

GERMANIC MIGRATIONS – RECEPTION AND SELF-PERCEPTION IN THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Martin Lindner¹

Nils Steffensen²

Abstract

For centuries, Arminius was a focal point of the German reception of antiquity and a founding figure who was appropriated from various sides. With the end of World War II and the subsequent transformations in a divided Germany, 'Hermann the German' seemed to have lost the basis of his legitimisation. Our dossier will outline the changed role of Arminius and Germanic history in the Federal Republic up to the present day (including some observations for the short-lived eastern Democratic Republic). The focus will be on film as creator and carrier of a popular image, the utilisation from the perspective of state actors and the position of the Germanic tribes in the school curriculum.

Keywords

Arminius; Hermann the German; Germanic history; nationalism; historical consciousness; film; school.

¹ Senior Lecturer in Ancient History - Georg-August-Universität Göttingen, Göttingen, Germany. E-mail: martin.lindner@uni-goettingen.de

² Senior Lecturer in Ancient History and the Didactics of History - Europa-Universität Flensburg, Flensburg, Germany. E-mail: nils.steffensen@uni-flensburg.de

Resumo

Durante séculos, Armínio foi um ponto central da recepção alemã da antiguidade e uma figura fundadora que foi apropriada por vários lados. Com o fim da Segunda Guerra Mundial e as transformações subsequentes em uma Alemanha dividida, "Hermann, o Alemão" parecia ter perdido a base de sua legitimação. Nosso dossiê irá delinear a mudança do papel de Armínio e da história germânica na República Federal até os dias atuais (incluindo algumas observações sobre a efêmera República Democrática Alemã). O foco será no filme como criador e portador de uma imagem popular, a utilização da perspectiva de atores estatais e a posição das tribos germânicas no currículo escolar.

Palavras-chave

Armínio; Hermann, o Alemão; História germânica; nacionalismo; consciência histórica; filme; escola.

1. Introduction

For centuries, the formation of German identity and self-perception as a nation was dominated by an image of ancient Germania that can be traced back to the humanist reception of Tacitus' *Germania* and Velleius Paterculus (Muhlack, 2006; Krebs, 2011; Winkler, 2016). The 'Germanic cult' was propagated until the 'Third Reich' and the Second World War marked a turning point in the history of the German state and identity (von See, 1994; Idem, 2001; Puschner, 2001). For modern native speakers, there is a clear distinction that is easy to overlook in its English translation: 'germanisch' equals 'ancient Germanic', while 'deutsch' denotes 'modern German'. We henceforth use 'Germanic' not to suggest a homogenous group or inherited German-Germanic traits (cf. Steuer, 2004), but as a collective term for the region's ancient population in lieu of an alternative. In that sense, our contribution examines the position of the Germanic peoples in the historical consciousness of the Federal Republic of Germany from 1949 to the present day from three perspectives:

Firstly, it looks at film as creator and carrier of a popular image. In the post-war decades, some productions struggled to distance themselves from the Nazi legacy, while others reused 'cleaned-up' versions of old propaganda films. The change in the (private) television market fueled the desire for a 'fresh' cinematic re-evaluation of Germanic history. The global return of the classical epic film in the 2000s or, on a national level, the anniversary of the 'Battle of Varus' in 2009 as a media event brought about further transformations.

Secondly, our contribution evaluates the utilisation from the perspective of state actors. The study of regional ancient history was boosted by the discoveries at Kalkriese and the endeavours to determine the location of the 'Battle of Varus'. The focus here was less on national interests than on local patriotism, hobby research and the logic of merchandising.

Thirdly, we analyse the position of the Germanic tribes in the school curriculum. Until National Socialism, the teaching of the history of the Germanic tribes served to create a national identity. In the present day, new paradigms have replaced old goals. Curricula and textbooks are aimed at questions of coexistence in a multicultural society, interdependence through trade and the usage of self-images and images of others.

By viewing the current state of Germanic reception in the Federal Republic of Germany in its historical context, our contribution demonstrates the political potential of antiquity for modern Germany, but also how it is determined by political conjunctures.

2. Arminius on screen

In the early days of film, i.e. since the late 19th century, the medium had the reputation of a fairground attraction. Classical material was used to improve this image, especially from the 1900s onwards. In Germany, however, there were no major productions until World War I that could have rivalled monumental films such as the Italian *Cabiria* (1914) or the American *Intolerance* (1916). The Germanic peoples were more the sort of material that was shown on German theatre stages. Development was further slowed down by the World War I and its consequences.³

2.1. Pre-1945 films: failed narratives

It was not until 1924 that two very different silent films were released: *Die Hermannschlacht* (*The Battle of Hermann*) signalled authenticity through its locations. Most of the scenes were filmed in the region around Detmold, which at the time was thought to be the site of the battle of 9 AD. In its execution, however, the film came across as old-fashioned. In just under an hour, it told its five acts like a theatre piece. The dialogue and Germanic costumes looked like something out of a bad performance of a Wagner opera. *Die Hermannschlacht* was supposed to be saved by a contemporary political analogy that was made increasingly blatant in the course of the production process: the Roman legions became equated with the French and Belgian occupiers of the Ruhr region; the retelling of the Arminius uprising was intended to motivate resistance in 1924 (cf. Winkler, 2013). However, an agreement was reached shortly after the premiere, ending the occupation by the summer of 1925 and losing the film its last selling point. Fritz Lang was more successful with his two-parter *Die Nibelungen*, which was superior in terms of craftsmanship, aesthetics and marketing. The neo-mythological tale about Siegfried and the downfall of the Nibelungs was successful by drawing more heavily on the medieval saga and also by departing from traditional uses of style in the depictions of Germanic history (cf. Levin, 1998; van Laak, 2007).

In any case, the contemporary tendency was towards Pan-Germanic or Ur-Nordic cultural concepts. This acquired a completely different dimension when the National Socialists came to power (cf. von Goldendach and Minow 1994). A short version of Fritz Lang's epic set to music was released in cinemas as late as 1933. However, the new rulers had a different portrayal of history in mind. Several members of the leadership distanced themselves from the 'Teutomania', which was perceived as embarrassing, and looked for role models in Sparta,

³ Several of the following basic information and observations may be found in more detail in two older articles by M. Lindner (Lindner, 2020; Idem, 2013).

Rome, the German Middle Ages or in a vague Nordic/Aryan prehistory.⁴ Initially, existing films – especially for use in schools and other educational institutions – were re-dubbed and additional scenes were added. New productions were added from the mid-1930s onwards. The main aim was to reinforce the narrative of a connection between land and people that had existed since the beginning of human history, from which an increasingly radical rhetoric was developed that could even be used to justify defensive imperialism, wars of conquest and genocide (Stern, 2015).

