Geographies of networks and knowledge production: the case of Oscar Montelius and Italy

Anna Gustavsson

In this chapter, I aim to highlight the potential of thinking geographically when studying networks and the production of archaeological knowledge, by considering the contacts in Italy of the Swedish archaeologist Oscar Montelius (1843–1921, see Figure 6.2) and his work on Italian prehistory.¹

Oscar Montelius was a pioneer of prehistoric archaeology from the late nineteenth century onwards. He is mainly known for his work on typology and chronology. His *Om tidsbestämning inom Bronsåldern med särskildt afseende på Skandinavien* (1885), is still frequently cited.² Montelius held positions at the National Museum of Stockholm, eventually became the director of the Swedish National Heritage board and was involved in numerous excavations in Sweden. He also travelled all over Europe, more than most scholars at the time, to compile and study archaeological finds, and is still one of few who have managed to study and publish on such a vast number of archaeological artefacts. His wife Agda Montelius (1850–1920) was deeply involved in her husband's work, and accompanied him on several research trips. Montelius became affiliated with the National Museum as a young scholar in the mid-1860s and was awarded a doctorate in history, since archaeology was not yet an established academic discipline. His dissertation, entitled 'Remains from the Iron Age of Scandinavia' (published as Montelius, 1869), was an overview of current research on how Iron Age culture spread from Egypt, via Greece, Rome and Hallstatt to Scandinavia. From an early stage, an important characteristic of his research method was to gather as complete a collection of examples for each object type as possible

6.1 Oscar Montelius' study and desk in his home in Stockholm. (Date unknown). Ref: Riksantikvarieämbetet arkiv, ATA, Montelius-Reuterskiölds samling, FIV a1 Fotografier. Copyright © Riksantikvarieämbetet. All rights reserved and permission to use the figure must be obtained from the copyright holder.

(Baudou, 2012a: 181). When Montelius studied the prehistory of Europe archaeological sites and finds in Italy were of fundamental importance for understanding and constructing chronologies for the Bronze and Iron Ages. He was the first scholar to produce a synthesis of the Italian Bronze and Iron Ages, *La Civilisation Primitive en Italie depuis l'introduction de métaux*,³ which was published in five volumes (1895–1910) covering northern and central Italy.

The past twenty years or so have seen a development of geographical thinking among historians of science, which is signified by the acknowledgement that spatiality – spaces and places of different kinds – influence the production of knowledge in a variety of ways. Such ideas were a reaction to earlier notions that (good) science is placeless (Livingstone, 2003: 1–5; Naylor, 2005: 2). To me, adapting geographical perspectives when writing histories of archaeology offers the possibility to add new perspectives and methods to a field (archaeology and its history) where these ideas are relatively new. As pointed out by Withers and Livingstone (2011: 1), a great number of aspects and themes of science can be analysed by thinking of knowledge production in geographic terms,⁴ and they claim furthermore that:

... the geographies of nineteenth-century science present a particularly fertile intellectual terrain for inquiries of this sort: science was being given disciplinary shape in this period as perhaps not before; science became in this period a public good with a variety of audiences and staging places; science's disciplinary emergence was evident in certain discursive procedures and methods that helped define 'the field' in question; particular forms of dissemination, be they lectures, specialist journals, or instrumental procedures, helped give science a public and professional credibility not readily enjoyed in earlier periods (Withers and Livingstone, 2011: 4–5).

In my opinion, this is applicable to the development of the archaeological discipline and therefore for the study of the production of archaeological knowledge. Archaeological knowledge is created in a variety of places. The location of research activities affects both how science is conducted, and the result of the science; science is not independent of local settings (see Livingstone, 2003: 1–3 for a discussion of situated knowledge production). Naylor states that while science is always carried out in 'circumscribed localities', it also is always situated in a general context. With this in mind, I would like to stress that the history of archaeology and the production of knowledge can, and needs to, be studied in the light of regionalism, nationalism, trans-nationalism and internationalism. I agree with Livingstone (2003: xi) that scientific findings 'are both local and global; they are both particular and universal; they are both provincial and transcendental'. This makes it particularly interesting and useful to study a scholar's work done outside their own country. Oscar Montelius was a Swedish scholar partly financed by the Swedish state, who spent many years studying finds and sites in and from different Italian regions, meeting a variety of scholars, collectors and professionals involved in heritage and culture politics. He obviously needed to learn how to navigate local and regional Italian customs, while being in the midst of geographical and political changes, regional struggles and competitions for influence following the recent unification of Italy in 1861. (Rome did not become the capital until 1870–71.)

