig. Pp. 351-357.
- Jazdzewski, Konrad, 1948, *Atlas to the prehistory of the Slavs*. Acta praehistorica Universitatis Lodziensis. Lodz.
- Kater, Michael, H, 1974. *Das "Ahnenerbe" der SS 1935-1945 : ein Beitrag zur Kulturpolitik des Dritten Reiches*. Stuttgart.
- Kossack, Georg, 1999, *Prähistorische Archäologie in Deutschland im Wandel der Geistigen und Politische situation*. Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Sitzung. München.
- Kossinna, Gustaf, 1909/1910. 'Der Ursprung der Urfinnen und der Urindogermanen und ihre Ausbreitung nach dem Osten', 1, *Mannus*, 1909 pp. 17-52, 225-245, 2, *Mannus*, 1910, pp. 59-108, Berlin.
- 1911. 'Anmerkungen zum heutigen stand der Vorgeschichtsforschung'. *Mannus*, vol. 3, pp. 127-130. Berlin.
- 1914 [1912]. *Die Deutsche Vorgeschichte, eine hervorragend nationaler Wissenschaft*. Second edition. Leipzig.
- 1928. *Ursprung und Verbreitung der Germanen in vor- und frühgeschichtlicher Zeit*. Leipzig.
- 1940. *Das Weichselland, ein uralter heimatboden der Germanen*. Leipzig.
- Krockow, Christian von, 1990. *Die Deutschen in ihrem Jahrhundert, 1890-1990*. Reinbek bei Hamburg.
- Lapouge, Georges Vacher de, 1899. *L'Aryen, son rôle social*. Paris.
- Lindquist, Sune, 1913. 'De svenska holklyxorna från Bronsåldern'. *Opuscula Arcaeologica Oscari Montelio Septuagenario*. Stockholm. Pp. 79-90.
- 1919. 'Den svenska folkvandringsstilens uppkomst'. *Rig*. Vol. 2. Pp. 65-80.
- 1922. 'Till vår folkvandringstids historia'. *Fornvännen*. Vol.17. Pp. 166-188.
- 1926. *Vendelkulturens ålder och ursprung*. KVHAA handlingar 36:1. Stockholm.
- 1935. *Svenskarna i heden tid*. Stockholm.
- 1940, 'Das Schwedische Bootgräberfeld von Valsgärde'. *Germanenerbe* (Reichsbundes für Deutsche Vorgeschichte), vol. 5: 3-4, Berlin. Pp. 34-43.

- Lindquist, Sune, 1941-1942. *Gotlands bildsteine, 1-2*. Stockholm.
 – 1944. *Svenskt forntidsliv*. Stockholm..
- Lubbock, John, 1872, *Prehistoric times, as illustrated by ancient remains, and the manners and customs of modern savages*. London.
- Lutzhöft, Hans-Jürgen, 1971, *Der Nordische Gedanke in Deutschland 1920-1940*. Stuttgart.
- Menghin, Oswald, 1931, *Weltgeschichte der Steinzeit*. Wien.
 – 1934. *Geist und Blut: grundsätzliches um Rasse, Sprache, Kultur und Volkstum*. Wien..
- Montelius, Oskar, 1884. 'Den förhistoriska fornforskarens metod och material'. *Antiquarisk Tidskrift för Sverige*. Vol. 8:3. Pp.1-28.
 – 1899a, 'Typologien eller utvecklingsläran tillämpad på det mänskliga arbetet'. *Svensk Fornminnesförenings Tidskrift*. Vol 10. Pp. 237-268.
 – 1899b, *Der Orient und Europa: Einfluss der Orientalischen Cultur auf Europa bis zur Mitte der letzten Jahrtausends v. Chr.*. Stockholm.
 – 1919. 'Die Vorfahren der Germanen'. *Mannus*, pp. 65-69. Leipzig & Würzburg.
- Moore, Barrington jr., 1973, *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*. Harmondsworth.