Ewiger Wald (Eternal Forest) from 1936 even made an attempt at cinematic ‘folk poetry’: the film travels through the history of Germany from early times to the present, commented on solely by a narrator in verse, but without mentioning any names. The Arminius scenes can only be recognised as such if the viewer has prior knowledge of the events of 9 AD. The focus is on the actual battle, which is won more by the forest and the weather as the natural allies of the Germans/Germanic people. *Ewiger Wald* was a failure despite the enormous amount of funding and propaganda support (cf. Linse, 1993; Zechner, 2006). Nevertheless, the film is an example of how Arminius as an individual figure with some problematic traits – betrayal of Varus, death at the hands of his own followers, etc. – had lost his function in the national reception of antiquity. From the beginning of the World War II, other film content dominated anyway, particularly comedies designed as a distraction or modern parallels of endurance narratives.

2.2. 1945–2024: omission, replacement, irrelevance

After the World War I, there was a delay of several years before the German film and cinema industry started to recover. In Western Germany, even the larger studios could never come close to competing with Hollywood. The content produced was mainly comedies, romantic farces, crime thrillers and, later, the occasional (World) war film. The development of television was also only gradually gaining momentum. In Western Germany, the nucleus consisted of regional, publicly financed stations that formed a kind of federation. A country-wide second channel was only set up in 1963. It was not until the 1980s that commercial stations were authorised. In Eastern Germany, film and television remained under state control anyway (Hickethier, 1998).

The Germanic tribes and with them Arminius were a topic in both parts of Germany that hardly anyone wanted to touch when it came to making new films. Due to a lack of alternatives, some supposedly harmless films from the

⁴ Creating a self-stabilizing exchange through the influence of and impact on research in the field of classical philology, archaeology and ancient history; cf. Leube and Hegewisch, 2002; Focke-Museum 2013; on the wider context, see Wiwjorra 2006.

1920s to 1940s were still used in the beginning – especially for educational purposes.⁵ In Western Germany, the emerging new productions tended to focus on local history: Alamanni, Suebi and Baiuvarii instead of ‘the Germanic peoples’. In Eastern Germany, Spartacus was seen as the better alternative for a resistance narrative against Roman imperialism. However, the film industry here was unwilling or unable to produce corresponding blockbusters (cf. Hosfeld and Pölking, 2006).

One exception in Western Germany was *Hermann der Cherusker*, which will be discussed below. Visually, the film is clearly recognisable as part of the second wave of classical epic films that lasted until the mid-1960s, or more precisely: of the European variety that became known as *peplum*. The international production (German, Italian and Yugoslavian) was not shown in German cinemas until 1977, mainly due to legal disputes. This made the film seem to have fallen out of time and provided another deterrent example of why Arminius was incapable of making money on the big screen (cf. Lindner, 2013: 111–114). Nevertheless, it resulted in a parody, also discussed below, which established itself as a kind of cult film.

The preference for local historical topics or more general cultural and everyday history continued in school films and documentaries. Where there was an opening, it was more in the sense of adding new aspects such as the role of Germanic women, results from experimental archaeology and living history or greater consideration of the Roman part of German prehistory. Only a few productions, such as the mini-series *Die Germanen* (1984; cf. Lindner, 2020: 219–222), represented more conservative or reactionary narratives and even used footage from 1930s films with new soundtracks. However, this was more about saving the reputation of the Germanic tribes as German forefathers than revitalising the story of Arminius as a heroic individual example.

After the German reunification in 1990, other narratives were in demand anyway. A reference to Arminius would have contributed nothing to the self-perception as the peaceful success of a grassroots movement of ordinary citizens. Documentaries about the so-called Völkerwanderung (with certain undertones of ‘tribal migrations’ which cannot be reproduced in translations such as Barbarian Migrations) occasionally used terminology and motifs from the German *völkisch* movement of the 19th and early 20th century (cf. Puschner, 2001). The context of the films, however, was an origin story of and for Europe rather than one for a specific nation state. *Held der Gladiatoren* (*Hero of the Gladiators*; cf. Lindner, 2013: 120–121) is one of the few exceptions and can at best be seen as a partial adaptation of the Arminius narrative – more on this

⁵ Remakes of films from the Nazi era were not uncommon, but largely restricted to non-historical full length feature films; cf. Frank, 2017.

below. As a pilot for a series that was never produced, the film became just another entry into the long list of unsuccessful examples.

2009 could have brought a turnaround thanks to the bi-millennium of the Battle of 9 AD. In fact, the few productions that were made proved to be of limited success, partly because the increasingly international dimensions of secondary marketing were severely limited due to the subject matter. Individual examples which attempted a person-centred focus on 'Arminius versus Varus' are also discussed below. In fact, however, even here a large proportion of the running time was devoted to the excavation results, technical reconstructions and possibilities for localising the battle, i.e. more to concrete issues than hero worship. After 2009, individual sequences were sometimes reused, for example in a documentary about the discovery of a 3rd century battlefield in central Germany, for which 9 AD was used as a comparison. The already limited attention paid to Arminius was thus further diminished by such condensation. Just as an aside: even the archaeological park at Kalkriese, where the vast majority of scholars believe the events of 9 AD are to be located, now advertises itself as the site of 'The Battle of Varus' (see section 3).

2009 proved to be a short-lived flash in the pan for Arminius in German film and television productions. The fact that the topic is receiving more attention again through the most recent Netflix series is due not least to the international nature of the project, which attempts to imitate worldwide successful formats. Before this can be categorised in conclusion, the following three exemplary individual studies shall serve to illustrate the described developments.

2.3. Echoes of Hermann: case studies

Films, especially larger productions for screening in cinemas or today's streaming services, are commercial works of art. One of the simplest recipes for success is to replicate patterns and content that have already been successful in other films. Currently, it seems to be mainly superhero narratives, even if their popularity appears to have passed its zenith. In the 1950s, it was biblical, mythological and ancient historical content that fuelled a second wave of classic epic films originating in the USA. In terms of quantity, the often-cheaper European productions soon superseded their predecessors. Between all the Hercules and Christ films that were being released in cinemas with increasing frequency, there was a demand for material that could be realised in a similar way and yet had a certain unique selling point (cf. Lindner, 2020).

Hermann der Cherusker belongs to the very last years of this era. Its formula is familiar from hundreds of films of the time: an Italian director and writer, locations in Yugoslavia, a (reasonably) well-known American actor as the Roman antagonist, a local actor as his adversary, a tragic love story,

interchangeable action scenes, an overemphasis on the seriousness and historicity of what is shown, etc. The narrative is almost teleologically orientated towards the battle of 9 AD, even if the latter is not staged very heroically and is kept surprisingly short, not least for budgetary reasons. The devil is in the detail, for example in the casting of the local hero not with one of the established international *peplum* actors, but with the German *heimatfilm* star Hans von Borsody, who also played a central role in the remake of *Die Nibelungen* (1966/67; cf. Samblebe 2007). *Hermann der Cherusker* shares with many other *peplum* productions a rather generic fundamental narrative with an underlying moral that oppression of freedom can never be positive and permanent. By contrast, the message at the end of the German dubbed version is more specific: thanks to Arminius, Augustus has recognised the limits of his power, and 9 AD thus marks Rome's de facto withdrawal from free Germania.