Here I will provide examples of Oscar Montelius' contacts within the Italy-based scholastic community, focusing on the geographical areas Bologna/Emilia-Romagna and Rome, during the last decades of the nineteenth century. Despite the importance of Italy for Montelius' work, little detailed examination has been made of his specific whereabouts and personal connections within this context. It soon becomes clear that an enterprise such as *La Civilisation Primitive* cannot be analysed as a one-person job. To scrutinise the work process and production of archaeological knowledge that took place in a variety of geographical spaces and places also means studying and understanding the scholarly

networks of the time. I believe that a fruitful methodological approach includes thinking in terms of co-production, collaboration and contribution, but also controversy. Another important aspect in my opinion would be to consult and combine a large variety of sources. By doing these things, I believe it is possible to gain a wider understanding of how archaeological knowledge is created, and to learn more about the premises and factors that affected individual scholars' work at the end of the nineteenth century. Here, I analyse the creation of knowledge by studying the travels of the Montelius couple and the work related to Oscar Montelius' massive work on Italy, *La Civilisation Primitive*, which I treat as a great project as well as a publication. Focusing on an analysis of the project is a way to relate the different source material, and to help identify the dynamics of these networks and their impact on Montelius' research.

Previous research on Oscar Montelius and his work

Previous research on Oscar Montelius' work has often focused on important but quite specific aspects such as typology and the accuracy and legacy of, in particular, his Bronze Age chronology (see, for example, Gräslund, 1974). However, little focus has been put on investigating the conditions under which artefacts were studied, and how the international scholarly community developed in detail. In addition, many Swedish publications and articles on the history of archaeology are not published in English. There are few monographs about Oscar Montelius. The archaeologist Hanna Rydh published a biography, the first, in 1937. Evert Baudou published a second, extensive biography of Montelius (2012a), in which the relationship between his work, origins and his personality are discussed. Baudou is the leading Montelius scholar to date. He has discussed and developed ideas and a methodological approach to biographical studies of individual scholars that is based on the theories of Ludwik Fleck.⁵ These have been thoroughly discussed elsewhere in this volume, and will not be further explained here. Important features in Baudou's work are the relationships between a scholar's life and research, as well as relationships and interactions between an individual and the collective. He presented his method (2012b) in comparing the parallel work and scholarly progress of Montelius and Hildebrand, two colleagues and friends. In the case of Montelius, the discussion includes his role in scholarly groups, or thought-collectives (Baudou, 2012b: 194). Baudou's research forms a solid base for further studies as he has carefully mapped the life, work and personality of Montelius. He underlines Montelius' friendly, outgoing personality and exceptional social skills, but also characterises him as being a very independent

individualist, with strong self-esteem (Baudou, 2012a: 378–9). This image of Montelius seems accurate in many aspects. The most recent publication on Montelius is Patrik Nordström's (2014) book, *Arkeologin och livet*. Nordström's work is a portrait of Agda and Oscar Montelius and contains a collection of 902 letters, transcribed from the 2,500 letters sent between them during the period 1870–1907 that have been preserved. In a short introduction, Nordström outlines the basic facts about the couple and the archive material. These studies of Montelius have been based mainly on Swedish archive material.

The sources: digging deeper in the archives

The rich Montelius archive is located at the Riksantikvarieämbetet, Antikvarisk-topografiska arkivet (ATA) in Stockholm. There are actually two collections: the Oscar Montelius archive and the Montelius–Reuterskiöld collection, the latter of which also includes the archive of Agda Montelius. Drawing on diverse types of material, but also from different archives, offers the possibility of finding cross-references and discrepancies in the material, which add new dimensions to the research. The archive material used for this chapter includes the diaries of Agda Montelius and private correspondence as well as ‘work material’ from the Oscar Montelius files.

I would like to underline the importance of placing the work of Montelius and other scholars in a wider geographical, historical and political context. To add further depth to an analysis of both individual and general perspectives on a scholars' work, I suggest always consulting and combining a variety of sources and archives. Studying a famous person who has already been a subject of research can be complex, though. The archaeologist Oscar Moro Abadía (2013) provides a good example of how multiple sources can be used, and how a national narrative can be challenged by changing focus, in his article ‘Thinking about the concept of archive: reflections on the historiography of Altamira’. He questions the traditional story of the discovery of the Altamira cave paintings, and the view of the scholar Juan de Vilanova as being a radical pioneer, and presents an alternative interpretation of the history of the discovery and Vilanova's role. Moro Abadía succeeds in doing this by compiling and comparing archival sources in an innovative way. I believe, as Moro Abadía argues, that it is important to broaden the analysis to be able to present alternative and new narratives of well-known persons like Montelius, and in the process recognise more unnoticed factors, actors and the conditions of their time in which research was carried out. Moro Abadía does not use geographical thinking explicitly in his short article, but it would be possible, and could be fruitful, to

discuss for example intellectual and political geographies that influenced national narratives about Altamira and Vilanova.