- Nordenborg Myhre, Lise, 2001, 'Arkeologi och nazism – en ockupation av ämnet'. *Myter om det nordiska* (Raudvere, Andrén & Jennbert eds.), Lund. Pp. 59-90.
- Odén, Birgitta, 1975, *Lauritz Weibull och forskarsamhället*. Lund.
- Oxenstierna, Eric, 1945, *Die Urheimat der Goten*. Mannus Bucherei. Vol. 73. Leipzig.
 – 1948. *Die Urheimat der Goten*. Stockholm.
- Paulsson, Gregor, 1943. *Konsthistoriens föremål*. Uppsala.
- Pettersson, Håkan, 2005. *Nationalstaten och arkeologin: 100 år av neolitisk forskningshistoria och dess relationer till samhällspolitiska förändringar*. Göteborg, Institutionen för arkeologi Göteborgs universitet.
- Plessner, Helmut, 1982. *Gesammelte Schriften, vol. 6*. Frankfurt am Main.
- Pringle, Heather, 2006, *The Master Plan*. New York.
- Raakow, Peter J., 1986, 'Friedrich Lisch (1801-1883) – Geheimer Archivrat und bürgerliche Forscherpersönlichkeit'. *Rostocker Wissenschaftshistorische Manuskripte*. Vol. 13. Pp. 17-23.
- Reinerth, Hans, 1940. 'Die Urgermanen'. *Vorgeschichte der Deutschen Stämme, 1* (Reinerth ed.). Reichsbund für Deutsche Vorgeschichte & Reichsamt für Vorgeschichte der NSDAP, Leipzig & Berlin, Pp 1-64.
- Ripley, William Zebina, 1900. *The Races of Europe: a sociological study*. London.
- Schultz, Walter, 1937, *Führer und Volk in Germanischer vorzeit. Rede*. Hallische universitätsreden, Marthin Luther univeristät, Halle-Wittenberg, 72. Halle (Saale).
- Smith, Woodruff D., 1991, *Politics and the Sciences of Culture*. New York/Oxford. Pp. 193-240.
- Steuer, Heiko, 1997, 'Gedenkrede für Herbert Jahnkuhn am 21. November 1991 in Göttingen'. *Haus und Hof in ur- und frühgeschichtlicher Zeit. Bericht über zwei Kolloquien der Kommission für die Altertumskunde Mittel- und Nordeuropas vom 24. bis 26. Mai 1990 und 20. bis 22. November 1991 (34. und 35. Arbeitstagung)* (Beck & Jankuhn eds.). Pp. 539-568.
 – 2001a, 'Deutsche Prähistoriker zwischen 1900 und 1995 – Begründung und Zielsetzung des Arbeitsgesprächs'. *Eine hervorragend nationale Wissenschaft: deutsche Prähistoriker zwischen 1900 und 1995: ein Symposium vom 2.-3. Juli 1999 im Rahmen des Sonderforschungsbereiches 541 Identitäten und Alteritäten: die Funktion von Alterität für die Konstitution und Konstruktion von Identität an der Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg im Breisgau, Teilprojekt C4: ethnische Einheiten im frühgeschichtlichen Europa, archäologische Forschung und ihre politische Instrumentalisierung* (Steuer & Hakelberg eds). Berlin. Pp. 1-54.
 – 2001b, 'Herbert Jankuhn und seine Darstellungen zur Germanen- und Wikingerzeit'. *Eine hervorragend nationale Wissenschaft: deutsche Prähistoriker zwischen 1900 und 1995: ein Symposium vom 2.-3. Juli 1999 im Rahmen des Sonderforschungsbereiches 541 Identitäten und Alteritäten: die Funktion von Alterität für die Konstitution und Konstruktion von Identität an der Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg im Breisgau, Teilprojekt C4: ethnische Einheiten im frühgeschichtlichen Europa, archäologische Forschung und ihre politische Instrumentalisierung* (Steuer & Hakelberg eds). Berlin. Pp. 417-473.