If the finished film had been released in German cinemas in 1965/66 as planned, it could have hoped to blend in with the masses of similar films. In 1977, however, it was competing e.g. with the first *Star Wars* film, and came across as amateurish and cheap in every respect. It is therefore hardly surprising that the 1995 parody *Die Hermannsschlacht* ironically markets itself as the third major film adaptation of the material after the equally awkward 1924 silent film and *Hermann der Cherusker*.⁶ The parody breaks the metaphorical fourth wall several times in order to address the audience about how every heroic retelling of the material inevitably resonates with echoes of a tradition that, on closer inspection, must seem outdated or even ridiculous nowadays.

Held der Gladiatoren was completed in 2003 as a TV movie for the German television broadcaster RTL. The idea was once again a copy of successful formulas, this time from the third wave of classic epic films. At the heart of the film is the fictional hero Germanus, a former soldier who has been unjustly enslaved. He has to fight his way to freedom in the arena, while at the same time avenging the death of a family member – Maximus from *Gladiator* (2000) is the obvious role model. The film takes a turn when Germanus is transported to his Germanic homeland as a gladiator – although the main setting, Augusta Treverorum, strictly speaking is part of Gallia Belgica. On crossing over into his native land, Germanus feels a connection to the country and is overwhelmed by the feeling of being destined to be the defender of freedom. At this moment, freedom is primarily characterised as personal liberation, but is in turn associated with the fight for the freedom of his friends/relatives. This is not the only way in which elements of Maximus and Arminius flow together. When Maximus in *Gladiator* reminisces, he sees himself running his hand through the ears of grain in his farmland. Germanus, on the other hand, feels the connection

⁶ For a taste of the ongoing marketing of the film, visit the publisher's website: *Schloßfilm*, http://www.die-hermannsschlacht.de/_deu/index.html; cf. also Völker, 1996.

in contact with his raw native soil, which he experiences – corresponding to the weather conditions of the 9 AD battle – in pouring rain. The fact that the Greek-born director claimed to have aimed for a messiah narrative does not make the similarities to the blood-and-soil mysticism of the first half of the 20th century any less alarming.⁷

The two-part documentary *Kampf um Germanien* (*Battle for Germania*) was produced for the German public broadcasters ZDF as well as ARTE in 2009 on the occasion of the bi-millennium. The result is exemplary for a handful of similar attempts from the same period: on the one hand, the film is intended to appeal and entertain, which is why it relies heavily on play scenes and the personal opposition between Arminius and Varus. On the other hand, it endeavours to deal with the nationalistic ‘ballast’ of the earlier reception through expert interviews or narrator commentaries. The final sequence demonstrates how difficult it is to reconcile the two: first, the death of Arminius is framed in the context of aristocratic rivalry as the main obstacle to German unity up until the 19th century. This is followed by a spectacular drone flight around the Arminius monument near Detmold, which does not quite fit in with the narrator’s commentary on the misappropriation of history. The final conclusion, spoken over dramatic images from the film, is equally idiosyncratic: a fight against an occupying power is never reprehensible. Arminius may not have been a hero, but he was a military genius and, in his torn nature, a modern figure who still has a lot to teach us today.

A production for German children’s television, of all things, manages a much more coherent and unagitated alternative: one episode of *Bibliothek der Sachgeschichten* (*Library of Stories*, 2005) retells the events of 9 AD with Playmobil figures and a slightly ironic undertone. The result undermines the tendencies towards heroization that, among others, *Kampf um Germanien* evokes with its dramatic play scenes. In addition, the *Bibliothek der Sachgeschichten* episode emphasises through many small indicators that what is shown is as much a story as it is history.

2.4. Conclusion

How relevant is Arminius in German film? Probably even less so today than in the already not particularly successful pre-1945 era. This conclusion may come as a surprise given that the *Netflix* series *Barbarians* is in its second season while these lines are written. However, context is crucial here: *Barbarians* is modelled

⁷ Ironically, one of the most influential supporters of the blood-and-soil-ideology, Richard Walther Darré, also dabbled in naïve film narratives like his pet project *Altgermanische Bauernkultur* (The Ancient Farming Culture of Germany); cf. Lindner 2020, 213-216; see also Gies, 2019.

on similar shows such as *Vikings* (2013–2020) or *Britannia* (2018–2021), which were designed to (also) appeal to an international audience.⁸ *Barbarians* apparently succeeds in this respect. The reactions expressed for example by American viewers indicate that even the use of modern German as a signal of authenticity for Germanic history may work to some extent. In Germany itself, on the other hand, the popularity of the series is relatively limited. The irony that the leading actor is an Austrian and that his bride Thusnelda is played by the child of Franco-German parents is unlikely to be realised by many people anyway. However, all of this fits well with the above-mentioned pattern of a rather international production reality, which leaves little room for nationalistic appropriation. In this sense: if the narrative works, it does so as Arminius the Hero, not as Herman the German.

3. The 'Germanic' discourse in politics and the public sphere

'There may never have been a people who called themselves "Germanic"' (W. Pohl, cited in Schmauder and Wemhoff, 2014: 14). This statement is a product of modern research. Until the middle of the century it would have been almost inconceivable, but then the end of the World War II heralded a 'break in continuity' (Wolters, 2006: 116).

3.1. The post-1945 paradigm shift and contemporary perspectives

With the collapse of 1945 and the division of Germany, the political significance of any Germanic heritage or memory evaporated. New research on ethnogenesis rejected the idea of a homogeneous German people that could be traced back to its 'Germanic roots' (particularly relevant: Wenskus, 1961). The figure of Arminius as the defender of the Germanic tribes against Roman aggression became stripped of its idealisation, partly against fierce resistance from 'Germanophile enthusiasts' (Losemann, 2008: 259).⁹ The Hermann Monument in Detmold became a tourist destination; as a potential 'Memorial for the Reunification' (Moosbauer, 2009: 114) it found little resonance. The Arminius myth only retained some potential for mobilisation in nationalist and right-wing or even extremist circles (Losemann, 1995: 428–432; Idem, 2008: 262; Hinz 2023: 91–168).

Nonetheless, Arminius and the Germanic peoples are still present in the public consciousness. Recently, Hagen Schulze and François Etienne ranked the

⁸ Which might also explain the rather generic advertising (<https://www.netflix.com/de-en/title/81024039>).

⁹ On Timpe's influential studies in this regard, esp. Timpe, 1970, see Pfeilschifter, 2022, 389–390.

Cheruscan among the German *lieux de mémoire* memorial sites of national importance (cf. Doyé 2001). Any political instrumentalization of the Germanic tribes and Arminius remains a marginal phenomenon (Vieregge, 2011). The state is no longer using Germanic ideology to create a national identity. A recent scientific assessment explicitly deconstructed the 'idea of a Germanic people, frequently linked to the scientifically unfounded construct of a direct line of tradition to today's Germans' (Schmauder and Wemhoff, 2020: 14). Even if there is no doubt that the Germanic tribes are part of German history, any popularisation without discernible proof of scientific rigour can no longer gain recognition. When Jürgen Rüttgers, then Minister President of North Rhine-Westphalia, wrote his introduction to the exhibition on the Varus Battle, his following remarks can be taken as representative of the new image of the Germanic tribes: that 'not merely conflict and military confrontations' characterised the relationship between the Germanic tribes and the Romans; 'but likewise manifold trade contacts and settlement activities and finally social and religious considerations', whereby 'the most diverse points of reference between the distant past and the present' (Rüttgers, 2009: 14) became visible and usable.