La Civilisation Primitive

Outside Italy I have only one debt, but it is a very deep one. It is to the late Prof. Oscar Montelius, whose literary executors – The Swedish Academy – have generously allowed me to reproduce a number of drawings, some of them original, from the three-volume atlas of plates entitled, *La Civilisation Primitive en Italie*. This exhaustive work should be the incessant companion of all who are studying the Italian prehistoric cultures. (Randall-MacIver, 1924: vi)

This quotation comes from the preface to David Randall-MacIver's work, *Villanovans and Early Etruscans*. Published in 1924, it was one of the first attempts to make a synthesis of the Iron Age in Italy, building directly on the work of Oscar Montelius. Since then, Montelius' publication on Italy has frequently been (and still is) cited internationally, while seeming to have sunk into obscurity among Scandinavian archaeologists. As mentioned, Montelius was the first to publish an extensive work on prehistoric Italy. He never completed the volumes on South Italy, Sicily and Sardinia, which were supposed to end *La Civilisation primitive*. Nevertheless, the publication consists of five large volumes on the north and central Italian peninsula.

During the nineteenth century, the means for travelling and communication changed drastically, at least for those who could afford them, owing to technical and infrastructural advances in Europe. Oscar Montelius went all over Europe to study collections and artefacts. He often travelled together with his wife Agda, who became very engaged in his work. He was involved in debates on Mediterranean research from an early stage. Adopting a comparative research method, Montelius tried to see as many collections and finds as he could, and to date, his work actually remains the most extensive study of the Italian material. In the archive in Stockholm there are a vast number of notes, sketches and working materials prepared by the couple. Agda Montelius made most of them, and she kept a fairly detailed travel journal during their trips.

Why did Montelius carry out such a large study? Previous research suggests that early in his work on establishing a final typological chronology for the Bronze and Iron Ages of northern and Central Europe, he found it necessary to turn to the Mediterranean area. The combination of finds, literary sources and references to Egyptian material could help with dating artefacts (Gierow, 1995: 67). Previous research implies/

suggests that his master plan was quite clear from the beginning, but this was probably not the case. Greece would have been a good starting place for Montelius' work for many reasons, but Italy is closer to Scandinavia than Greece, and it was more likely that direct links to Scandinavia would be found there. The most important reason for choosing Italy was above all the archaeological activity and new research that had begun at the time (Gierow, 1995: 68; Guidi, 2008: 113; Sassatelli, 2015: 9). For a long time it was also easier, for logistical and political reasons, to travel to and within Italy than to Greece.

The beginning of his travelling and his networks (1870s and 1880s)

Scientific activities are dependent on, but also generate, places and spaces for research activities (see for example Naylor, 2005: 3). These include both physical/material and intellectual/abstract spaces. Probably the most important spaces or venues for the international development of the archaeological discipline and the formation of networks in the 1870s and 1880s (apart from museums) were academic congresses. In 1865, the subtheme *paletnologia* (prehistory) was introduced at an Anthropological and Geological Congress in La Spezia. It was there decided that an 'International congress on Anthropology and Prehistoric Archaeology' (CIAAP) should take place regularly. At this time, both cultural exchange between countries and scholarly interaction seems to have been quite limited among Scandinavian scholars, at least when it came to learning of regional and local discoveries, collections and finds in Europe (Baudou, 2012b: 184–5). The CIAAP congresses, and other international meetings, were about to change all that. An important question at the time was whether the past should be organised according to a three-age system, and how different ages/periods should be placed and related. In 1869, the congress convened in Copenhagen, where the young Oscar Montelius made his big entrance onto the international scene. This was probably where he first met or heard of several of the scholars who would be a part of his professional network throughout his career. Among the Italians were Luigi Pigorini (1842–1925), at the time the director of the museum in Parma, Giovanni Capellini (1833–1922), Professor at the University of Bologna and Count Giovanni Gozzadini (1810–87) who was involved in the first discoveries at and excavations of the Villanova 'culture' near Bologna. It was at the next Congress, in Bologna in 1871, that the Bronze and Iron Ages gained serious attention for the first time.⁶ The congress was scheduled to take place in 1870 but had to be postponed because of the Franco-Prussian War (Sommer, 2009: 18–19). International conflicts have constantly changed

the political map, something that heavily affected scientific activities and interactions during the period of my study. As Livingstone puts it, 'imagined geographies have real consequences' (Livingstone, 2003: 8). In the meantime, Agda and Oscar Montelius had married, and the trip to the Bologna congress (see Figure 6.2) was part of their honeymoon (Bokholm, 2000: 49).

