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I Reenacted prehistory today
Preliminary remarks on a multidisciplinary research project

Stefanie Samida
Zentrum für Zeithistorische Forschung

Historical and archaeological topics have been very popular for many years. This is witnessed by a variety of events and developments: well-attended exhibitions, so-called “medieval markets”, an ongoing success of historical documentaries, a booming market of specialised books and magazines, as well as star-studded historical movies. Living history formats on television or historical “docu-soaps” also attract millions of viewers (see, e.g., Black Forest House 1902” / “Schwarzwaldhaus 1902”, “Stone Age – The Experiment” / “Steinzeit – Das Experiment”). Remarkably, documentaries on pre- and protohistory build a large contingent in German historical TV programs beyond those on World War II. Moreover, this period is very popular in open-air museums, memorial culture or “themed walks” – for instance, the crossing of the Alps “in the steps” of “Ötzi the Iceman”. While these approaches to “popular history” or living history have been en vogue for at least two decades, academic historical research has discovered this field of study only recently.

The project “Living History: Reenacted Prehistory between Research and Popular Performance” will, therefore, analyse different popular performances of prehistory. Research will focus on television documentaries, open-air museums, history sites and “themed walks”. These performances will be explored from three perspectives:

- We will examine the production of living history, particularly its relationship with academic history, the didactical concepts, the reenactors’ professional and personal background and their motives.
- We will analyse the presentations and performances themselves, their narratives, visualisation, realisation and staging.
- The project will investigate the experience of the participants and the viewers – their emotional processing and involvement. Thus, the research group is profoundly multidisciplinary and integrates methods and knowledge from European ethnology, media / contemporary history and archaeology (Fig. 1).

Current state of the research

The term “living history”, in Germany often translated as lebendige / wiederbelebte / erlebte Geschichte, stands for a specific form of popular representation of history. While it has its roots in the USA, it might almost be termed a global phenomenon today. The English term “reenactment” is quite often used as a synonym, but originally referred to the replay or reenactment of concrete historical events (often battles), while living history tries to simulate living conditions of the past in the present. Thereby, reenactors can act in different interpretative modes: While first-person reenactors try to act like a specific historical or some fictitious ordinary person of the past, the third-person interpreters predominantly seek to retain the distance between the present and the time setting on which their narrative focuses. Living history is valued as a participatory historical culture, but also as effect-orientated. It is not limited to a specific time or to historical role-playing and theatrical performance of history, but includes approaches of “themed environments” (Schlehe et al. 2010).

One of the pioneers of living history research, the American folklorist Jay Anderson (1982, 291), defined the topic as “an attempt by people to simulate life in another time”. He distinguished
three types or dimensions of living history which are relevant for us (ibid. 290 f.):

- Living history can be part of “research”; according to Anderson this means, for example, that through “experimental” living history archaeological hypotheses on specific questions of technology can be tested.
- Living history can be pursued as a vehicle of spreading interpretations of the past. In this sense it is being used as a “tool” of knowledge dissemination.
- Living history can be carried out as “play”. In doing so, it serves as a “recreation” where one can “participate in an enjoyable recreational activity that is also a learning experience”.

Anderson’s classification, however, has led to terminological blurring since living history is, in fact, located in both an academic or professional and a public, non-professional sphere. Due to some overlapping with experimental archaeology, the impact of archaeologists in the development of living history is often highlighted. However, experimental archaeology is a subfield of archaeology in general, which by means of scientific experiments intends to obtain deeper insights into certain pre- and protohistorical phenomena (e.g. Eggert / Samida 2009, 54 ff.). Although the term “living history” is fuzzy, it is used here because of its common and widespread usage.

Currently, research on living history is restricted to single aspects analysed from different disciplinary perspectives. The main focus of studies of living history has been in the context of museums and historic sites. Therefore questions about “authenticity” play an important role. Further interesting research has been done on so-called “medieval markets” and commercialisation of medieval history. In the recent past reenactments in television documentaries – some call them “televised reenactments” – are also taken into account. Contrary to the quite intense discussion within the Anglophone humanities (e.g. Criticism 2004), the subject is widely unexplored in Germany. For instance the relationship of academic and public history has not yet been dealt with in any thorough manner. The effect of such performances on their audience has also rarely been analysed in current research. Moreover, neither the American and British nor the continental research has focused on living history in archaeological contexts thus far.