3.2. Kalkriese: the archaeological evidence

Nowadays, the archaeological site of Kalkriese is the focal point of any Germanic and Arminius reception, surpassing even the Hermann monument near Detmold. Centuries of dispute about the location of the 9 AD battle had led to the identification (or self-proclamation) of over 700 candidates. The finds discovered near Osnabrück, in the north-western corner of Germany, from 1987 onwards seemed to provide the long-awaited conclusion. Irrespective of the scientific aims of Germanic studies, the 'Battle of Varus' now became the centre of public interest. Regarding the interpretation of the findings, however, clarity may never be achieved.¹⁰ Thus began a renewed and extremely emotional debate that led to a renaissance of amateur research and revealed a wide range of motives on the part of all those involved.

As a result, Arminius and the Germanic tribes became a political and economic brand. The fascination of the 'Battle of Varus' was not only due to the 'criminalistic triumph' (Timpe, 1995: 13). It was consistent with the logic of media marketing that the scientific findings became relevant primarily through the actualisation of the Germanic myth (Moosbauer, 2012; Jürgens, 2009). Without the connection to its earlier popularity, which had established motifs such as freedom, unity, self-determination and self-assertion as defence against the foreign, Kalkriese would probably never have become a successful tourist

¹⁰ For an overview and a discussion of current positions, see Wiegels, 2011.

destination (Timpe, 1999: 733–734). When the term ‘anniversary celebration’ was criticised by academics on the occasion of the bi-millennium of the 9 AD events (e.g. Wiegels, 2007), appeals for a more matter-of-fact approach were only met with limited response (Moosbauer, 2009: 115). The *VARUSSCHLACHT im Osnabrücker Land gGmbH – Museum und Park Kalkriese* became the main agent of commercialisation, unhesitatingly utilising the myth to market the *Osnabrücker Land* region by linking it to the region where the site was found.

The ‘Battle of Varus’ was also politicised on a regional and state level¹¹. Since its establishment under British occupation in 1947, North Rhine-Westphalia has been a state in search of identity. The country was created as a combination of historically very different, formerly independent regions. The discoveries made at Kalkriese brought the rivals in the Lippe region onto the scene, who claimed Arminius and the ‘Battle of Varus’ for themselves. Both sides, Lippe and Osnabrück, campaigned to win over the state government. It was only through ministerial intervention that co-operation was finally achieved for the bi-millennium. In matters relating to Arminius and the battle site, both regions were ‘willing to fight and sacrifice’ (Horn, 2012: 424).

On a national level, the ‘Battle of Varus’ gained relevance by statements from high-ranking politicians such as the German Chancellor, the President of the European Parliament and two prime ministers. By linking the event with motifs such as freedom, resistance and *heimat* (LWL-Römermuseum in Haltern am See, 2009, 12–16), they evoked a centuries-old tradition of historical instrumentalization. What was new was that they renounced any kind of nationalism. Instead, they emphasised the European idea, which they associated with the events. The political context had changed, but not the appeal of the historical subject matter. It became clear that the potential of the Germanic tribes and Arminius was still intact, despite the historical discontinuities of recent times.

3.3. Kalkriese: museum and archaeological park

The Kalkriese Museum is certainly the most important multiplier of the subject matter to the public.¹² In doing so, it expressly references the political dimension of the Arminius myth and stylises the ‘battle’¹³ as a place of longing in German history: ‘Hardly any other historical event has fuelled German identity and German nationalism in such a way as the Battle of Varus. Hardly any other

¹¹ On this and the following, see Horn, 2012.

¹² For a detailed description of the exhibitions’s concept which was reorganised in 2002 and expanded in 2009, see Guyer and Gigon, 2009, as well as Derks et al., 2009.

¹³ On the military events and the shift in terminology towards the ‘Battle of Varus’, see Lindner, forthcoming.

historical site has been so eagerly sought after in the last 500 years as the battlefield of this legendary conflict' (Museum Kalkriese). This gives the impression that the identification of the battlefield marks the end of the search for German identity.

The museum claims scientific authority for the categorisation of the battle: 'The only thing that helps in this regard are scientific facts. [...] There are many arguments in favour of Kalkriese as a site of the historic Battle of Varus' (Idem). The museum is full of praise for its scientific relevance as a supposedly nationally and internationally renowned scientific facility: 'We work and conduct research on site, in cooperation with numerous other research institutions. Science is in a constant state of flux, old certainties require constant questioning, new methods offer new research opportunities. Research in Kalkriese is on the move – and remains exciting' (Idem).

In reality, the scale of the institution's scientific activities is less impressive. So far, the advertised insights into current research have failed to materialise as have the promised new developments from the excavation itself. Adventure tours and children's birthday parties demonstrate the event character of the museum. The Instagram channel puts an emphasis on experimental archaeology, the aim of which is to visualise history. Roman Days and various forms of re-enactment supposedly bring the past to life. The museum provides teaching aids for visits by school classes, some of which pursue modern approaches of scientific propaedeutics, but otherwise address historical questions only to a limited extent. The high frequency of events cannot mask the fact that the scientific output of the institution run by the *VARUSSCHLACHT im Osnabrücker Land gGmbH – Museum und Park Kalkriese* is hardly innovative. Instead, the site has been established as a place for staging history as an event.

4. Arminius and the German school system

The teaching of history at school has an eminent influence on the culture of history as a crucial forum for methodologically controlled historical learning outside of academia. The democratic constitutional state sets the institutional framework through curricula that define the content, topics and objectives of lessons. Central to current teaching practice is the individual, whose personal (self-)responsibility and autonomy within a liberal society are to be developed and strengthened (e.g. Sandkühler et al., 2018; Fenn and Zülsdorf-Kersting, 2023). The aim of teaching history is to develop a reflective historical consciousness, the ability to independently deconstruct and construct history, which should provide orientation in the present and equip the pupils for future action (Jeismann, 1978; Idem, 1979; Idem, 2000).

4.1. Germanic content in the curriculum

While the Germanic tribes used to be an integral part of history lessons before 1945 (Sievertsen, 2011; Idem, 2013; Hinz, 2023), they have lost much of their relevance as subject matter in the present day. Their remaining didactic significance is essentially twofold: to address acculturation processes and to deconstruct myths. Pupils are expected to assess the effects of Roman imperialism on the provinces, interpret the relationship between Romans and Germanic tribes as inter-cultural encounters, and evaluate the effects of provincialisation. Furthermore, they are asked to analyse cultural transfers between conquerors and conquered – and to determine the significance of migratory movements in the Germanic region at the end of the Western Roman Empire. Another task is to problematise the construct character of the terms ‘Germanic’, ‘Roman’ and ‘barbarian’ considering the interplay between internal and external ascription. The curricula establish a direct link to modern German history via the figure of Arminius: the deconstruction of national myths is to be learnt using him as a case study. His former prominence as an exemplum has, however, been lost. Arminius now features alongside historical figures such as Che Guevara, Frederick Barbarossa, Frederick the Great and Bismarck.