The archaeological congresses reflected international politics and national aspirations in the mid- and late-nineteenth century, but of course also individual research interests. The fast development of pre-historic archaeology, especially in the North Italian regions, might be looked upon as a reaction against the earlier focus on Roman and Classical periods and part of the struggle for independence as well as for the unification of Italy. In this melting pot of archaeological discoveries, political ideas and the formation of nation-states, the first broad generation of modern professional archaeologists met and formed networks. Evert Baudou (2012b: 194) has identified and suggested at least four thought-collectives of different character in which Montelius took part. Two of them were international; one is defined as South Scandinavian, the fourth as a group of Bronze Age scholars (non-specified), born in the 1840s. Fleck's (1979: 38–51) theory of thought-collectives can be perceived as distinct and accessible, and provides a base for further studies of the international networks which sprung from the 1869 congress in Copenhagen.

The congress publications shed light on what scientific questions were considered important and which scholars and dignitaries were present. Private letters between the scholars can tell us about what happened between congresses and how trans-national networks took form. The Italians were not surprisingly in the majority at the Bologna congress and it is not possible to know how many of them Montelius actually talked to. However, it is possible to compare the list of letter senders in the Montelius archive with the listed delegates to study how it corresponds. The North Italian archaeologist Edoardo Brizio (1846–1907) was not listed as a delegate at the Bologna congress, but he was engaged in preparing an archaeological exhibition for the conference. Montelius took great interest in the display, which presented material from every Italian region. Despite not being recorded, Brizio is present in a group photo of the delegates and it is very plausible that Montelius met him and talked to him at the congress. Brizio had a strong interest in both the Classical and prehistoric periods as well as the origins of different people; he had an impact on the future work of Montelius and some of his Scandinavian colleagues. The congress was of great importance for Montelius, and the congress events were the start of more extensive debates concerning the Iron Age. With the discoveries near Bologna

6.2 Oscar Montelius, portrait from the Bologna Congress 1871. Ref: Riksantikvarieämbetet arkiv, ATA, Montelius-Reuterskiölds samling, FIV a1 Fotografier. Copyright © Riksantikvarieämbetet. All rights reserved and permission to use the figure must be obtained from the copyright holder.

came the possibility for Montelius and others to study the material in context, connecting typology with stratigraphy. Montelius would later return to Bologna on several occasions and was included in another type of geographical space, an international scientific and intellectual circle, arranged by the Countess Maria Teresa Gozzadini, the wife of Count Giovanni Gozzadini (Vitali, 1984: 224; Guidi, 2008: 110).

The earliest preserved letter between Brizio and Montelius is from 1882. Brizio had been working in Pompeii, Rome and other places, but from the 1880s he was mainly active in Bologna and the surrounding region. He held different positions within archaeological and museum administration, as well as at the university, and was therefore an important person to know for a foreign scholar like Montelius. In addition to Brizio and Pigorini, the scholars Giuseppe Bellucci (1844–1921) in Perugia and Pompeo Castelfranco (1843–1921) in Milan are among those who stand out at this stage as having been extremely helpful. Even though Bellucci was based in Perugia, he was apparently of assistance when the Montelius couple visited Bologna and other cities north of Rome. Montelius maintained contact with many Italian scholars over long periods. In some cases, the correspondence was relatively frequent, as with Pigorini. Over 60 letters between 1874 and 1919 are present in the archive, which proves regular contact in between meetings in person. In other cases, as with Bellucci, the letters are fewer (about a dozen between 1876 and 1902) although the meeting in person would have been very important to Montelius. Bellucci was listed as a delegate at the Bologna congress, while Castelfranco was not. Further investigation is needed into when and how Montelius met and interacted with each of these important Italian scholars.