- Strzygowski, Josef, 1937, *Morgenrot und Heidnischwerk in der Christlichen kunst*. Deutsches Ahnenerbes. Berlin-Lichterfelde.

- Strzygowksi, Josef, 1940, *Die Deutsche Nordseele. Das bekenntnis eines Kunstforschers*. Wien & Leipzig.
- Ströbel, Reinhard, 1941. 'Arbeitsbericht des Reichsbundes für Deutsche Vorgeschichte', 1 Juli-31 december 1941, *Mannus*, vol 33, Leipzig. Pp. 549-560.
- Taylor, Telford, 1993. *The anatomy of the Nuremberg trials: a personal memoir*. London.
- Torstendahl, Rolf & Thorsten Nybom, 1988, *Historievetenskap som teori, praktik, ideologi*. Stockholm.
- Trägårdh, Lars Christian, 1996, *The concept of people and the constitution of popular political culture in Germany and Sweden 1848-1933*. University Microfilms International Ann Arbor (Mich.).
- Veit, Ulrich, 2002, 'Gustaf Kossinna and his concept of national archaeology'. *Archaeology, Ideology and Society* (Härke ed.), Frankfurt am Main. Pp. 41-66.
- Wijworra, Ingo, 2006, *Der Germanenmythos. Kontruktion einer Weltanschauung in der Altertumsforschung der 19 Jahrhundert*. Darmstadt.
- Windelband, Wilhelm, 1894, *Geschichte und Naturwissenschaft. Rede*. Rectorsreden der Universität Strassburg. Strassburg.
- Wirth, 1928, *Der Aufgang der Menschheit. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Religion, Symbolik und Schrift der atlantisch-nordischen Rasse*. Jena.
- Wüst, Walter, 1942, *Indogermanisches Bekentniss*. Ahnenerbe Stiftung. Berlin/Dahlem.
- Åberg, Nils, 1912. *Studier öfver den yngre stenåldern i Norden och Västeuropa*. Uppsala.
- 1918. *Das Nordische Kulturgebiet in Mitteleurope während der jüngeren steinzeit*. Vilhelm Ekmans universitetsfond 22:1-2. Uppsala.
- 1919. *Ostpreussen in der Völkerwanderungszeit*. Uppsala.
- 1921. 'Striden mellan Rom och Germanien'. *Historisk Tidskrift*. Stockholm. Pp. 257-272.
- 1922. 'Stil II', *Fornvännen*. Vol. 17. Pp. 1-26.
- 1927. *Till Filosofiska fakulteteten Humanistiska sektion*, Uppsala. Uppsala.
- 1932. 'Gustaf Kossinna', *Fornvännen*. Vol. 27. Pp. 52-54.
- 1936a. *Vorgeschichtliche Kulturkreise in Europa*. Stockholm.
- 1936b. 'Ein gruss aus Schweden. Wissenschaftliche autorität.' *Jahresschrift für die Vorgeschichte der Sächsisch-thüringschen Länder, XXIV: Unserer Vorzeit. Zum gedenken Hans Hahne*. Halle. Pp. 22-24.
- 1937a. *Kulturmötsättningar i Danmarks stenålder*. KVHAA 42:4, Stockholm.
- 1937b. *Till Filosofiska fakulteten i Lund, Humanistisk sektion*. Stockholm.
- 1949. *Nordisk befolkningshistoria under stenåldern*. KVHAA handlingar 70:1, Stockholm.
- 1951. *Skapande fantasi. En studie över intuitionens natur*. Stockholm.
- 1953. *Den historiska relationen mellan folkvandringstid och vendeltid*. KVHAA handlingar, 82. Stockholm.

CONSULTED ARCHIVES AND NEWSPAPERS

- Lunds Universitets Historiska Museum (Lund University Historical Museum, LU), E2:11946-1950,
Professor Holger Arbmans korrespondens.
- Sydsvenska Dagbladet, Sweden, 1940
- Dagens Nyheter, Sweden, 1945
- Völkischer Beobachter, Germany, 1940