These syllabus requirements reflect a shift that began in the 1970s. Until then, teaching history had focussed on a kind of ‘inner nation-building’. Now, as a consequence of two lost World Wars and the discrediting of the national idea, the creation of identity and legitimisation of the state as well as the cultivation of romantic historical narratives gave way to other issues: problem-orientated teaching geared towards the everyday world and the interests of the pupils (Sandkühler, 2014; Rohlfes, 1988; Bergmann, 2016: 14–19). This change resulted in new priorities when it came to thematising the Germanic tribes and Arminius. The idolisation of ‘resistance’ against ‘foreign occupiers’ is replaced by the analysis of historical actors and their objectives. The ethnic collective concept of ‘Germanic peoples’ is scrutinised by means of a method-conscious appraisal of ancient literary sources. Earlier claims that the Germanic tribes were a part of the *national* history of Germany are deconstructed. The treatment of the material at school is now completely focussed on issues that are essential for the development of a reflective historical consciousness.

4.2. Germanic content in school textbooks

Curriculum objectives are by no means the same as actual lessons. However, school textbooks, the ‘leading medium of history teaching’ (Rüsen, 1992: 237), can provide information about the content of teaching practice.

The above-mentioned reforms had brought about a reconsideration of how to represent the Germanic tribes in teaching aids as well, but the archaeological

discoveries at Kalkriese heralded yet another turning point (Sénécheau, 2012; Onken, 2017). At the moment, 'Germanic' sections have become an undisputed part of school textbooks again¹⁴ – with a particular focus on the Germanic-Roman relationship. The history textbooks explicitly address the biased perspective of the Roman sources, their stereotypes and interpretations, which created a dualism of 'the Romans' and 'the Germanic tribes'. In a similar fashion and scope, they outline the chequered Germanic-Roman interactions. The impact of the Empire on the Germanic provinces is hardly disputed, but the focus is more on the importance of mutual trade contacts and cultural exchange. Both sides appear to have benefited from what was essentially a conflictual relationship, which had been defused – if not overcome – by commerce and co-operation. Despite all the differences between the Romans and their Germanic counterparts, manifested in their way of life, culture and political organisation, an equal status of both peoples is emphasised. In this respect, the textbooks adopt a kind of decolonial perspective.

By addressing the subject matter via the understanding of history as a construction, the development of methodological skills, the consciousness of alterity and the confrontation with pivotal problems, textbooks are in line with the integral goals of current didactics of history and curriculum requirements. The political background for this specific thematization is the concept of a multicultural society. This refers to the Federal Republic as a country of immigration, as well as to the debates on migration and *leitkultur* which have been raging around the national self-image of Germans since the end of the 1990s at the latest.

By contrast, Arminius does not benefit particularly from what might be called a Germanic renaissance. Once praised as one of Germany's founding fathers, his actions are nowadays contextualised without any pathos or national claims. Recurring elements are critical source analyses into the causes of Varus' defeat, comparisons between Varus' and Arminius' character, and the historical impact of the battle on Roman expansion in the region. Another key point of the subject's representation is always the problem of how to localise the battle site. The textbooks feature in-depth scientific discussions of archaeological finds, often combined with an introduction to critical source studies.

In addition, the textbooks emphasise the modern Arminius myth. They problematise the constructions of the Germanic concept and the German nation which began with the humanist reception of Arminius. The modern instrumentalization of the Cheruscan is largely confined to the 19th century, to the Wars of Liberation, but above all to the founding of the German Empire under Bismarck. Chronologically, the portrayals discussed do not extend

¹⁴ This survey is based on an evaluation of all history textbooks currently in use at secondary school level, which was kindly prepared by Hannah Servais (Flensburg).

beyond National Socialism. Current, pop-cultural interpretations of Arminius in present-day discourses on the German nation and society hardly feature at all.

4.3. Teaching Arminius: A case study

Buchners Kolleg Geschichte (Schulte and Stello, 2017: esp. 123–129) is a history textbook intended for senior high school students. In our particular case, the subject is the ‘idea of a nation’. The genesis of the nation and nationalism are discussed both with regard to Germany and Europe. The Arminius myth is used to problematise that, for a long time, the origin of the German nation was traced back to a founding hero.

The section begins with a brief introduction to Arminius and the Varus Battle. This is followed by several short passages devoted to the reception of the Cheruscan prince. Tacitus’ phrase of Arminius as the ‘liberator of Germania’ is rejected on the grounds that, (1) the year of the battle, 9 AD, was not a turning point in history, and (2) the ‘resistance against the occupiers’ was not a ‘matter for the people’ – but a matter for the Germanic elite, who saw their ruling interests threatened. Germanic ethnicity is identified as a ‘foreign term’ of Roman origin. In turn, the emergence of ‘German’ as a concept is linked to the reception of Tacitus’ *Germania*. Several paragraphs then outline the humanist reception of Arminius and trace the dynamization of the Arminius myth in the 19th and 20th centuries, identifying nationalist and *völkisch* tendencies in science and politics as the driving forces. The authors demonstrate the greatest possible objectivity based on modern scientific expertise. They express regret that the concept of Germanic peoples, which has been characterised as academically unsound, is still in use at all. Furthermore, they reject any concept of Germanic-German identity and rigorously de-idealise the historical role of Arminius. Even though it is conceded that the Cheruscan prevented a Roman occupation of the entire Germanic region, the authors immediately endeavour to downplay this feat by highlighting Rome’s continuing influence in the region. Depicted in this way, the Germanic tribes and Arminius possess no potential for political mobilisation. The question ‘Arminius – “founding father” of the Germans?’ receives more than just an implicit negative answer.

The deconstruction of the myth is continued on the basis of several sources and the corresponding assignments. The latter ask for an analysis of excerpts from Velleius Paterculus and Tacitus’ *Germania* in order to unmask the Germanic tribes as Roman constructions, designed for internal political purposes, and to demonstrate the limited value of the texts as sources for Germanic history. In contrast to this exercise in historical source criticism, pupils are given a section from a brochure on the inauguration of the Hermann monument. They

furthermore receive pictures of a 'Germanic parade' through the town centre of Detmold in 1909 and of an NSDAP rally at the monument in 1928. The intention is to help them work out the political instrumentalization of the myth - 'from the time of its creation to the present day'. As the authors' texts form the historical contextualisation, the result of this analysis is determined by implication from the outset. The aim is not to acquire new information, but to confirm previously imparted knowledge through student activity.