Unfortunately, there are no diary notes by Agda Montelius from the Bologna congress. Her first accounts of their journeys to Italy are from 1876. Oscar Montelius had been awarded the generous Letterstedska travel grant, which allowed them both to travel for almost eighteen months in total, during 1876 and 1878–9. Judging from Agda's diary, the couple were extremely busy and productive. In addition to sight-seeing and getting to know Rome, Bologna and other cities, they made new connections and visited well-known people and scholars. They also began their studies and documentation of archaeological finds in museums and private collections. In the early days of December 1876 Agda made several notes about meetings in Rome with people like Augusto Castellani (1829–1914), Wolfgang Helbig (1839–1915) and Luigi Pigorini. Pigorini had transferred to Rome and from the mid-1870s was both the director of the national prehistoric museum and the professor of prehistoric archaeology at the Università di Roma (today known as La Sapienza). In mentioning Helbig, it might be important to

point out that the early scholars travelled to Rome long before most of the foreign institutes and academies had been founded. The first was the German archaeological institute (Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, DAI), established in 1888. DAI was a continuation of the Istituto di corrispondenza archeologica, a 'German' (Prussian) initiative from 1829. The institute was therefore an obvious platform for foreign scholars. Helbig held an important position at the institute from 1865 and kept it for two decades. With help from the staff at the institute, the scholars were introduced to the Roman scholarly community.⁷

After a few days in Rome in December 1876, the couple went to Naples where Agda worked on drawings of finds in the National Museum while Oscar searched for and bought *fibulae* and other small objects from the local art dealers.⁸ It should come as no surprise that he, like many others, was buying artefacts, but it is worth noting, especially as he complained about collections and objects lacking context, for example at the museum in Tarquinia. From the diary notes, it is clear that the couple travelled back and forth in Italy to study finds and collections.

Judging by the registered correspondence in the Montelius archive at ATA as well as his publications, it was from the early to mid-1880s that his work on Italy's prehistory became more organised. The Montelius couple made several trips to Italy during the 1880s. In 1881 Oscar and Agda returned to continue the collection of data. Agda's diary tells that on 13 June 1881 Oscar Montelius met Pigorini at the Rome prehistoric museum for many hours and studied the museum collection, which was followed by a visit to Wolfgang Helbig. Judging from the diary, Helbig was helpful and gave advice concerning a visit to Orvieto that the couple had planned for the next day. Helbig was not always so accommodating, as we shall see. In the Italian context, political power struggles and possible tensions between regionalism and nationalism, Rome and other cities, seem to have had important impacts on the means to carry out research and produce knowledge. What did it mean to be a foreign researcher in this setting? Montelius was in many aspects a complete outsider, being Swedish and not living permanently in Italy. Being local but also German, like Helbig, could certainly generate tensions as well. When is a person an insider or an outsider in a scholarly community? (See for example Livingstone, 2003: 19–20 on aspects of inclusion and exclusion.)

If one wishes to build on the concepts of thought-collectives discussed by Fleck (1979: 38–51) and the research of Baudou (2012a and b) to understand and exemplify more of the international context of the research Montelius conducted, one way could be to look for other thought-collectives within the local Italian context. However, I

6.3 Examples of original illustrations and sketches sent to Oscar Montelius by his Italian colleagues. Ref: Riksantikvarieämbetet arkiv, ATA, Oscar Montelius arkiv, F1b Arbetsmaterial F1b vol 148. Copyright © Riksantikvarieämbetet. All rights reserved and permission to use the figure must be obtained from the copyright holder.

find it necessary to incorporate the study of networks or clusters in a wider and more inclusive framework. Here, thinking geographically about science and knowledge production provides useful tools. After mapping a number of places (such as sites or museums) and people (their location and professional/social position) found in the travel notes and letters, it is possible to start suggesting different networks or clusters in which Montelius took part, which have to be considered. The networks might overlap each other, or be revised later on, depending on the connections between the actors. To further explore and understand the work process, mechanisms and knowledge produced in the work of Oscar Montelius on Italy, I suggest thinking in terms of different degrees of contribution, collaboration and co-production, but also controversy. For some Italian colleagues, and a few Scandinavian scholars/archaeologists, who sent written information or sketches from different locations in Italy (see for example Figure 6.3), it is quite difficult to ‘assess’ the individual and exact impact/significance of their contribution to *La Civilisation Primitive* (and other work by Montelius). Co-production might therefore be too strong a term in

most cases. We can definitely state, however, that collaboration is a valid description for several cases where Montelius received written information and illustrations of finds and sites from colleagues on an informal and friendly basis, without being charged. In other cases, he had to formally order and pay for sketches and other items. Ongoing analysis of the archive material indicates that the former, more informal ways of cooperation were more common in northern Italy, than Rome. For the 1870s and 1880s, I suggest the following groups (in addition to the special example of his wife Agda) to be considered in relation to the work of Montelius: scholars based in northern Italy, scholars based in Rome, and art dealers and collectors.