Aims of the living history project

Our project explores the specifics of living history as performances of prehistory, especially their relation to historical and archaeological research. Therefore, the project will analyse the production, realisation and reception of living history presentations and acquirments in different environments, namely museums and historic sites, television documentaries, as well as “themed walks” with common questions. In doing so, we will concentrate on the following six objectives:

- First, the project will analyse the mutual relationship between academic history and living history in much more detail than has been done thus far. On the one hand we will research whether living historians or reenactors integrate historical and accordingly archaeological insights into their performances and to what extent their performances function as a means of transferring knowledge about the past. To deal with these and similar questions we will need to collect information on the “professional”, i.e. academic knowledge of the reenactors and how they acquire it. What information material (e.g. publications, films) do they use and how do they gain archaeological advice? The involvement of academic researchers is also investigated: their role as supervisors, as contact or subject in presentations.
- Second, we are interested in acquiring information on pedagogical or didactical aspects which are connected to living history performances under consideration. In this context, questions of quality management and professionalisation are also important. Which tendencies towards a professionalisation of living history performances can be pointed out, e.g. at museums, and which are missing?
- Third, the project will analyse the reenactors’ professional and personal background and their motives to engage in living history activities and to acquire prehistory. It is, for instance, generally assumed that both reenactors and persons who enjoy “themed walks” share similar motives. This is, however, just one of the many hypotheses of living history which are still widely unexplored.
- Fourth, we will research the realisation of authenticity. Reenactments seem to be popular because they emanate a hands-on atmosphere and impart what the audience considers as authentic experience. Reenactors often employ a whole range of visual, acoustic and haptic possibilities, the effect of which is underscored by the seeming authenticity of their costumes and equipment. This specific kind of historical representation is based on the persuasiveness of the “real”, the “tangible”, and the “comprehensible”. Living history performances are effective in that they constitute an emotive approach to the past through an active involvement of both parties, i.e. reenactors and audience.
- Fifth, we will study the reception of living history and its influence on the historical awareness (Geschichtsbewusstsein) on all participants including audiences. We have to assume that the reenactors and audience perceive and memorise quite different aspects of history than it might be
intended by the organisers. In doing so, different modes of processing and knowledge acquisition will be investigated in regards to living history audiences in general. The proposed project may also contribute to answer the question whether knowledge acquisition and entertainment are exclusive effects or whether both can be achieved equally well with living history formats.

Finally, if living history performances exert an influence on the historical awareness, we need to investigate what kind of historical knowledge is predominantly communicated. We assume that reenactors support the interest in details of “everyday history” (Alltagsgeschichte). It appears to us that there is a certain difference to other kinds of “popular history” – e.g. historical novels, non-fiction books – in which “grand narratives” about peoples and ages are pointed out (as “The Celts”, “The Germanic Tribes”, “The Bronze Age”). By analysing the specific interests of living history we will contribute to differentiation of “popular history”. This will be discussed in relation to specialised archaeological research, which seeks to understand and explain prehistoric man as a social being, and therefore uses a differentiated range of methods to gain and interpret archaeological remains (e.g. excavations, different kinds of prospections, ethnographic analogies).

### Theory, methods and objects of the project

Our project is based on empirical qualitative and quantitative methods. It uses a range of methods and techniques in order to implement the gathering of data on reenactors’ behaviour, background and motives, on the audience’s reception modes and, finally, on the interrelationship between scholars and the public. Some of these methods, however, differ between the disciplines and may also depend on the questions under considera-

---
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### Living History: Reenacted Prehistory between Research and Popular Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multidisciplinary Approach</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media/Contemporary History</td>
<td>Prehistoric Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Centre for Contemporary History, Potsdam)</td>
<td>(Centre for Contemporary History, Potsdam)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Living History Performances – Production – Presentation – Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documentaries</th>
<th>Museums/Events</th>
<th>Themed walks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative Media Analysis</td>
<td>Qualitative Field Studies</td>
<td>Ethnographic Field Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Project structure.
and Georg Koch, Centre for Contemporary History, Potsdam / Zentrum für Zeithistorische Forschung). While the popular representation of archaeologists in documentaries and movies had been discussed increasingly in recent years (e.g. Samida 2010), the sub-project’s goal is to investigate the changing narratives and visualizations of televised prehistory, the intentions and public perception of the production, and their relation to academic researchers. Therefore, it will analyse different types of presentations. On the one hand, it considers documentaries about the work of archaeology with scenic elements. On the other hand the project examines TV programs with experimental character, which show people staging the past in front of cameras, the so-called “docu-soaps”, a hybrid genre that combines documentaries and soap operas.