However, the opportunity to comprehend the 'touristic turn' of the Arminius myth and thereby shed light on current German discourses on identity is missed. The textbook admittedly introduces an illustration of 'Zwermann, the Cheruscan dwarf from Hermannsland': a plastic souvenir 39 cm tall produced in Detmold in 2008, apparently modelled on a garden gnome. The caricature transforms Arminius from a mythical figure into a symbol of lower-middle class, thus reflecting the shift from a once political myth into an apolitical, commercial product. The pupils, however, are unable to address the issue because the book does not provide them with the necessary contextual knowledge: the Germanic renaissance of Kalkriese in the interweaving of (local) patriotism and regional economic interests. For the authors of the textbook, the instrumentalization of Arminius as Hermann is only relevant in connection with German nationalism. The fact that the political can also manifest itself in the non-political sphere is a point that has escaped their notice. In this respect, 'Zwermann' not only illustrates the current irrelevance of formerly dominant national myths, but also reveals that Arminius is no longer even considered useful for debates about German identity in the present.

4.4. Conclusion

This critical analysis of the Arminius myth also addresses central requirements for any modern teaching of history in general: only those who are able to grasp how a specific subject matter has been shaped and framed by attempts of legitimisation through history possess 'historical maturity'. Only they are capable of making their own judgement when encountering historical interpretations and reflecting their modern-day relevance. Current textbooks, however, narrow the scope by focussing on humanism and the 19th century while excluding modern references and thus the pupils' own environment and experiences. They also fail to take into account how commercialisation and entertainment have depoliticised the myth, let alone the significance for the culture of remembrance in the Federal Republic of Germany. It is not the absence of Germanic content and Arminius in the classroom, but their thematization that reveals the discontinuity of German history.

The reception of the Germanic peoples has undergone a significant evolution, transitioning from the politically motivated mythologization in the era of humanism into (post-)modern pop-cultural presences. Curriculum requirements ask for replacing apology with deconstruction. The Germanic myth is therefore scrutinized as a historical phenomenon, especially prevalent in the early modern period and the 19th century. On the other hand, there is a notable absence of a contemporary orientation that includes the predominantly apolitical, commercially influenced receptions of today. Terminating traditions of politically motivated historical narrations, however, is a crucial feature of the historical culture of the Federal Republic. Understanding this relevance offers highly relevant insights into the (historical) self-perception of German society. What began as an exercise in defining and stabilizing a national identity has now given way to methodical training and historical deconstruction. Only time will tell whether Germanic history and a figure like Arminius will ever retain normative influence. The twists and turns of reception history forbid to exclude such a possibility. Considering the pivotal political developments and the restricted mobilization potential of antiquity, however, it seems unlikely.

5. Arminius 2024 AD

The previous observations could be elaborated further, for instance by extending them to other media. Before 1945, for example, Arminius was present in board games and historical novels (Lindner, 2018). Today, he is used in advertising, merchandising and children's books, among other things. As we have shown elsewhere (Steffensen, 2023; Lindner, forthcoming), even in these remaining spheres of presence, his overall relevance is low compared to the pre-1945 period. The presentation is detached to self-deprecating as a rule; the few exceptions seem to be due to naivety.

In recent years, right-wing parties have regained strength in the German political landscape, above all the *Alternative for Germany* (AfD). In many respects, the AfD draws on ideologies from the first half of the 20th century, for example in debates about culture and identity. However, unlike Vox in Spain with the Celtiberians, for example, it does not rely on ancient references. On the contrary, it rather distances itself from the classical tradition of education in order to utilise prejudices against intellectual elites and at the same time claim to focus on current realpolitik. Arminius thus has no place in Germany's current political discourse.

All things Germanic continue to have appeal in certain areas of politically motivated popular culture, for example in radical right-wing rock music and specific heavy metal genres. However, this phenomenon is expressly not limited to Germany (Heinen, 2017; Seibt et al., 2021). Even in those cases in which the

publications in question are not banned by German authorities, due to justiciable language and symbolism, the dissemination is limited. Arminius is practically irrelevant anyway in these music genres.

Earlier generations sought a link to the ancient Germanic tribes and invented daring narratives and explanations if necessary. Nowadays, Arminius in particular does not seem to be able to return to this status.

Bibliographic References

BERGMANN, Klaus. *Multiperspektivität*. Third Edition. Schwalbach/Ts.: Wochenschau, 2016.

DERKS, Heidrun et al. ... und keine Frage offen: Die neue Dauerausstellung in Kalkriese. In: VARUSSCHLACHT IM OSNABRÜCKER LAND GMBH – MUSEUM UND PARK KALKRIESE (ed.). *Varusschlacht im Osnabrücker Land: Museum und Park Kalkriese*. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 2009, 242–249.

DOYÉ, Werner M. Arminius. In: FRANÇOIS, Etienne; SCHULZE, Hagen (eds.). *Deutsche Erinnerungsorte*. Vol. 3. München: C.H. Beck, 2001, 587–602.

FENN, Monika; ZÜLSDORF-KERSTING, Meik (eds.). *Geschichts-Didaktik*. Berlin: Cornelsen, 2023.

FOCKE-MUSEUM (org.). *Graben für Germanien: Archäologie unterm Hakenkreuz*. Stuttgart: Theiss, 2013.

FRANK, Stefanie M. *Wiedersehen im Wirtschaftswunder: Remakes von Filmen aus der Zeit des Nationalsozialismus in der Bundesrepublik 1949–1963*. Göttingen: V&R unipress, 2017.

GIES, Horst. *Richard Walther Darré: Der „Reichsbauernführer“, die nationalsozialistische „Blut und Boden“-Ideologie und Hitlers Machteroberung*. Köln: Böhlau, 2019.

GRUNDWALD, Susanne; HOFMANN, Kerstin P. Wer hat Angst vor den Germanen? In: UELSBURG, Gabriele; WEMHOFF, Matthias (eds.). *germanen: Eine archäologische Bestandsaufnahme*. Darmstadt: wbg Theiss, 2020, 482–503.

GUYER, Mike; GIGON, Annette. Museum und Park Kalkriese: Architektur und Landschaftsarchitektur. In: VARUSSCHLACHT IM OSNABRÜCKER LAND GMBH – MUSEUM UND PARK KALKRIESE (ed.). *Varusschlacht im Osnabrücker Land: Museum und Park Kalkriese*. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 2009, 232–241.

HEINEN, Serina. *„Odin rules“: Religion, Medien und Musik im Pagan Metal*. Bielefeld: transcript, 2017.

HICKETHIER, Knut. *Geschichte des deutschen Fernsehens*. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1998.

HINZ, Felix. *Historische Mythen im Geschichtsunterricht: Theorie und Zugriffe für die Praxis*. Frankfurt a.M.: Wochenschau, 2023.

HORN, Heinz-Günter. Varus im 21. Jahrhundert: Zur kulturpolitischen Gestaltung des Varus-Jubiläums. In: BALTRUSCH, Ernst et al. (eds.). *2000 Jahre Varusschlacht: Geschichte – Archäologie – Legenden*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2012, 423–436.

HOSFELD, Rolf; PÖLKing, Hermann. *Die Deutschen 1945 bis 1972: Leben im doppelten Wirtschaftswunderland*. München: Piper, 2006.