In the case of Agda Montelius there is no doubt the term co-production is the most appropriate. She was involved in the travel planning, took the more detailed notes of the two, compiled informative notes and made sketches of finds and also of their day-to-day experiences (see Figure 6.4). When she did not accompany her husband on his journeys, she very often acted as his stand-in at the museum in Stockholm, performing a variety of tasks and enabling him to take time-off (Bokholm, 2000: 51–2). One particular example of co-production is an article about Sardinia. It was published under Oscar's name in the journal *Ymer* (Montelius, 1883: 31–5). However, when consulting the diary of Agda from their trip to the island; one discovers that parts of the article are a re-writing of her diary (from 1879).

Consolidation and competition (1890s to early-1900s)

During the 1890s, the Italian state formulated stricter judicial regulations for heritage management and excavations, especially in relation to foreign scholars. Montelius made another study trip to Italy in 1895, the year that the first volume of *La Civilisation primitive* was published. He returned in 1898. Even if there were few new finds to see, Montelius was still missing certain drawings and considered it necessary to revisit collections to make additional comparative studies before concluding his work. Competition and rivalry had existed all along, but seems to have increased during this period. When tracing the visits of Montelius it becomes obvious that political and scholarly rivalry had hardened. Even though Montelius had gained an increased scholarly status internationally, it became more difficult for him to get access to certain collections in Rome. Conflict, which would also affect a foreign scholar like Montelius, stemmed from enmity between the first director of the Museo Nazionale Romano,⁹ Felice Barnabei (1842–1922) and Wolfgang Helbig. In short, the conflict between Barnabei and Helbig

6.4 A Sardinian man in Cagliari. Sketch from the diary of Agda Montelius, 1879.
Ref: Riksantikvarieämbetet arkiv, ATA, Montelius-Reuterskiölds samling, F2B.1a.
Copyright © Riksantikvarieämbetet. All rights reserved and permission to use the
figure must be obtained from the copyright holder.

concerned new finds from the Faliscan culture, a Latin-speaking ‘people’ in northern Latium. Helbig accused Barnabei of unprofessional excavation methods, wrongly documenting the contexts in which finds had been made, and displaying them poorly.

Barnabei was appointed general director of the state cultural authority in 1895. He was still very much involved in the museum work, but Edoardo Gatti (1875–1928) was introduced as operative director at the

museum in 1899. However, the archive material suggests he might have functioned as the director long before that. In a letter to Agda from spring 1898, Montelius wrote about the difficulties of locating both Barnabei and Gatti to ask for permission to study the collections. In the letter, Montelius referred to the former as having been promoted to general director, and the latter as being the operative director of the museum.¹⁰ After finally finding Barnabei at the museum a day later, Montelius was told that he could not make any notes or sketches while studying the collection. He had to write a formal application to Barnabei. Montelius is mostly described as a gentle person by others, but referred to his encounter with Barnabei as 'lively'. Barnabei wrote about the same event in his diary, where he referred to Montelius as bursting in like 'a hyena', demanding to see this and that (Barnabei and Delpino, 1991: 245). When Montelius mentioned the problem to Helbig at a dinner the same evening, the latter considered the whole thing to be a scandal. Despite the problematic start, the archive material shows that Barnabei and Montelius were soon on speaking terms, and that Montelius got permission to study the collections. Montelius was also among the few foreign scholars who expressed his support for Barnabei in the conflict with Helbig (Barnabei and Delpino, 1991: 254). At the end of his study visit in May 1898, Montelius decided to invite his colleagues to dinner to show his gratitude. He found it necessary to arrange two separate dinners, which clearly illustrates the cold social relations between the Italian and German archaeologists at the time. As an extra courtesy to Barnabei, Montelius invited him first, and asked him to choose the date for the dinner.¹¹ To succeed, a foreign scholar like Montelius had to interpret how to behave within the local and regional 'intellectual' structures. This meant, as Livingstone puts it, 'unpacking the implications and inferences that are fixed in local structures' (Livingstone, 2003: 6–7).