The project uses the approaches of research in “visual history”. It will point out characteristic narratives and “visiotypes” (regular visual key elements) and ask how alterations within media technology changed representations of the past. Notably, the impact of digital virtual elements will be considered. In addition to the films themselves, archival sources of the selected TV productions, statistics of audiences and their public reception will be analysed. Their specific character is indicated by a comparison between the key elements of different decades and by comparing British and German presentations. British documentaries are chosen because it is assumed that Britain has a different way of presenting the past: they have very successful archaeological series (such as “Time Team”), which regularly attract millions of viewers because they manage to combine information and entertainment in a distinct manner. They involve researchers more directly and refer much more to local discoveries. At the same time, transfers between Britain and Germany are identified. The database of the German Broadcasting Archives (Deutsches Rundfunkarchiv) and the West German Broadcasting (Westdeutscher Rundfunk, WDR) have already proven helpful with an overview of TV productions in the past. This will help in selecting a sample of representative documentaries for each country which will be analysed in much more detail.

The archaeological sub-project (Stefanie Samida, Centre for Contemporary History Potsdam) is directed at the interactions between professional archaeologists, reenactors and visitors (scholars, actors and recipients) in open-air museums. The main objective is to investigate the motives, agenda and meaning of living history performances for all participants. A second major aim is to explore the reenactors’ personal and professional background and their relation to academic research and didactical concepts. Finally, an important objective is concerned with whether, and if so to what extent, the audience exerts an influence on the reenactors. It is intended to integrate the outcome of this study into a model of what the author calls “didactics of archaeology” (Archäologiedidaktik).

The research of the archaeological sub-project will concentrate on two open-air museums – the Lake Dwelling Museum Unteruhldingen (Pfahlbaumuseum Unteruhldingen at Lake Constance) and the Museum Village Düppel (Museumsdorf Düppel, Berlin) – as well as on the “Roman Festival” (Römerfest) at the open-air museum located at the Roman site of Hechingen-Stein (District Zollernalbkreis, Germany). The Pfahlbaumuseum Unteruhldingen is the oldest archaeological open-air museum in Germany. It was built in 1922 and from its very beginning presented living history performances. Thus, there is a unique opportunity to investigate the development of living history. The reconstructions of the Museumsdorf Düppel were chosen for similar reasons. These two museums constitute brilliant examples for a detailed comparison on living history. The Römerfest at the Roman Open-Air Museum Hechingen-Stein (Freilichtmuseum Hechingen-Stein) is a special event organised every two years. It brings together various reenactment groups representing different cultures (e.g. Romans, Celts and Alamanni) and is well-known for its lively performances (e.g. demonstrations of Roman and Celtic handicraft, the reenactment of a battle between Romans and Alamanni).

In order to implement the sub-project’s objectives, different methods of qualitative research will be used. The fieldwork will focus on a series of open observer techniques (e.g. photos, video-documents, observance reports) and guided interviews with selected reenactment groups and individual participating performers. The structure of the groups will be of special importance. It is intended to obtain heterogeneous samples, such as the Celts group “Carnyx” (a Celtic wind instrument) or the group of Alamanni “Ask” (Germanic for ash tree) whose members consist of archaeologists, and such groups whose members do not have any archaeological background. Furthermore, non-participating monitoring and structured questionnaires will be used for ascertaining answers concerning the role of the audiences. Guided interviews with the directors of both museums, staff members and visitors are also intended.

Finally, the ethnographic sub-project (Bernhard Tschofen and Sarah Willner, Ludwig-Uhland-Department of Empirical Cultural Science, University of Tübingen, Ludwig-Uhland-Institut für Empirische Kulturwissenschaft) examines practices and conceptions of visitors in the context of prehistoric paths and walking tours with an integral and actor-centred perspective of European ethnology. The primary research inter-
I would like to thank Frank Bösch (Potsdam) and Bernhard Tschofen (Tübingen) – both partners of the project “Living-History: Reenacted Prehistory between Research and Popular Performace” – for discussions and their input on this manuscript. The project is financed by the VolkswagenFoundation (VolkswagenStiftung) and is conducted by the Centre for Contemporary History Potsdam and the Ludwig-Uhland-Department of Empirical Cultural Science, University of Tübingen. Many thanks to Manfred K. H. Eggert (Tübingen) who corrected my English and made it more comprehensible – no easy undertaking. Michele Williams-Schmid (Dresden) did the final proofreading, thank you.
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