JEISMANN, Karl-Ernst. Didaktik der Geschichte. Das spezifische Bedingungsfeld des Geschichtsunterrichts. In: BEHRMANN, Günter C.; Idem; H. SÜSSMUTH, Hans (eds.). *Geschichte und Politik: Didaktische Grundlegung eines kooperativen Unterrichts*, Paderborn: UTB, 1978, 50–76.

JEISMANN, Karl-Ernst. Geschichtsbewußtsein. In: BERGMANN, Klaus et al. (eds.). *Handbuch der Geschichtsdidaktik*. Vol. 1. Düsseldorf: Schwann, 1979, 42–45.

JEISMANN, Karl-Ernst. „Geschichtsbewußtsein“ als zentrale Kategorie der Didaktik des Geschichtsunterrichts. In: Idem. *Geschichte und Bildung: Beiträge zur Geschichtsdidaktik und zur Historischen Bildungsforschung*. Paderborn et al.: Schöningh, 2000, 46–72.

JÜRGENS, Yvonne. Von „blutgetränkten Böden“ und „ungelösten Rätseln“: Die Varusschlacht in den überregionalen Print-Medien. In: VARUSSCHLACHT IM OSNABRÜCKER LAND GMBH – MUSEUM UND PARK KALKRIESE (eds.). *Varusschlacht im Osnabrücker Land: Museum und Park Kalkriese*. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 2009, 222–231.

KREBS, Christopher B. *A Most Dangerous Book: Tacitus's Germania from the Roman Empire to the Third Reich*. New York: Norton, 2011.

LEUBE, Achim; HEGEWISCH, Morten (eds.). *Prähistorie und Nationalsozialismus: Die mittel- und osteuropäische Ur- und Frühgeschichtsforschung in den Jahren 1933–1945*. Heidelberg: Synchron, 2002.

LEVIN, David J. *Richard Wagner, Fritz Lang, and the Nibelungen: The Dramaturgy of Disavowal*. Princeton: PUP, 1998.

LINDNER, Martin. Germania Nova: Das antike Germanien in neuen deutschen (Dokumentar-)Filmen. In: Idem. *Antikenrezeption 2013 n. Chr.* Heidelberg: Verlag Antike, 2013, 107–142.

LINDNER, Martin. Winning History: Nationalistic Classical Reception in 19th Century German Board and Card Games. In: DUPLA ANSUATEGUI, Antonio et al. (eds.). *Antigüedad clásica y naciones modernas en el Viejo y el Nuevo Mundo*. Madrid: Ediciones Polifemo, 2018, 183–210.

LINDNER, Martin. Der Krieg der Töpfe: Rom und die ‚germanische‘ Alltagsgeschichte in deutschen Filmen der 1930er Jahre. In: MATIJEVIĆ, Krešimir (ed.). *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft in der späten Römischen Republik: Fachwissenschaftliche und fachdidaktische Aspekte*. Gutenberg: Scripta Mercaturae, 2020, 199–227.

LINDNER, Martin. Conditionally Heroic: Arminius the Meme. Forthcoming.

LINSE, Ulrich. Der Film „Ewiger Wald“ oder die Überwindung der Zeit durch den Raum: Eine filmische Umsetzung von Rosenbergs „Mythus des 20. Jahrhunderts“. In: HERRMANN, Ulrich; NASSEN, Ulrich (eds.). *Formative Ästhetik im Nationalsozialismus: Intentionen, Medien und Praxisformen totalitärer ästhetischer Herrschaft und Beherrschung*. Weinheim: Beltz, 1993, 57–75.

LOSEMANN, Volker. Nationalistische Interpretationen der römisch-germanischen Auseinandersetzung. In: WIEGELS, Rainer; WOESLER, Winfried (ed.). *Arminius und die Varusschlacht: Geschichte – Mythos – Literatur*. Paderborn: Schöningh, 1995, 419–432.

LOSEMANN, Volker. Denkmäler, völkische Bewegung und Wissenschaft: Die römisch-germanische Auseinandersetzung in der Sicht des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts. In: SCHNEIDER, Helmuth (ed.). *Feindliche Nachbarn: Rom und die Germanen*. Köln/Weimar/Wien: Böhlau, 2008, 229–270.

LWL-RÖMERMUSEUM IN HALTERN AM SEE (ed.). *2000 Jahre Varusschlacht – Imperium*. Stuttgart: Theiss, 2009.

MOOSBAUER, Günther. *Die Varusschlacht*. München: C.H. Beck 2009.

MOOSBAUER, Günther. Die Ausgrabungen von Kalkriese und die neue Rezeption der „Varusschlacht“. In: WIEGELS, Rainer; WELKER, Karl H. L. (eds.). *Verschlungene Pfade: Neuzeitliche Wege zur Antike*. Rahden/Westf.: Marie Leidorf, 2011, 43–56.

MUHLACK, Ulrich. Die Germania im deutschen Nationalbewusstsein vor dem 19. Jahrhundert. In: Idem. *Staatensystem und Geschichtsschreibung: Ausgewählte Aufsätze zu Humanismus und Historismus, Absolutismus und Aufklärung*. Berlin: Duncker und Humblot, 2006, 274–299.

MUSEUM KALKRIESE. URL: <https://www.kalkriese-varusschlacht.de/index.html> (rev. 17.05.2024).

ONKEN, Björn. Der Hermannsmythos in deutschen Schulbüchern von 1800 bis 2000, in: BERNHARD, Roland et al. (eds.). *Mythen in deutschsprachigen Geschichtsschulbüchern*. Göttingen: V&R unipress, 2017, 59–90.

PFEILSCHIFTER, Rene. Nekrolog Dieter Timpe (1931–2021), *Historische Zeitschrift*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 315, 2022, 385–394.

PUSCHNER, Uwe. Die Germanenideologie im Kontext der völkischen Weltanschauung. *Göttinger Forum für Altertumswissenschaft*. Heidelberg: Propylaeum, 4, 2001, 85–97.

ROHLFES, Joachim. Geschichtsunterricht und Geschichtsdidaktik von den 50er bis zu den 80er Jahren. In: VERBAND DER GESCHICHTSLEHRER DEUTSCHLANDS (ed.). *Geschichtsunterricht und Geschichtsdidaktik vom Kaiserreich bis zur Gegenwart: Festschrift des Verbandes der Geschichtslehrer Deutschlands zum 75jährigen Bestehen*. Stuttgart: Klett, 1988, 154–170.

RÜSEN, Jörn. Das ideale Schulbuch. Überlegungen zum Leitmedium des Geschichtsunterrichts. *Internationale Schulbuchforschung*. Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 14, 1992, 237–250.

RÜTTGERS, Jürgen. Grußwort. In: LWL-RÖMERMUSEUM IN HALTERN AM SEE, 2009, 14.

SAMBLEBE, Karin W. F. Nationaler Mythos in Westernmanier: Figurenkonzeption als Authentizitätsstrategie in Harald Reinls *Die Nibelungen* (1966). In: MEIER, Mischa; SLANICKA, Simona (eds.). *Antike und Mittelalter im Film: Konstruktion – Dokumentation – Projektion*. Cologne: Böhlau, 2007, 283–299.