From time to time the sometimes rather helpful Helbig would also obstruct Montelius' investigations, for example by delaying communication with other (Italian) scholars. The importance of having 'agents', both when Montelius could not be present in Rome or Italy himself, and when navigating the networks, appears to have become greater and greater. During the 1890s, Montelius did not rely just on his Italian connections, but also on Swedish/Scandinavian agents or mediators. One such person, and a person of high political status, was the Swedish diplomat Carl Bildt (1850–1931). He was more or less based in Rome from the 1890s onwards. Bildt was interested in history generally and in promoting Swedish research. He wrote letters to scholars like Felice Barnabei and Wolfgang Helbig, and mediated and arranged meetings with the aim of enabling/facilitating for Montelius. He also kept

Montelius informed about current disputes and archaeological news in Rome:

The enmity between Helbig and Barnabei is unfortunately fiercer than ever. Which of the two is right, I do not dare think, but I have observed that most of my acquaintances agree with Helbig. Recently, at the Forum, highly interesting excavations have taken place, and even more promising ones are imminent in the upcoming months. At the same time several 'restorations' are taking place, that I, for my part, would rather see undone. It would be lovely if you could come here soon and see the new finds. (letter from Bildt to Montelius, 16 January 1899)¹²

Another helpful person was the Swedish Classical archaeologist Sam Wide (1861–1918). In 1893, Wide received the Letterstedtska travel grant and spent six months in Italy (Berg, 2016: 67). Judging from the letters he wrote to Montelius during his trip, one wonders how he had time for his own studies. He must have spent a lot of his time helping Montelius, and collaborating with Carl Bildt, to get access to information and sketches of finds that Montelius needed for *La Civilisation Primitive*.¹³ Wide, being twenty years younger than Montelius and aiming for an academic career in Sweden, might have acted for career-strategic reasons. In addition to looking at excavated objects, Montelius also discussed with Wide the possibility of setting up excavation projects in Crete and elsewhere in Greece.¹⁴ These plans were never realised by Montelius, but the correspondence between them can serve as an illustration of the international competition for 'big digs' in the Mediterranean region, fuelled by both national agendas and personal prestige.

Following the correspondence of both Bildt and Wide to Montelius, it is necessary to consider even more categories of networks or clusters in addition to the three groups mentioned above. These would include diplomats and visiting Swedish scholars, subgroups in the Roman scholarly network and the division between Italian scholars and non-Italian, especially German, Rome-based scholars.

Concluding thoughts

In this chapter, I have highlighted the potential for using a geographical approach when studying knowledge production and when writing histories of archaeology. Archaeology is itself a geographic discipline. As Simon Naylor (2005: 2) points out, it is not a finite result in itself to claim that science can be interpreted geographically. It is rather a foundation for empirical narratives. It has proven very useful so far to use Montelius' personality, and his connections with Italy, as a

starting point for studying knowledge production during the early days of international prehistoric archaeology. He and his wife were able to travel more than most scholars at the time. Many of the trips were motivated by Montelius' extensive work on the prehistory of Italy, and could be realised thanks to travel grants and other funding. Montelius did study collections of Italian artefacts in other European countries, but the majority of the material was in Italy. His personal meetings with Italian scholars and dignities often made it possible for him to gain knowledge of, as well as access to, private collections and new discoveries. The mapping of research activities includes, in the case of Montelius' archaeological sites, locations of collections, of institutions and of key persons. How the latter move between geographical places, and/or within social/political strata affects the practices and premises of knowledge production.

By adding methodological tools and concepts from network studies and consulting a variety of source material, I believe that it is possible to pinpoint factors that contributed to the formation of a scholarly network, and to reconstruct the most important features of the research processes and work of Montelius and his colleagues. Analysis of archive sources has made it clear that it is of great importance to study the nationalities, geographical locations and relations between the actors, rather than 'just' the specific discoveries and archaeological data, to understand how knowledge was produced and disseminated. The extensive travelling and network building through personal meetings were necessary for Montelius' research. A notable feature is that there is a relatively high representation of Italian scholars in the private correspondence of Montelius, with many of whom he stayed in contact over long periods, regardless of where they were affiliated. He appears to have moved quite easily between the different scholarly traditions of Classical and prehistoric archaeology. He also succeeded in maintaining good relationships with scholars who were enemies, like Barnabei and Helbig.

His specific role in, and the dynamics of, different networks has to be further investigated, but it can be stated that his work was not an individual effort. It must be analysed in terms of different degrees of co-production and collaboration, as well as controversies. By thinking geographically of science and knowledge production, it is possible to identify and map different geographies/categories that affected the work process, as well as the outcome. When building on previous studies on Montelius, I would also suggest making a clear distinction between the methodological concepts of thought-collectives and different types of networks or clusters. The networks/clusters might partly overlap other networks and thought-collectives, or not do so at all, but more

importantly they serve as a structure that enables (or disables) the production and dissemination of knowledge. It is possible to identify both formal and informal structures, and they too overlap each other. Just like layers on a digital map, they can be lit/switched off in a continuing analysis of the networks.

It is important to consider that the means available and practices of scientific activity must often be understood within the context of a region (Livingstone, 2003: 88; Naylor, 2005: 7). One trait so far is the suggestion of a more informal 'climate' in Northern Italy, and a more formal setting in Rome. Another is that Montelius needed to pay less often when he asked for material from northern Italy, than from Rome. What relations did really impact on the premises of knowledge production? Can we really tell whether and how a schism affected the research process and the development of the archaeological fields of research? In some cases, the answer is yes. A concrete example of a formal way to stop or delay Montelius in his work would be not granting him official permission to study a collection, or refusing to send him a requested drawing or data of a find in the name of the state authority, as Barnabei did at first. Such situations had some impact on Montelius' research and the spread of knowledge.

A case study of Oscar Montelius and his project *La civilisation primitive* clearly benefits from geographical aspects of knowledge production, but can also serve as an example of how the history of archaeology can add to the geographical understanding of scientific development, both when it comes to the conditions for the individual scholar, and for the European scholarly community in general.

As always, when scratching the surface, many new questions can be raised. In which respects were Montelius representative and unique, for his time? Why did a Scandinavian – not an Italian – publish a synthesis of Italian prehistory?

Notes

- 1 Thanks go to Ingrid Berg, Evert Baudou and Patrik Nordström for generously sharing their knowledge of how to navigate in the archives.
- 2 This book was originally published in Swedish, with a French summary. In 1986 the book was republished and translated into English with the title *Dating in the Bronze Age: with special reference to Scandinavia* (Montelius, 1986).
- 3 From here on shortened to *La Civilisation Primitive*.
- 4 In English the word 'science' traditionally refers to the natural sciences. In this chapter, I make no distinction between different disciplines. I include archaeological research in the term.
- 5 Fleck's ideas and concepts have been frequently used by Swedish scholars

since the 1990s, which is worth noticing. In 1997 *Genesis and development of a scientific fact* was translated into Swedish by Bengt Liliequist, who also published a dissertation (2003) on Fleck at the Department of Philosophy and linguistics at Umeå University, Sweden. At the same university, Evert Baudou was the professor in Archaeology between 1975 and 1991. These circumstances could probably provide a geographically inspired case study on thought-collectives in itself.

- 6 This can be established by studying the themes and content of the congress publications chronologically, and by reading contemporary travel/conference reports; see for example Hans Hildebrand (1872). *Den arkeologiska kongressen i Bologna: Berättelse*. Stockholm.
- 7 Wolfgang Helbig left his formal position at the Istituto di corrispondenza archeologica in the mid-1880s, but stayed very much involved in archaeological research and art dealing. He and his wife, the Russian princess Nadine, held a strong social position and were often the centre of attention, inviting scholars to their home in Rome for scientific and cultural evenings. See Chapter 3 for further information.
- 8 Riksbankens arkiv, ATA, Montelius-Reuterskiölds samling, F2B 1a, Agda Montelius, diary notes, December 1876.
- 9 At the time, the museum had two sections, one housed in the baths of Diocletian, the other in Villa Giulia, a former papal estate a stone's throw from Piazza del Popolo, just outside the Roman city wall. At the beginning of the museum's history, the collections were arranged properly in the section in Villa Giulia, but not the other. The finds included objects from Latium and its pre-Roman inhabitants, mainly collected from current excavations. The two museums remain in the same buildings today, but the bureaucratic organisation and collections have changed over time.
- 10 Oscar Montelius to Agda Montelius, 13 May 1898, in Nordström, 2014: 331.
- 11 Oscar to Agda Montelius 24 May 1898 and 30 May 1898 in Nordström, 2014: 334, 337; Biblioteca Angelica, Rome, Fondi Barnabei 237/3, letter from Montelius to Barnabei, 24 May 1898.
- 12 Riksbankens arkiv, ATA, Oscar Montelius arkiv, E1a vol 4.
- 13 See for example Riksbankens arkiv, ATA, Oscar Montelius arkiv, E1a vol 42, letters from Wide to Montelius, 7 April and 27 July 1893.
- 14 Riksbankens arkiv, ATA, Oscar Montelius arkiv, E1a vol 42, letter from Wide to Montelius, 12 April 1901.