SANDKÜHLER, Thomas. Die Geschichtsdidaktik der Väter: Zur Kulturgeschichte der 70er Jahre. In: WILDT, Michael (ed.). *Geschichte denken: Perspektiven auf die Geschichtsschreibung heute*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014, 260–279.

SANDKÜHLER, Thomas et al. (eds.). *Geschichtsunterricht im 21. Jahrhundert: Eine geschichtsdidaktische Standortbestimmung*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2018.

SCHMAUDER, Michael; WEMHOFF, Matthias. Vorwort. In: UELSBERG, Gabriele; WEMHOFF, Matthias (eds.). *Germanen. Eine archäologische Bestandsaufnahme*. Darmstadt: wbg Theiss, 2020, 14–17.

SCHULTE, Rolf; STELLO, Benjamin (eds.). *Buchners Kolleg Geschichte. Ausgabe für Schleswig-Holstein. Qualifikationsphase*. Bamberg: C.C. Buchner, 2017.

SEIBT, Oliver et al. (eds.). *Made in Germany: Studies in Popular Music*. London: Routledge, 2021.

SÉNÉCHEAU, Miriam. Die Germanen sind wieder da: Archäologische, didaktische und gesellschaftspolitische Perspektiven auf ein altes Thema in neuen Lehrwerken. *Archäologische Informationen*. Kerpen-Loogh: Verlag Deutsche Gesellschaft für Ur- und Frühgeschichte, 35, 2012, 219–234.

SIEVERTSEN, Dirk. Zur Darstellung der Germanen in den Schulbüchern zwischen 1900 und 1945. In: WIEGELS, Rainer; WELKER, Karl H. L. (eds.). *Verschlungene Pfade: Neuzeitliche Wege zur Antike*. Rahden/Westf.: Marie Leidorf, 2011, 83–167.

SIEVERTSEN, Dirk. *Die Deutschen und ihre Germanen. Germanendarstellungen in Schulgeschichtsbüchern von 1871 bis 1945*. Rahden/Westf.: Marie Leidorf, 2013.

STEFFENSEN, Nils. Von Hermann zu Zwermann: Arminius im problemorientierten Geschichtsunterricht. In: *Varus-Kurier*. Georgsmarienhütte: Varus-Gesellschaft, 25, 2023, 28–36.

STERN, Tom. Archäologiefilme als Propagandainstrument der NS-Diktatur: Eine Auswahl. In: BECK, Erik; TIMM, Arne (eds.). *Mythos Germanien: Das nationalsozialistische Germanenbild in Schulunterricht und Alltag der NS-Zeit*. Dortmund: Westfälisches Schulmuseum, 2015, 74–83.

STEUER, Ingo (ed.). *Zur Geschichte der Gleichung „germanisch – deutsch“: Sprache und Namen, Geschichte und Institutionen*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2004.

TIMPE, Dieter. *Arminius-Studien*. Heidelberg: Winter, 1970.

TIMPE, Dieter. Geographische Faktoren und politische Entscheidungen in der Geschichte der Varuszeit. In: WIEGELS, Rainer; WOESLER, Winfried (ed.). *Arminius und die Varusschlacht: Geschichte – Mythos – Literatur*. Paderborn: Schöningh, 1995, 13–27.

TIMPE, Dieter. Die Schlacht im Teutoburger Wald: Geschichte, Tradition, Mythos. In: SCHLÜTER, Wolfgang; WIEGELS, Rainer (eds.). *Rom, Germanien und die Ausgrabungen von Kalkriese*. Osnabrück: Universitätsverlag Rasch, 1999, 717–737.

VAN LAAK, Lothar. „Ihr kennt die deutsche Seele nicht“: Geschichtskonzeption und filmischer Mythos in Fritz Langs *Nibelungen*. In: MEIER, Mischa; SLANICKA, Simona (eds.). *Antike und Mittelalter im Film: Konstruktion – Dokumentation – Projektion*. Cologne: Böhlau, 2007, 267–82.

VARUSSCHLACHT IM OSNABRÜCKER LAND GMBH – MUSEUM UND PARK KALKRIESE (ed.). *Varusschlacht im Osnabrücker Land: Museum und Park Kalkriese*. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 2009, 222–231.

VIeregge, Elmar. 2000 Jahre Varusschlacht: Welche Bedeutung hat Arminius für den Rechtsextremismus? In: MÖLLERS, Martin H. W.; VAN Ooyen,

Robert Chr. (eds.). *Jahrbuch Öffentliche Sicherheit 2010/2011*. Frankfurt a.M.: Verlag für Polizeiwissenschaft, 2011, 165–172.

VÖLKER, Cornelius et al. Monumental, magisch, maßlos: *Deutschland im Jahr 9! Die Hermannschlacht*, der Spielfilm. *Grabbe-Jahrbuch*. Bielefeld: Aisthesis, 15, 1996, 38–47.

VON GOLDENDACH, Walter; MINOW, Hans-Rüdiger. „*Deutschtum erwache!*“: *Aus dem Innenleben des staatlichen Pangermanismus*. Berlin: Dietz, 1994.

VON SEE, Klaus. *Barbar, Germane, Arier: Die Suche nach der Identität der Deutschen*. Heidelberg: Winter, 1994.

VON SEE, Klaus. *Freiheit und Gemeinschaft. Völkisch-nationales Denken in Deutschland zwischen Französischer Revolution und Erstem Weltkrieg*. Heidelberg: Winter, 2001.

WENSKUS, Reinhard. *Stammesbildung und Verfassung: Das Werden der frühmittelalterlichen gentes*. Köln: Böhlau, 1961.

WIEGELS, Rainer. Vorwort. In: Idem (ed.). *Die Varusschlacht: Wendepunkt der Geschichte?* Stuttgart: Theiss, 2007, 7.

WIEGELS, Rainer. Der Ort der „Schlacht im Teutoburger Wald“ in der historischen Erinnerung In: Idem; WELKER, Karl H. L. (eds.). *Verschlungene Pfade: Neuzeitliche Wege zur Antike*. Rahden/Westf.: Marie Leidorf, 2011, 25–42.

WINKLER, Martin M. From Roman History to German Nationalism: Arminius and Varus in *Die Hermannschlacht* (1924). In: MICHELAKIS, Pantelis; WYKE, Maria (eds.). *The Ancient World in Silent Cinema*. Cambridge: CUP, 2013, 297–312.

WINKLER, Martin M. *Arminius the Liberator: Myth and Ideology*. Oxford: OUP, 2016.

WIWJORRA, Ingo. *Der Germanenmythos: Konstruktion einer Weltanschauung in der Altertumsforschung des 19. Jahrhunderts*. Darmstadt: WBG, 2006.

WOLTERS, Reinhard. *Die Römer in Germanien*. Fifth Edition. München: C.H. Beck, 2006.

ZECHNER, Johannes. „*Ewiger Wald und ewiges Volk*“: *Die Ideologisierung des deutschen Waldes im Nationalsozialismus*. Freising: Trepl, 2006.